

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11 November 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 14:00 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.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

COMMISSIONER FOR KANGAROO ISLAND BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RETURN TO WORK BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Condolence

GOSS, HON. W.K.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:04): On indulgence, sir, it is with great sadness I inform the house of the passing of the Hon. Wayne Goss, a former Premier of Queensland. He died at his home on 10 November 2014 surrounded by his wife and children. This is a great personal sadness as well as being a loss to the Australian, Queensland and South Australian communities. Wayne Goss was Premier of Queensland from 7 December 1989 to 19 February 1996, ending 32 years of Coalition/National Party rule, which has to be a good thing.

A lawyer by trade involved in a number of community and legal reform groups, he was first elected to the district of Salisbury in 1983 and then later in 1986 as the member for Logan. He was leader of the Labor Party from March 1988. It is said that he joined the ALP in 1975 because of his outrage at the dismissal of Gough Whitlam. Initially he was reluctant to join the Labor Party because he saw the Queensland ALP as too conservative, but he was a great reformer of Queensland. He focused on making Queensland a headquarters for economic development, invested in education and research, maintained close ties with universities and implemented a number of important social reforms including appointing Queensland's first female minister and first female governor. He decriminalised homosexuality.

Beyond politics he took an active interest in the arts. He chaired the Queensland Art Gallery, he was Director of the Brisbane Broncos, he was national chairman of Deloitte and was a member of the taskforce responding to the 2010-11 Queensland floods.

Mr Goss battled a series of brain tumours for 17 years, undergoing four operations to remove them. He was an incredibly courageous man in the face of those awful challenges. I remember speaking to him one day about those matters. He said, 'Psychologically I can never look backwards.' He was the most relentlessly positive person I have ever met. He helped out the South Australian

government in relation to his work on the Government Reform Commission. It is with great sadness that we acknowledge his passing but also express gratitude for his service.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): On indulgence, sir, I rise to support the Premier's acknowledgement of the passing of former Queensland Premier Wayne Goss. Premier Goss had a distinguished career in politics and government as well as in the business and community sectors. He came to power in Queensland in 1989 at the end of a highly tumultuous period of politics in Queensland that had well and truly reverberated across the nation.

His election ushered in a number of milestone reforms, particularly the implementation of the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry which slowly restored public confidence in key Queensland government institutions. After his time as Premier, he pursued a number of opportunities in business and community organisations and continued to contribute to Queensland and the nation more broadly.

Unfortunately he spent the past 18 years battling brain tumours which he ultimately succumbed to yesterday morning. I join with the Premier in passing on the condolences of this parliament to the Goss family.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament students from Rostrevor College, who are guests of the member for Morialta.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—
Berri Barmera Council Annual Report 2013-14
City of Charles Sturt Annual Report 2013-14
City of Victor Harbor Annual Report 2013-14
City of West Torrens Annual Report 2013-14

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Prescribed Unit

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Distribution Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Generation Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
Government Financing Authority, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14
Transmission Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
Treasury and Finance, Department of—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Motor Accident Commission—Annual Report 2013-14
State Procurement Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia (Funds SA)—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Australian Energy Market Commission—Annual Report 2013-14

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Electricity—Energy Efficiency

Gas—Energy Efficiency

Mines and Works Inspection—Certificates and Permits

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

BioSA—Annual Report 2013-14

Club One (SA) Ltd—Financial Report 2013-14

Construction Industry Training Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Education Adelaide—Annual Report 2013-14

Liquor and Gambling Commissioner—Annual Report 2013-14

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Dry Areas—Beachport—Cadell—Coffin Bay

Evidence of Age

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following acts—

Primary Industry Funding Schemes—

Apiary Industry Fund

Deer Industry Fund

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Adelaide Entertainments Corporation Performance Statement for the 2014–15 period

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. S.E. Close)—

South Australian Water Corporation Direction

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Heritage Places—Revocation of regulation

Natural Resources Management—Variation of heading

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Motor Vehicles—Accident Towing Roster Scheme

Ministerial Statement

REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:13): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Today marks the 96th anniversary of the armistice which ended the First World War. At 11 this morning, as we do at this time on the 11th day of the 11th month every year, our nation fell silent for a minute to observe the memory of all the men and

women who died or suffered in Australia's war-like and peace-time missions to keep the nation safe and free.

We reflect on a very sombre time in our nation's history, a time when we learnt great truths. The tragedy and the loss of World War I affected our nation deeply. The loss of our best and brightest young people from a small population of just five million was devastating for Australia. At that time, our young nation raised an army of more than 400,000 service personnel, 330,000 of whom were deployed overseas. By the end of the war, more than 60,000 Australians had been killed; 5,565 of these were South Australians.

Very few Australian families and communities were left untouched, with one in five not returning home. Today we also remember the more than 40,000 Australians who have died in service since the end of the First World War. Regardless of our heritage or family story, we are one as we remember those who died so that we might live freely.

I was honoured this morning to attend the Remembrance Day service with the Mitcham RSL within the Memorial Gardens at Mitcham. The Premier and other ministers and members across the house have attended services across the state. The Director of Veterans SA, Rob Manton, and Chairman of the Veterans' Advisory Council, Hon. Sir Eric Neal AC, CVO, attended a service in the Australian Imperial Forces section of the West Terrace Cemetery. I know that many members across the state have been involved with their communities at this important time.

I would like to thank all who endeavoured to support the spirit of Remembrance Day, as well as those who have served their country. Over the ANZAC centenary period, I would encourage all Australians to pay their respects in whatever way they can. It is important that, no matter our situation in life, we continue to remember them.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:16): I bring up the 507th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister rule out closing the Repatriation General Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): I've been asked this question before in estimates and I've repeatedly said that I'm not going to be ruling anything in or out.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm not going to be playing the rule in, rule out game, but what I can guarantee is that, through part of the Transforming Health process, we will have a health system which is better for South Australians.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Chaffey and Hartley. Leader.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Considering the government closed the Repat's acute referral unit in 2012, does the minister have any further plans to cut services at the Repatriation General Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:18): We have no plans other than what's been foreshadowed in the Transforming Health document, and that is about getting services which are better suited to South Australians. The simple fact is that the health needs

of South Australians have changed substantially, even over the last 10 years. The nature of illness has changed significantly over a very short period of time. Our hospital infrastructure has not caught up to those changes in the health needs of South Australians. Through the Transforming Health document we have been consulting with clinicians about how we can rebuild, reconfigure, our health infrastructure in order to meet the needs of South Australians, and I'll make no apology for that.

Members interjecting:

Mr Marshall: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary is asked, I call to order the members for Heysen, Bragg and Kavel, and Bragg, the deputy leader, is for inappropriate gesturing. The leader.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): What modelling has the government done to look at the impacts upon the waiting times at the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department on the closure of the Repat acute referral unit in 2012?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): I am more than happy to have a look at that. I don't know whether any have been brought to my attention. Certainly, the decision was made before I became health minister, and I don't know whether any studies have been made of the impact of that. I would suspect, though, that any there would be would be very minimal.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Has the minister done any modelling, has the department done any modelling or has any modelling been undertaken on the potential increases to the incidents of overcrowding at the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department if the Repatriation General Hospital is closed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:20): Again, not that I am aware of, but I am more than happy to check. The important thing about emergency departments is that people go to the right place the first time. There are two things that affect our emergency departments: one is people not going to the correct place—not through any fault of their own, but it is very important. The easier we can make it for people to go to the correct place to get the health care they need, the better it is going to be for them.

The closest hospital may not always be the best hospital. If you are having a stroke, for example, it is very important that you go to a hospital that has the equipment and the clinicians who are able to look after you. If you go to the wrong place that is not able to provide that suite of services to enable you to be properly looked after, you will go there, you would have to be transferred to another place—all of that means delays. It means a delay to you being properly looked after. It is very important that people go not necessarily to the closest hospital but to the correct hospital, the right hospital. That is really what Transforming Health is all about.

The second issue with our emergency departments is, while we are very good at seeing people quickly—in fact, we have among the best performance numbers in the nation in terms of people being seen promptly by a doctor when they present to an emergency department—where we do have problems is getting people admitted into an acute bed when the decision is taken that they need to be admitted.

The other point of Transforming Health is: how do we create that capacity within our existing bed stock to make sure that, when people need admission into an acute bed, they have an acute bed available for that person to be admitted. That is what Transforming Health is all about. That is why we have had three clinical groups: we have had a group of doctors, a group of nurses and midwives, and a group of allied health professionals. It is the most comprehensive consultation ever undertaken in South Australia about its health system with the people at the coalface, the people who have to deal with the patients day in day out, the people who understand the system.

Any reconfiguration, anything that we do, will be based upon the advice of those clinicians about what we need to do to have the best possible health system for South Australia. I will always listen to the clinicians before I listen to anyone on the other side of the house when it comes to health policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks the supplementary, I call to order the member for Hammond and I warn, for the first time each, the members for Heysen, Hartley and Chaffey. The leader.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Can the minister outline to the house whether or not the government has had any discussion or consultation with the veterans community in South Australia, given that they are currently considering the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23): I never said that we were considering it.

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, sir, the minister has made it very clear that he will not rule out the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital. He said that he will rely on the advice of—

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. Question time is not for impromptu speeches—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Ask a question.

The SPEAKER: —so you are called to order. The leader may ask another question, and the Minister for Education is called to order for doing my job.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): What message does the minister have for the veterans community, who are concerned about the government's refusal to rule out the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:23): Any changes that we make will result in better health services for all South Australians, and that includes veterans. I know very well the health needs of the veteran population. I have a father who is a Vietnam veteran. I would never do anything to harm the health services available to veterans of South Australia. I can guarantee one thing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And I won't be shouted down by the opposition. I can guarantee one thing, and that is: any changes we make will be tailored and better provide services to our veterans, who I have always stood shoulder to shoulder with, unlike you lot.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order for referring to Her Majesty's opposition as 'you lot'. Leader.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is called to order, also. Leader.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the health minister. Can the minister inform the house how much the EPAS system is impacting upon hospital activity levels at the Repatriation General Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:25): I am more than

happy to get a report. There certainly have been some issues, particularly with outpatients, in the Repatriation Hospital. Any new IT system, no matter where it's rolled out—whether it is the government or private sector—always has its teething problems, and the EPAS is absolutely no different.

What I can inform the house of is that I think literally thousands of alerts have been fired through the EPAS system where otherwise an error would have been made with regard to the administration of medication to patients, and EPAS has been able to pick that up. I think it is literally thousands of times that EPAS has been able to pick up when a doctor or nurse has prescribed or given medication which would have conflicted with other medication that the patient was on. For some clinical reason they should not have been given it and EPAS has picked that up.

Whatever teething problems there might be with EPAS, the simple fact is that it has had a significant impact on good quality care for South Australians. Compare that to the opposition, who had nothing to say about health policy at the last election, who had to be called out on it by the leader of the nurses federation, Elizabeth Dabars.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. He is not responsible to the house for the opposition. Leader.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary, sir: what action has the minister taken to respond to the concerns raised by four senior clinicians at the Repat that:

EPAS has impacted significantly on clinical activity, reducing it to 50 per cent of previous levels. This has had a similar effect on surgical case loadings, increasing waiting times and impacting on surgical training opportunities for trainees.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): We have procedures in place and we constantly engage with clinicians about EPAS and about how we can make EPAS work better. I have certainly made no secret that there have been issues with EPAS, like there would be any IT system. That is why we have rolled it out at relatively small sites—so that we can deal with these issues before we roll out EPAS to big sites like the Flinders Medical Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary, sir: how has the minister responded to the claims made by senior clinicians at the Repat that the rollout of the EPAS system was 'a direct risk to patients' safety' and that they did not endorse its use?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28): I will need to see what those comments are, but we do have procedures in place whereby clinicians, if they have concerns about EPAS, can engage with the people who are running the project to make sure that any issues that clinicians have are appropriately dealt with, but I certainly reject any claim that at any time patient safety is compromised.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Will the minister inform the house on recent impediments to the development of the state's vital oil and gas sector?

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned a second and final time. He must remain silent during this answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:28): He's the only one we fear, sir. Let there be no mistake: across South Australia,

we are seeing a concerted push by extremist groups and their parliamentary allies to rip investment out of the state's burgeoning oil and gas sector. Recently, we have seen this house speak out against a decision by the ANU to sell off its shares in resource companies, including Iluka Resources and South Australia's very own Santos, a position that was met with passionate opposition not only here in South Australia but across the country.

It was followed by South Australian Senator Sarah Hanson-Young embarking on what can only be called a reckless attack on Santos, as she rallied fellow extremist campaigners to argue that South Australian universities could do a great service to the people of South Australia by separating from fossil fuel companies.

The actions of extremist groups seeking to spread fear throughout the community present a clear and present danger to the expansion of our state's oil and gas sector. We will stand up against an extremist 'lock the gate' campaign; we will not let the blind ideology of a fringe element, and those who seek to exploit their support for political advancement, endanger our state's future.

There is no doubt that this government is proud to stand by the resources industry because this government recognises the vital role this expanding sector will play in growing our economy. We recognise it as our number one economic priority and to ensure that our state is recognised across the nation as the place where people and businesses thrive.

I have said it before and I will say it again: we are at the centre of an energy revolution with billions of dollars being spent in the search for oil and gas in South Australia. In 2013-14 there was nearly half a billion dollars of expenditure on gas exploration, threefold the exploration expenditure of just two years ago. These are exciting times for our state as, with investment, comes jobs and prosperity for our towns, cities and regional communities.

I find it ironic that, as the Premier and I were officially opening a new base for US energy services company Halliburton, which employs 200 new people here in South Australia—a clear sign of the growing confidence in the state's growing energy sector—members opposite jumped on the bandwagon calling for the establishment of an inquiry seeking to crush the oil and gas sector in this state.

The decision of the ANU and the actions of Sarah Hanson-Young pale into insignificance when it comes to those opposite supporting an inquiry into unconventional gas extraction. It is nothing more than a lack of political courage to stand up for science, to stand up for facts—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point or order, sir: the minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he may be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully and, meanwhile, warn the member for Kavel.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, don't take my word for it: there are bastions of socialist activity in the South Australian Chamber of Mines, Business SA, the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association, Santos and Beach Energy who have all condemned the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party. Business has turned its back on the Liberal Party in South Australia. They say desperate men do desperate things but I urge the Leader of the Opposition not to risk jobs in our state just to save his own.

Members interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: And the point of order is?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Debate again, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Mr Gardner: Would you like a hearing tunnel, sir; one of those funnels?

The SPEAKER: I'm quite prepared to receive an ear horn as a gift of the opposition.

An honourable member: And we know where to put it, sir.

The SPEAKER: I think Billy Hughes may have had one; a politician I admire greatly.

HOSPITAL STAFF, SAFETY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many criminal charges have been laid in relation to assaults on hospital staff since the laws were tightened last year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): I'm happy to get a report but certainly I can say, from my point of view, that I have not been satisfied with some of the action that has been taken against alleged offenders by our courts. I will speak to the Attorney-General about this particular issue but, from my point of view, attacks and assaults on our emergency services workers, whether they be doctors and nurses in our hospitals or ambulance workers, are completely reprehensible. To commit an assault against someone who has committed their life to serving our community is absolutely disgusting. If we need to revisit the legislation with regard to assaults on emergency services workers then we will.

HOSPITAL STAFF, SAFETY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): I have a supplementary question. Given that there were more than 7,000 code black incidents against hospital staff last year alone, what steps have been taken to prevent these attacks?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): Code blacks cover a range of things. I have been in discussions with doctors and nurses—in fact, our ambulance workers have been particularly angry about this issue—and have been looking at what we might be able to do. I must say that it is a little bit frustrating, when the parliament has passed legislation imposing the upper range of penalties at 25 years for an assault against an emergency worker, to see people come out with convictions which are significantly less. It causes a great deal of frustration to our emergency services workers, doctors, nurses and me.

PAEDIATRIC HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:35): My question is also to the Minister for Health. Minister, what is being done to improve paediatric ear, nose and throat services for children in northern Adelaide?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:35): I thank the member for Little Para for his question. The Lyell McEwin Hospital, of course, is in the electorate of Little Para, and the member for Little Para has spoken to me on many occasions about services for children at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

I want to work together with doctors from the Modbury Hospital to provide paediatric ENT services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Nevertheless, our state needs doctors who are prepared to offer their services where the patient needs them, not where it happens to be convenient. SA Health believes that the doctors' concerns have been addressed. In February, we wrote to the industrial bodies representing the doctors involved to work through how ENT services can be offered where they are needed.

We currently have a very good surgeon providing paediatric ENT services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The Lyell McEwin Hospital also provides surgical services for children, including paediatric, dental and orthopaedics. Children as young as three years old are provided with surgical care at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. However, the current service is limited to one part-time ENT surgeon, who needs to be supported by colleagues who previously have provided paediatric ENT surgical services at Modbury Hospital. That service needs to be expanded so that families living in the northern suburbs can access ENT services for their children at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

SA Health is currently working to develop paediatric ENT services at the Lyell McEwin. If we do not have cooperation from the surgeons, I am considering three other options to ensure that ENT services are available at the Lyell McEwin Hospital for people living in our northern suburbs. These include using private sector ENT services, ENT services provided through an outreach agreement with the Women's and Children's Hospital, or consolidating all the ENT services at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

The government is dedicated to working with the ENT surgeons to ensure that any safety concerns are fully addressed. There must be acknowledgement, however, from the ENT surgeons that the Lyell McEwin, with its new women's and children's health hub, will be the focus of paediatric services in our northern suburbs.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Does the minister agree with the police commissioner that the government is playing musical chairs with remand prisoners in police cells and that this is now affecting police operations?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:38): This is a very important question, and it is something that involves a question that raises the issue of the efficiency and effectiveness of the whole justice system, from the point at which a person might be apprehended by the police through to the processing of that person through the court system, through to the admission or not of that person into a Correctional Services facility.

I heard with interest the comments made by the police commissioner today. That is one of the reasons why last year, in about July, we established the Criminal Justice Reform Council to look at these issues. It has as members of that council the Commissioner of Police, the head of the Legal Services Commission, the head of each of the court jurisdictions, the head of Correctional Services and my colleague the Minister for Police and Correctional Services.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. That is why, at the swearing-in after the election, the Premier asked me to undertake the process of justice reform, which is intended to look at the whole system, that is, from one end to the other. The important point to make about this is that Corrections are a recipient of whatever product comes through the system. They have no control of how many prisoners come their way because that is determined by the police, who either do or do not grant bail at a particular occasion; it is determined by the courts, who do or do not grant bail; and it is determined by the statutes that this place passes, because they either require people to be imprisoned or they don't.

So, the idea that we can focus on Corrections as a single entity and say, 'Look, what's going on in Corrections?' is a complete fallacy and it misunderstands the position overall. There is no doubt that if you wanted to be simplistic about the matter you would be banging the drum of, 'Let's build more prisons, let's build more prisons.' It may be that, in time, prison capacity does need to be reviewed, and indeed I know the minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, I don't find anything funny about talking about prisoners.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The Minister for Corrections has already got projects in the pipeline which are going to be addressing, to some extent, the requirements of the system. But, Mr Speaker, can I give you one example of where I think some useful work can be done which will ameliorate some of these problems? At the moment—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm trying to provide information to the parliament because I thought the parliament was interested in what's going on in our system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is called to order in order to support his previous warning.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He's been distracting the others a bit, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Sorry?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He's been upsetting the others from back there, I think. Where was I up to?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, remand prisoners. It is a well-known fact, if you look at the ROGS material, that in South Australia we have a higher proportion of prisoners on remand than in any other state.

An honourable member: Shame.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Perhaps.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He's attempting to intimidate me, Mr Speaker. Oh dear, I'm out of time.

The SPEAKER: I'm afraid that's all we have time for.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:42): I have a supplementary, sir. Given the minister's comments that the corrections department has no control over who goes into their system, given that Corrections numbers, prisoner numbers, have increased by 10 per cent last year and 5 per cent in the first two months of this year, all of which was entirely predictable, and every day this year the prison system has been overcrowded, when are you going to take responsibility for the mess in Corrections and when are you actually going to deal with the fact that there is no long-term plan in the Corrections system?

The SPEAKER: That question is out of order. I see the Attorney is keen to answer it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:42): If I'm given sufficient latitude I'm happy to answer that question. First of all, the first statement made by the honourable member for Morialta is what a famous American statesman would have referred to as a self-evident truth; that is, that the Corrections service does—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: A priori.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: A priori, indeed. The Corrections service does not actually select its own people, believe it or not; they are selected by others. The second thing is, he then went on to say that these things are entirely predictable. Well, predictable according to what and whom, I would be interested to know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If you would just let me, I am building this up to the eureka moment where the smiles will break out on their faces, Mr Speaker, when they realise that all this worry has been unnecessary. The situation is this: at the last election the Premier asked me to look at this question of justice reform, from beginning to end.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I was explaining, the fact that we have a large number of people in remand at any given time (that means in prison awaiting trial), one of the questions that we are looking at is, for example, how many of those remandees are short-term remandees? And if they are short-term remandees (say, people remanded for a fortnight or less) why is it that it was necessary for them to be remanded in custody at all in the first place, for instance? Do they represent, in fact, a danger to the public? Is the reason that they are on remand because they could not be put before a suitable—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Anyway, is it because they were not able to be put in front of a magistrate to be able to have a bail application heard? Is it because police were not able, for whatever reason, to process an application for police bail? Is it because the charge actually should not at that time have been a charge but could have been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, it is very hard to add additional things to a cup that is full. It would appear their cup is completely full presently and further information is unnecessary.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Their cup overfloweth.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Their cup overfloweth with ignorance.

Mr Gardner: Two minutes ago you said this was no laughing matter and now you're trying to make jokes.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I'm not. As I was trying to explain, there are many reasons why somebody winds up in remand, for example. Some of those reasons may be very good reasons; some of those reasons may be reasons that we should be looking at and paying a great deal of attention to.

It is my intention and the government's intention before the end of the year hopefully to be able to present a high-level paper which looks at the whole question of justice reform, not just focusing on Corrections—not saying, 'Corrections, it's all your fault'—not just focusing on the police and saying 'Police, it's all your fault', not just focusing on the courts and saying 'Courts, it's all your fault', but looking at the whole system, including the private profession, including the Director of Public Prosecutions, and including the Legal Services Commission, and asking the question: are all of you people cooperating in the best possible way?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will in that context also be turning our minds to the sentencing regime and whether there is an appropriate range of penalties available to the courts which add on to the alternative of imprisonment.

Mr GARDNER: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Morialta asks the question, I call the member for Colton to order.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:47): Supplementary, sir: can the minister guarantee that there will be enough holding cells for police to continue making arrests over the Christmas period, given that there is a nine-day courts recess and the minister's white paper that is going to solve all these problems certainly won't have been dealt with by then?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:47): I think that's out of order, isn't it?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, as an indulgence I am happy to answer a supplementary out of order question, and the answer is that we are making every effort to improve the system. We will continue to do so and we will be perfectly happy to engage with the member for Morialta and others about the quite bold solutions we will be putting forward. We hope they will engage with that in a positive way so that we can actually achieve meaningful change in the justice system.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Automotive Transformation. Can the minister provide advice on recent developments in the South Australian automotive industry?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:48): I thank the member for this question and acknowledge her very keen interest in the fate of the automotive workers in South Australia. Just a few days ago, Holden workers voted to accept a final workplace agreement that settles the redundancy payouts for workers once the Elizabeth plant shuts down in 2017. However, as the relevant employee representatives have noted, these redundancy payments should never have been necessary. Had the Liberal federal government listened to industry experts, we would not be grappling with the task of transitioning thousands of workers to a post car industry future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Last month was the 60th anniversary of TI Automotive Australia, a business that was established in Adelaide in 1954 to originally supply GM Holden and that has since been competing with the global vehicle manufacturing marketplace. The company supplied parts for the very first Holden to be made here in South Australia: the FJ Holden. Their contribution to the automotive industry within South Australia has played an important and critical role in the automotive supply chain, creating many good jobs for South Australians.

To be celebrating 60 years in business is testament to the quality of their executives, managers and employees, but all of that will come to an end for their Australian division with the closure of Holden in 2017. This now globally successful company will continue on as a vibrant part of the auto sector throughout the world, but sadly not here. Without question, the costs of the closure of this industry will be enormous and I witnessed firsthand the profound sense of personal loss felt by these workers at their recent 60th anniversary event.

So, it is not only the direct and flow-on economic costs but the accompanying social costs of a shift from automotive manufacturing that will have a profound impact on our state's economy and on our community. Our government took a clear policy to the election that we intend to play a leading role in the transformation of the state's economy. We believe that it is the appropriate role of government to support this transformation through the provision of targeted support for growing sectors of our economy. We are working to help businesses identify new opportunities for innovation, to focus on developing and expanding their capabilities and to compete on value.

All of this will help them occupy new niches and reach new global markets. The impending closure of TI Automotives Australian division reinforces the need for investment and through our jobs plan launched at the beginning of this year. We have committed \$60 million over four years to support local companies to prepare to take action and to diversify their businesses. Is this going to be easy? Of course not. We are under no illusion that this is an extremely difficult task to assist a whole industry sector to transform.

However, we are certainly not the only community in Australia or globally to face the closure of a major industry. In the past 20 years in particular many communities have faced challenges associated with the closure of steelworks, shipyards, automotive and whitegoods plants. Was it a tough time for these communities? Of course, but they have adjusted to their new lives and to the changes within their economy and we must learn from those communities in order for us to successfully transition the sector.

Rejuvenation of a regional economy requires a multifaceted approach with a sound overarching strategy. It also requires a strong partnership between industry, government, universities and the community, focusing on building on our strengths, skilling the community and diversifying companies. Transformation of the South Australian economy will be built upon our ability to adopt new ways of doing things and how we use advanced technologies to build globally competitive high-value firms.

When you have a big economic transition such as the end of automotive manufacturing in Australia in a state such as South Australia, I believe that government bears a strong responsibility to step in and assist industry and the community through the period of transition.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Has the minister or the corrections department received any advice from South Australia Police that cells currently used as surge capacity in the police cells will have reduced availability after the next year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. I can advise the member that on that specific information I do not think we have been advised. However, I have been advised and I have sought advice from my own agency that we anticipate that the cells will still be available and, secondly, that the advice I have received from SAPOL is that our current use of surge beds is not having a negative impact on their operations.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:53): A supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer, can he advise whether he agrees with Commissioner Burns who said on radio in relation to remand prisoners in police cells that it was like playing musical chairs and in fact that there were impacts on operational capacity when cells were unavailable for police who were making an arrest and that was their closest station?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. The commissioner went to great lengths this morning to explain that as police commissioner he holds, if you like, the title to the cells but they are actually managed by Corrections. I have nothing to add to that opinion expressed by the commissioner. He is quite correct there. What I can also say is that Corrections officers do their best to make sure that people who are sent to gaol for whatever reason are housed and the community is kept safe.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:54): A supplementary, sir: can the minister advise perhaps if the Sturt or Holden Hill police cells are full of prisoners on remand, then is—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: 'If, if'—therefore, it is hypothetical.

Mr Marshall: When.

Mr GARDNER: When, as many times in recent days, police cells at Holden Hill or Sturt are full with prisoners on remand, where is a police officer who makes an arrest in the vicinities of those stations supposed to take the person who has just been arrested?

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned. Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his question. All I can advise the honourable member is that that matter hasn't been brought to my attention, so we—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The most recent advice I have received from both SAPOL and Corrections is that the two agencies work together to make sure that if people are arrested they need to be housed or people are sentenced they are.

Mr GARDNER: A supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:55): I am not sure if the minister heard the commissioner this morning, but is the minister investigating claims made on radio this morning that a prisoner was kept in a holding cell for three weeks without the opportunity to have a shower even?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. I did hear the comment made by a person who referred to himself as Michael and who alleged, first of all, that his son had been held in these cells. We have made inquiries to find out the background to that. Unfortunately, with the number of people who work through our system, we need some more information to work out whether that allegation is accurate or not—and it is an allegation at this stage.

Secondly, I am not suggesting that the person is not telling the truth; what I am suggesting is that the information provided on radio was insufficient to identify any person. What I can say is that our policy is as follows for the holding of prisoners in police cells. First of all, it is policy to ensure that prisoners are able to shower daily. Whether they choose to shower daily or not is a different matter, but they have the opportunity to shower daily. They also are showered under the supervision of Corrections staff, for obvious reasons. They also have an opportunity to change their clothing daily.

In the Sturt cells, there are six single cells and two double cells for a total of 10 prisoners, so I would have thought that if a person had not showered for 21 days it might come to the attention of a Corrections officer. In addition to that, there is a whole range of other rights which prisoners have in our cells, but if that person is concerned about the welfare of their child they should ring my office with some more details. I will be happy to investigate and have the integrity people look at it.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:57): Given the minister's indication that the department has been unable to identify this individual, how many prisoners have been on remand for more than three weeks in the South Australian corrections system and in police cells?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:57): First of all, we need to verify that it was three weeks or that it wasn't three weeks. Given that we have no name, and given that the police cells are determined as short-term stays, the number of people who go through the system is quite a few, obviously. As I said, in terms of the allegation made this morning, if we are given some more information, if the member has more information, I would be happy to investigate it.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a second and final time. The member for Florey.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How is the government investing in early childhood education for South Australian children?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:59): I thank the member for Florey for this question. Our government has made early childhood

a priority since we came into government, and we have been investing a great deal to ensure that our little ones get the best start in life that we can provide them.

Recent modelling by PricewaterhouseCoopers shows that investing in quality early childhood programs, and increasing participation by vulnerable children, is expected to increase the GDP by \$23.6 billion to 2050. Here in South Australia, we could expect to benefit in the order of \$2 billion. Our government has invested more than \$60 million in 42 children's centres across the state, and in the last couple of weeks I have had the pleasure of opening three new centres in South Australia: the Ardtornish Children's Centre at St Agnes, which I know the member for Florey often visits; the Darlington Children's Centre; and, just last Friday, the Clare centre, where I was joined by the member for Frome.

What great centres they all are, providing targeted services for their specific communities, none of which existed when we came to government in 2002. These wonderful children's centres bring together preschool, child health and family support services to meet the needs of local families. We are continuing that investment with an extra \$13.7 million to expand the allied health services offered in our children's centres.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sadly, it would appear the Abbott government doesn't share our commitment to early childhood. The federal Liberal government has discontinued the national partnership for Indigenous early childhood development, which has supported the four specific Indigenous children and family centres in Ceduna, Whyalla, Christies Beach and one on the APY lands. They have cut \$157 million from the community support program that ensures the viability of family day care.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: fortunately, the minister isn't responsible for the Abbott government. The question to her was what she's doing to assist this, not the Abbott government.

The SPEAKER: Well, under section 96 of the constitution, the commonwealth makes grants to the states, presumably for this purpose.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir, that's exactly right. This cut has been estimated by the childcare sector to mean fees will rise by \$35 a week, and the 15 hours of preschool under the universal access program has been left hanging by a thread. Finally, after months of refusing to confirm or otherwise whether this program would continue, I received a letter from minister Ley on 15 October advising of a one-year extension; however—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, don't verbal me; that is not true.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That's not true. You need to listen.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No whoops! You're wrong, you're absolutely wrong.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It was a big whoops when you told everybody to vote Labor.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In fact, I quoted 15 October on radio, if you had listened.

The SPEAKER: It's a very witty interjection by the Treasurer; it's out of order, and he's warned a second and final time. Any further interjections better be worth it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I think it was in September that minister Ley put out a press release saying, 'Oh, yes, it's going to continue,' but not until 15 October did we get letter from minister Ley, and it was only a week or so ago—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —the final detail arrived.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The final detail arrived, and it's always in the fine print: the goalposts had shifted. So, it came as quite a surprise when minister Ley made a commitment on radio last Friday to roll over the existing national partnership. This is at odds with the documentation we received and discussions that had been held with commonwealth officials. However, I'm happy to take her at her word: same money, same conditions, same benchmarks, which South Australia had met, but in an abundance of caution—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has long expired.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): When is the minister going to answer my letter on this same subject, which she has now had for two weeks, or even read it?

The SPEAKER: Well, there's four minutes on the clock.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:04): I had read the member for Bragg's letter and thought it was really interesting that she was lobbying me in relation to the universal access program that's funded \$30 million for South Australia to provide the extra three hours for kids to go to preschool. I was waiting until we had confirmation from the federal government about what they were actually proposing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You will get your letter after I have had a response from Sussan Ley. I have sent her a letter—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, it's in the detail—shifted the goalposts to ensure that no-one would actually qualify. They shifted the goalposts: 'Here is the money, but you will never get it.' I am happy to send you that response if that is what you want. I am writing to minister Ley asking her to confirm what she said on radio, that the universal access program, as has been operating successfully in South Australia and around the nation, will continue in exactly the same format, not a format that means no state around Australia can actually meet the benchmarks.

Ms Chapman: You got caught out.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I didn't get caught out. She has been caught out, and we are happy to take her at her word.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned a first time. However, it is the deputy leader who has had the two warnings, and continues.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: So I am the only one who gets warned, sir? Is that right?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Spectacular result for Charles Sturt, sir.

The SPEAKER: Indeed! Does anyone have a question? The member for Goyder.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister confirm his response to local government on emergency services levy increases of up to 237 per cent, as in the case of the City of Salisbury, and another example with the City of Charles Sturt where the bill has increased from \$43,913.20 to \$130,978.35, or an increase of 198 per cent?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:07): I find it stunning that the Liberal Party say to us, why can't we absorb the cuts that the Abbott government has made within our budgets, yet stand up here today and say, 'They can't afford to absorb the increases once the remissions are removed to the emergency services levy.' I find it absolutely hypocritical. I have to say, yesterday's little display by the Mayor of Onkaparinga reminded me of another display that the Mayor of Onkaparinga put on during the election campaign. She said this:

The changes proposed by the Liberals will put community services at risk. Ill considered & populist policy. Rates are a tax, not a fee/charge.

That was Lorraine Rosenberg. That is her view about Liberal Party policy on capping rates, yet the Liberal Party is actually standing up today saying, 'They can't absorb these cuts. They have to pass them on in rates.' Which one is it? Should they cap their rates or should they pass it on? The hypocrisy of the argument by members opposite is stunning.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Debate?

Mr GARDNER: Yes, and I remind you, sir, that the minister has had two warnings not to defy you.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Mr Marshall: Chuck him out!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sure the Liberal Party would like me to leave, but they have got me for 3½ years courtesy of the Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to thank him for his efforts. I have to say that councils that have budgets of \$100 million plus saying they have to pass on the costs of ESL increases I think is more politics than truth.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:09): Supplementary to the Minister for Local Government, given the Treasurer's response: can the minister confirm the outcome of his discussions with local government on the impact of the removal of the rebate for the emergency services levy for local government?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:09): I have not had any direct—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Mr Speaker, I have had no direct contact regarding this from the Local Government Association, to my knowledge. I will double-check that, but I heard the president's comment on the radio this morning.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:10): Can the minister confirm if he has directed his staff to find out what the total cost—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

Mr GRIFFITHS: To repeat that, can the Minister for Local Government confirm if he has directed his staff to provide an estimate on the total cost of the emergency services levy to all local government in South Australia?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:10): As the member realises, we have just had local council elections. Now that

the council elections are over, the correspondence will be going out through the Local Government Association asking them what are the impacts of the ESL.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:10): Supplementary, sir: indeed, in response, during caretaker period I did make contact, minister, so you should have, too. But the supplementary question is—

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is called to order and will resume his seat. The member for Torrens.

CHINA TRADE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you advise if there are any initiatives being undertaken to promote the sharing of South Australia's biosecurity expertise with key international trading partners?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:11): Primary Industries and Regions is currently undertaking a series of workshops in Shandong Province to talk to people in Shandong about the importance of biosecurity and how we do it so well here, but also to teach people over there things that we have done and things that they might want to introduce into Shandong Province and, wider, throughout China.

It is a two-pronged approach to things. It is reinforcing to China the great phylloxera free and fruit fly free standards that we have here in South Australia and to talk to people about those things that we are very proud of but also to work with them in a global sense to make sure we can all help out each other.

We do the same thing across in Victoria, which is a big threat. As the member for Chaffey knows, having the border right there, with fruit fly, is a threat to us, and we spend about \$5 million a year in biosecurity measures just to make sure that we can remain fruit fly free. It is getting harder and harder all the time, with the threat and the number of fruit fly increasing across the border.

The workshops have been on biosecurity, food safety, pest management issues and South Australia's fruit fly program, and the delivering of information to key personnel in the Shandong agricultural department and the industry.

The Premier has forged very tight relationships with the Governor of Shandong and also the Deputy Governor of Shandong, who was out here during Royal Adelaide Show time, and it was terrific to join with the Premier and Deputy Governor as we toured the Adelaide Show and met with agricultural producers and forged those relationships. We know when we do have dealings with China that they are long-term relationships. I congratulate those people on the other side of the chamber, too, who have been working with Chinese people, whether it has been in Shandong or other parts of China and Hong Kong, to develop those. If anyone is heading over there, we are happy to provide as much information as possible to ensure that we can continue to grow those relationships.

Also, the Hong Kong Wine and Spirits Fair was on last week and PIRSA had good representation there, and we know that a lot of deals have been signed already and that winemakers from throughout the state have come back with more leads to follow up. It is very important, once again, that we have people from PIRSA travelling into Asia and other markets to promote the South Australian wine and premium food that we have here, because it is a very competitive environment. We are up against wine producers from all around the world and we want to make sure that we get our fair share as we look to grow our premium food and wine sector from \$16.3 billion a year up to \$20 billion a year. We will only do that by the government working side by side with the private sector.

Our first international premium food and wine ambassador, Mr Wong Wing Chee, who is a very important and famous chef in Hong Kong, hosted a dinner that just blew people away. It was all cooked with South Australian produce and served with South Australian wine. We have already put in place an invitation to some very high-end buyers and wine collectors to come down here to South Australia so that we can show them in situ our wonderful wine regions. Of course, we have 18 wine

regions and, as I look around the chamber, we have plenty of members in here who are very proud of the great wines that are produced from those 18 regions throughout the state.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid the member's time has expired.

FRUIT FLY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:15): Supplementary: have you spoken to the recently-formed Greater Sunraysia Pest Free Area Industry Development Committee about how it can assist to reduce fruit fly pressure on the South Australian border?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:15): I thank the member for Chaffey for the question and acknowledge once again his commitment to keeping South Australia fruit fly free. I have not had a direct conversation with them, but I met with the Victorian agriculture minister when I first took over this role back in April to say that we want to work together. I know that, in the past, the relationship between South Australia and Victoria was a little frayed. It is in our interest to have people working across the border to make sure that our first line of defence is not on our side of the border but on the Victorian side of the border, as we work hand in hand.

I will give the member a copy of this just-launched publication, entitled *Citrus in South Australia*. It talks about the fruit fly free status that we have in South Australia and it also talks about how citrus is exported around the world. We have seen just in the past two years a doubling in the value of citrus exports into China, and we have seen overall further growth. Exports of citrus climbed in the 2013-14 year up to \$65.7 million from a figure of \$54.4 million two years earlier.

Citrus is a very important industry for South Australia and that is why we have the tight biosecurity measures that we do have in place. I will continue to work with people on this side of the border and on the other side of the border to make sure that we can continue to remain fruit fly free and phylloxera free. It is a great selling point and it is also a great protector for our wonderful industries.

BUSHFIRES ON GOVERNMENT LAND

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. How does the government intend to battle bushfires on government-owned land now that CFS volunteers are indicating that they will not attend callouts to fires on government land?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. As the member and other members would know, government agencies have their own capacity to fight fires—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If you let me finish the answer—in addition to that, they are supplemented and supported by the CFS. That was going to be my answer—and supported by the CFS. Having said that, I have also read in a number of newspapers (including the Riverland papers) that the CFS has indicated it will fight any fire.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I said government land, for example in the Riverland—I am making the point. It is unfortunate that the Liberal Party seems keen to make sure that we don't have a safe community by trying to encourage volunteers to down tools.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is absolutely appalling—

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You're disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, sir. My point of order is debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Minister for Education will leave the chamber for half an hour under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Wright having withdrawn from the chamber.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just for the record, I would like to indicate that I am confident, given the goodwill we have with the CFS and other emergency service workers, that we will be able to tackle whatever we need to tackle this fire season.

Grievance Debate

BRINKWORTH RESERVE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:20): I would like to discuss an event that took place in the electorate of Flinders over last weekend. On Sunday, there was a rally convened at the Brinkworth Reserve. The Brinkworth Reserve is an area of about 19 acres on the outskirts of the City of Port Lincoln, not contained within the city council area but, in fact, contained within the District Council of Lower Eyre. The protest rally was as a result of the National Trust's intention to sell this property.

My involvement with this goes back to when the committee that has been charged with the operation and management of the trust came to see me and indicated that they had received notification from the National Trust (a highly regarded and honourable organisation, I must add) that the intention was to sell the Brinkworth Reserve. My interest in this extends further than that because, in fact, the benefactor for the Brinkworth Reserve was one Mr Ken Brinkworth. Way back in 1926, he and two friends travelled from Kybunga to Yeelanna, on Eyre Peninsula, to make a new life. One of those friends was Mr Alf Trestrail and the other friend was Mr Colin Treloar, who was to become my grandfather. So, our families have been involved for a long time.

During the 1960s, Mr Brinkworth made available an area of land for the enjoyment of the people of Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula and, in fact, transitioned the ownership of that land to the National Trust in 1996, along with a sum of some \$50,000 to enable the reserve to be managed, which it has been over all of this time. In fact, \$35,000 of that original \$50,000 remains in trust.

So, it was with some surprise that we received notification from the National Trust that they intended to sell the property. The reason given by the trust was so that they could ensure their long-term viability; in other words, it is all about the money, which makes it particularly sad. I do not altogether blame the National Trust for this because, as we all know, they were once reliant upon significant government funding, along with donations and support from benefactors. But that significant government funding has been withdrawn in total, and what that has done is to put a 40 per cent hole in their budget, so they have had to make some other arrangements. It is a pity, of course, that, with this particular example, they are going very much against the original intent of Mr Ken Brinkworth and his family that the reserve be held in perpetuity for the enjoyment of not just the people of Eyre Peninsula but also of the entire state.

It also goes very much against the wishes of the local community, as was demonstrated by the crowd who turned out at Brinkworth Reserve last Sunday. There were over 200 people there, and it was significant not just for their presence but also for the fact that those people and people right around Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula are signing a petition at the moment to present to the National Trust to let them know of their discontent with the situation.

I sincerely hope that we can bring a conclusion to this. I have met with the National Trust and they seem intent to go through with the sale. We are hoping that public pressure will cause them to change their mind. I am sure that there are other options with regard to the raising of capital to ensure the survival of the National Trust. I am sure that, failing that, we can come to a proposition from the community that will be agreeable to both the community and the National Trust. We have not reached that point yet, but I sincerely hope that we can.

I do declare another interest in this, and that is that I am a member of the National Trust, as are many members of this place, I know. We consider it a noble and honourable organisation charged with keeping up the natural and historical assets of our state. It was established under an act of parliament in 1955. It does a marvellous job. It is, in fact, the greenest National Trust in the state. It manages over 3,500 hectares of nature reserve, and the Brinkworth Reserve is just one of those. The native vegetation is a sight to behold and it would be a great pity to see it subdivided and go for housing development.

Time expired.

MURADEL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:25): I rise today to acknowledge the formal opening on 31 October of the Muradel demonstration project in Whyalla. It is a highly innovative and exciting project, not just for Whyalla but also for the state and the nation. The \$10.7 million project is designed to demonstrate the ability to produce biofuels using the sun, sea water, carbon dioxide, nitrogen and phosphorous. With those inputs Muradel is able to grow a specialised strain of oil-rich algae. Algae essentially captures sunlight and turns it into oil and produces 100 times more oil than land-based plants, such as canola, sunflowers or soybeans.

The approach has a major advantage compared to many other biofuel endeavours in that it does not require productive agricultural land. The ultimate aim is to establish, in Whyalla and elsewhere, commercially viable projects that will deliver cost-competitive greener diesel and aviation fuel plus, potentially, a range of other useful by-products. It is intended that the green crude oil produced can be processed in existing oil refineries.

The project is a good example of collaboration. Muradel was incorporated in 2010 as a joint venture between the University of Adelaide, Murdoch University and SQC, which is an offshoot of India's largest infrastructure company. The Australian Renewable Energy Agency provided \$4.6 million to assist the project, which comes on top of the private sector investment. The Whyalla city council actively assisted Muradel to establish its presence in Whyalla and has provided in-kind assistance and made land available on a lease basis.

Muradel initially established a pilot plant in Karratha in the north-west of Western Australia but decided on Whyalla for its demonstration plant due to a number of competitive advantages. If the demonstration plant is a success, Muradel will scale up to a fully commercial facility in Whyalla and that will be used as a launch pad to develop plants elsewhere in Australia. The initial commercial plant will be a series of ponds covering approximately 1,000 hectares. It is anticipated that the 1,000-hectare site will be able to produce 80 million litres of green crude per year. It is worth noting that Muradel has already shown that it is able to generate the highest oil production rates in the world from algae grown in open saline ponds. The 1,000-hectare project has the potential to generate 100 jobs.

University of Adelaide associate professor, David Lewis, is Muradel's chief technology officer. He has expressed the view that if all goes to plan the potential exists in South Australia to produce hundreds of millions of dollars worth of clean biofuel within 20 years. The staged, systematic approach undertaken by Muradel permits a significant degree of confidence in the future progress of algae culture in South Australia. It is still early days but there has been a very promising start. Expectations are, on current trends, that we will be importing 70 per cent of our liquid fuels by 2030. In addition, 23 per cent of our greenhouse gas emissions come from using liquid transport fuels. On top of that, Australia has only 20-odd days of fuel available at any one time, which some see as a risk in the event of an international oil crisis.

Muradel is rightly taking things a step at a time, but others have observed that Australia has the potential to become self-sufficient in transport fuels based on algae culture. One estimate projects, on a national basis, \$50 billion in new revenue and over 50,000 jobs. Most of that investment and jobs will occur in regional Australia. Estimates of the land needed to ensure fuel self-sufficiency range from 6,000 square kilometres to less than half that area, and 6,000 square kilometres is around .07 per cent of Australia's land mass.

South Australia is at its best when it is curious and open to new ideas and willing to innovate, when it is willing to take the first step. I wish Muradel well, and I look forward to the company achieving

the goals it has set itself for the benefit of investors, for Whyalla, for our state, and for the environment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:30): I rise today to speak about the local government elections that took place at the weekend. Local government is an important part of our system, and the best results are achieved, in my view, when all three tiers of government—local government, state government and federal government—work together.

A shining example of where this has taken place is Hartley at the moment, where the Campbelltown Leisure Centre is about to be built, hopefully either late this year or early next year. It is a great example of where those three levels of government have worked together for a facility which is going to be fantastic and one that I am sure future generations will be proud of for many years to come.

We have three council areas in Hartley, namely, Burnside, Campbelltown, and Norwood, Payneham and St Peters. I want firstly to congratulate the councillors and mayors who were successful, and I also think it is fitting that we highlight all who offer their service in local government. There were two councillors in Norwood Payneham and St Peters who unfortunately did not get up this time, but I want to acknowledge the strong role they have played in shaping our local society for many years—namely, Isaac Pasalidis, who served for 27 years on Norwood Payneham and St Peters council, and Geoff Rundle, who served for 17 years. Unfortunately, they lost their seats on this occasion, but they have served our local community well over the years.

I congratulate the mayors who were elected. In Norwood Payneham and St Peters, we have Robert Bria, who was unopposed, and in Burnside, also unopposed, we have mayor David Parkin. In Campbelltown, I would like to congratulate mayor Simon Brewer, who was elected at the weekend.

A number of councillors were elected in Norwood Payneham and St Peters. I congratulate Lucy Marcuccitti and Christel Mex in Kensington Ward; in Payneham Ward I congratulate Carlo Dottore and Kevin Duke, and in St Peters Ward I congratulate John Frogley and Evonne Moore. In Torrens Ward, John Minney and Garry Knoblauch are two councillors in particular who have served for many years and I wish them well for their next term. In West Norwood/Kent Town Ward, Paul Wormald and Sue Whittington were elected, and I congratulate them and offer my sincere best wishes. In the Maylands/Trinity Ward (my old ward), Sophia MacRae, Kevin Shepherdson and Connie Granozio were elected.

Campbelltown has the most part of that area which is in Hartley, and about four wards flow into Hartley from that council area. I acknowledge their election and wish the councillors all the very best in their endeavours over the next four years. In Gorge Ward, Dom Barbaro and Max Amber were elected, and I would say that Max Amber must hold the record for the longest serving member on local government in South Australia ever; if not, he would be up there. In Hectorville Ward, I congratulate John Kennedy and also James Nenke.

In Newton Ward, Anna Leombruno and Jill Whittaker were elected. Jill Whittaker was the deputy mayor in the last term. In River Ward, I congratulate Marijka Ryan and Matthew Noble, Matthew Noble being a new councillor, and Marijka Ryan I particularly want to mention, as she has lobbied the state government to reinstate funding at Paradise Interchange. That is a very important issue, and I look forward to working closely with Marijka Ryan over the next four years to make sure that the government reverse their decision at Paradise. In Woodforde Ward, I congratulate Neville Grigg and also Robert Tidd. Robert Tidd is a new councillor and I welcome him.

In Burnside council, I take the opportunity to pay tribute to the councillors who were elected and to wish them all the very best: in Beaumont Ward, Anne Monceaux and Mark Osterstock; in Burnside Ward, Lance Bagster and Graham Bills; and in Eastwood Ward, Helga Lemon and Di Wilkins.

Mr Speirs interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: I hear, 'Hear, Hear!' from the member for Bright. It is good to see that other members also support these councillors. In Kensington Gardens and Magill Ward, I congratulate

Henry Davis, a new member of council—and I know that he will do a great job—and also Grant Piggott, an existing councillor. In Kensington Park Ward, we congratulate Jane Davey and Felicity Lord. In Rose Park and Toorak Gardens Ward, I offer my best wishes to Peter Ford and Peter Cornish.

We all know that public life is difficult at times and it takes its toll on family and friends. I wish these new councillors, existing councillors and the mayor all the very best in offering their service to our local community over the next four years. I congratulate those who were successful. I also thank those who were not successful on this occasion but have offered their service, and I wish them all the very best moving forward.

FOOTBALL FEDERATION SOUTH AUSTRALIA AWARDS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Little Para.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:35): Thank you, ma'am. I beg your pardon, Deputy Speaker. 'Ma'am' is The Queen, I understand, but I digress. I want to start by noting that the Football Federation of Australia CEO, David Gallop, will be in Adelaide on Thursday this week to engage stakeholders and the community as part of the Whole of Football Plan consultation process. This plan, for those who do not know, aims to improve all levels of soccer from grassroots to elite and eventually make soccer the biggest and most popular game in Australia. I cannot believe it is not already.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Maybe.

The Hon. S.W. Key: For women and men?

Mr ODENWALDER: For women and men, obviously. They are looking at the whole show, including elite player and coach development, community football for boys and girls, facilities development, the national competitions, and commercial enterprises. I wish David Gallop and the FFA the best of luck with this consultation. It will be held at the Office for Recreation and Sport on Thursday, so you can contact the Office for Recreation and Sport if you are interested in going.

Members will already know of my passion for grassroots soccer, and I have used this place on more than one occasion to brag about my own son's achievements, so a few weeks ago I was pleased to make him jealous and represent the Premier at the 2014 Celebration of Football, which is the FFSA's annual awards night. It was a pretty swanky black tie affair at the Entertainment Centre which celebrated the achievements of our best and most successful young soccer players as well as their coaches, umpires and importantly the club volunteers.

I was delighted to be seated with, among other people, Michael Petrillo, CEO of Adelaide United; Peter Peppin, CEO of Whyalla City Council; Bill Boehm, Administrator, Roxby council; Judge Rauf Soulio; and Morry Bailes from the Law Society. I was particularly pleased to meet local soccer royalty Ross Aloisi, and I took the opportunity to take a selfie with Ross and send it back to Jimmy before I put it on Facebook obviously, to make him doubly jealous.

All the people I mentioned before have an interest in one way or another in the success of soccer as a code in this state and, of course, they all share my view that it is not only a beautiful game but one of the best ways for kids—boys and girls—to spend their time. It has to be said at the outset, as much as I would like to go on about the achievements of northern suburbs clubs and Jimmy's current club, Adelaide City, the clear standout winner on the night was the Croydon Kings Rocco Visconte, who was awarded the Sergio Melta Medal. I should point out at this point that as I go on I will be saying lots of names and mispronouncing them.

Rocco Visconte was awarded the Sergio Melta Medal, voted on by his peers and professionals. Rocco was named Man of the Match following the 2014 SA National Premier League Grand Final and was also awarded the inaugural Marcellina Player of the Year and included in the South Australian National Premier League Team of the Year.

I will quickly go through some of the other achievers on the night. On top of Rocco Visconte's achievements, Croydon Kings also produced the Peter Nikolich SA National Premier League Goal Keeper of the Year in Nicholas Munro. Matthew Pelizzari from Adelaide Olympic was awarded the

Les Avory trophy for goalkeeping in the state league. MetroStars' Ivan Karlovic won the Martyn Crook Award, which is the SA National Premier League Coach of the Year.

The South Australia National Premier League Team of the Year was also named. This is 11 players voted on by the Premier League coaches to create a kind of dream team in recognition of their efforts. They were Nicholas Munro, as goalkeeper; Paul Pezos and Ricardo Da Silva from West Adelaide; Allan Welsh and Rocco Visconte from Croydon Kings; Nicholas Bucco, Matthew Halliday and Joel Allwright from Adelaide City; Perry Mitris from MetroStars; Shaun Harvey from Campbelltown City; and Alex Mullen from Para Hills Knights.

MetroStars' Stefan Cali was named the John Aloisi Rising Star and Perry Mitris, also from MetroStars, was awarded the Golden Boot Award for his 22 goals throughout the season. James Skeffington, from Port Adelaide Pirates, was awarded the Bob Telfer Medal, which is the SANPL State League Player of the Year. The Pirates' head coach, Derek Hall, was awarded the NPL State League Coach of the Year after leading his side to become the 2014 NPL State League Champions and gaining promotion to the Premier League next year.

On the women's side of the ledger, Daniela de Bartolo from Adelaide City Football Club was awarded the Shirley Brown Premier League Player of the Year for the women's competition, just ahead of Ruth Wallace from rival team West Adelaide. W-League Lady Reds player Dylan Holmes took home the Rising Star award in the women's competition. Also in the women's competition, Kelly Barltrop from Para Hills was awarded the Women's Premier League Goalkeeper of the Year, and Elise Garlick from Sturt Marion earned the Women's Premier League Golden Boot.

It was a particularly moving part of the evening when Adelaide Cobras supporter and volunteer Freda Murphy was presented with a well-deserved Volunteer of the Year award and made one of the more spontaneous and, it has to be said, inspiring speeches of the night.

ISLAMIC COLLEGE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:40): I would like to let the Parliament of South Australia know about my recent visit to the Islamic College of South Australia in the Speaker's electorate of Croydon. It was an eye-opening visit, and it was the first time that I had visited the college.

One thing that I was most impressed by during my visit was the inclusiveness of the people at the college. They all made me feel extraordinarily welcome. They invited me to speak at their morning assembly and then I got a lovely tour and, indeed, morning tea with their senior board members, their principal and, of course, the chairman of their council, Dr Farouk Khan. He is not only the chairman but also the founder of the Islamic College here in South Australia.

I was pleased to meet with board members, including Dr Faisal Chaudhary and Dr Abul Hossain, and to also meet Dr Pam Dettman, who is the principal of the Islamic College of South Australia. In my address to the students, I talked about the importance of cultural diversity. That is something that we can be extraordinarily proud of in South Australia, especially when we go back to the early origins of our state. Of course, our state was one that was very much founded on the fundamentals of equality, democracy and religious freedom.

I emphasised this point to the students, because where other jurisdictions sometimes tolerate people from different ethnic backgrounds or with different religious beliefs, we do not just tolerate; we actively encourage them to come to South Australia. In preparation for my speech at the Islamic College, it was great to do a little bit of research. I found that the first Muslims came to South Australia in the 1860s, in fact very early in the 1860s, and they were encouraged to come here by none other than the Elder company, because they were, of course, involved at that time in transporting wheat and other stores around our state and in the building of the Overland Telegraph, which ran from Adelaide to Darwin.

The Elder company wanted to find people to help with transporting at that time, and the most advanced people in the world at transporting in the desert were, of course, the Afghan cameleers. A number of Afghan cameleers came out to South Australia to work on these important projects, not just for South Australia but for the entire nation, and we are very grateful for the contribution that they made.

These migrants, when they came to South Australia, always set up a mosque wherever they worked. The first mosque in Australia was set up in South Australia, in Marree in 1888, and between 1888 and 1890 the community set to work to establish the first city-based mosque in Little Gilbert Street in Adelaide. So you see, Deputy Speaker, we have an enormous heritage, not just of tolerance, but of positive encouragement of people from different backgrounds. That is such an important lesson for students of all schools in South Australia.

I was also impressed that so many of the staff at the school were from a different background than Islam, and this is very important to the school. They really teach diversity. They have excellent grounds and a hardworking board that has built a very handsome campus that augments the original school, now with a fantastic new gym, fantastic library facilities and attractive classrooms. I know that there is another massive building program being contemplated by the board going forward.

The school starts in the early learning years and goes right through to year 12. On behalf of this parliament, I would like to congratulate the college on the excellent work they do in promoting diversity and harmony. Also, I wish all the year 12 students at that college, who are probably studying for their exams right now, all the very best.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Of course, you are welcome at Burc College in my electorate, sir, which is a wonderful Islamic school. Member for Ashford.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:45): I would like to bring to the house's attention the most recent newsletter, End of Life Choice, that is sponsored by the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society, Doctors for Voluntary Euthanasia Choice, Christians Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia, SAVE-YA (Syndicated Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Youth Advocates), Lawyers for Death with Dignity, and South Australian Nurses Supporting Choices in Dying. The 13 October newsletter states:

This issue is dedicated to Hon. Dr Bob Such (1944-2014), Member for Fisher, with thanks for his tireless advocacy to legalise voluntary euthanasia.

I am interested in following these groups because they all have a slightly different agenda. I think it is worth noting that the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society was established in 1983 by volunteers to campaign for a South Australian law that provides for medically assisted end of life as a right in appropriate circumstances and with defined safeguards. It states:

SAVES aims to raise public debate to a point where our Members of Parliament enact a VE law which provides everyone with the choice to end prolonged and painful suffering.

Doctors for Voluntary Euthanasia is a more recent organisation, as I understand. They are a national organisation of medical practitioners, both current and retired, who are committed to:

having a legal choice of providing information and assistance to rational adults who, for the reasons of no realistic chance of cure or relief from intolerable symptoms, would like to gently end their lives. Assistance may be by doctor provision of medication for the patient to consume, or by doctor-administration.

Another more recent organisation is Christians Supporting Choice for Voluntary Euthanasia. They say:

We are Christians who believe that, as a demonstration of love and compassion, those with a terminal or hopeless illness should have the option of a pain-free, peaceful and dignified death with legal voluntary euthanasia. The overwhelming majority of Australian Christians support choice for voluntary euthanasia.

SAVE-YA (Syndicated Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Youth Advocates) is another national body. It is a:

...youth lobby group which aims to provide a youth voice in support of legalising voluntary euthanasia in all...states/Territories. Members between the ages of 18 and 35 are encouraged to join and make contact with their local MPs to inform them of their support for voluntary euthanasia law reform.

Lawyers for Death with Dignity acknowledges:

the need for people with profound suffering to have the legal choice for a medically assisted and dignified death. The current law says suicide is not illegal, but assisting suicide is. In many cases, those who are in terminal states have profound, unbearable suffering and are put in the undignified position of being unable to end their life without assistance. The medical profession has advanced their discipline to improve life expectancy, but appropriate

changes have not been reflected in the South Australian law to deal with an often forgotten deterioration of quality of life that this may bring.

The South Australian Nurses Supporting Choices in Dying—this is an older organisation in South Australia—say:

We are a group of passionate nurses who believe in our patient's right to choose the end of life care that they wish, including the choice of voluntary euthanasia. Our members come from vastly different backgrounds and age groups but we all share the same goal.

Bills

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF ADELAIDE CHARITABLE TRUST (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:51): In accordance with standing order 325, I bring up the final report of the select committee on the bill, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:52): I move:

That the report be noted.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:52): As a member of the select committee, can I say that this process of examining the bill that was before the house was one that was uneventful, but it was very thorough. We did call for witnesses and we did advertise. We were cognisant of the fact that this piece of legislation was last reviewed in 1981. We also were very aware of the concerns that had been raised about the need to protect people who may have claims against the church: that they were not in any way going to be able to continue those claims with assets of the church in some way being shielded from any particular claimants where there could be some claim for damages and the assets could be used to provide resources for those damages. This was not the case here.

There are some straightforward mechanical changes to the arrangements that have been going on with the Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide. It is with hope that this bill goes through without any particular obstacles, that the report be noted and the bill become law as quickly as possible.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:53): I wish to speak briefly on the report that has been received and note that the recommendation—although I have not seen the report yet—is that the legislation progress. There are issues that I raised during the course of the debate on this matter as to the alienation of assets: that if, in fact, there was any structural change to further make those remote for the purposes of any civil proceedings against the Roman Catholic Church (in this case). I am assured that there is no change at all in respect of the effect of the rights and liabilities of these trusts as a result of this legislation; that the current status is that they are already protected in these trusts and that there is no change to that.

Probably unsurprisingly then, in answer to my second issue which is the question of why they have not moved to a private trust, even with the good grace of government or even this parliament supporting some exemption of stamp duty, if that was their decision to make, that has not been a course of action that the trusts have elected to progress.

I raise this one other matter, and that is this. The Sisters of Mercy, for example, is one of the trusts to be incorporated, now to be one of the designated ministries in this structure to try to provide some perpetual provision for the archbishop's nominee to be in charge of these trusts. I understand the whole future-proofing arrangement for this, but I understand that the Sisters of Mercy, for example (and I do not want to take this out), have proposed in their trust that they will take in Papua New Guinea as part of their territory.

One of the things I think we ought to be appreciative of here in the parliament—and the government, particularly, should be aware of this—is that if there are enterprises and activities proposed to be developed in other regions which are going to be given exemptions, for example, on payroll tax as a result of the status of these trusts, then the expansion of enterprise of these trusts (which I cast no reflection on) does have a consequence in respect of enterprises or businesses that they pursue in South Australia. They may or may not in the geographical area of Papua New Guinea. I do not know what activity they intend to develop or engage in up there in relation to their redefining of the boundaries, but we ought to be aware that there are consequences to the bottom line.

It just seems to me that the parliament does need to consider in the future how we can assist trusts that have the sanction of the parliament—as distinct from indentures such as Santos or BHP, for example—where private trusts have been established by the means that they were a century or more ago to transfer into private arrangements. I, for one, think that would be fairer and appropriate, and it would therefore take up the time of the parliament to deal with these matters. With those few words, we will leave it in the hands of the archbishop.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:57): I thank the speakers today, and I also thank the members of the hardworking select committee who thought very carefully about this matter before bringing it back to the parliament. We had a number of harmonious meetings where all of us were able to—

An honourable member: Bipartisan.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They were completely bipartisan, and I am looking at the member for Morphett and the member for Adelaide who participated in a very constructive way, and I thank them for their efforts. The government members, of course, were very constructive as well. I appreciate the fact that the recommendation of the committee is being endorsed by the parliament and I thank everyone for their assistance.

Motion carried.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 30 October 2014.)

The CHAIR: We have the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and a question from the member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: My question pertains to page 1277, the absence of a contract management framework can result in the department not identifying areas of noncompliance with key contract provisions, including performance obligations by the contractors, as the Auditor-General points out. Given that the Auditor-General has pointed this out, I ask the minister: what is he doing to remedy this to ensure that areas of noncompliance are being identified?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. Perhaps before I proceed to give an answer I will introduce the two advisers I have with me today: Michael Sedgman, from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, and also Julienne TePohe from the department.

My understanding, very generally, is that this issue, along with all the other issues which have been raised by the Auditor-General to the department, has been the subject of what are

commonly referred to as 'management letters' prior to the preparation of the report as we see it in front of us today. The Auditor-General, or one of his delegates, commonly writes to the department outlining any issues which he has identified and that is the opportunity for the department to respond about that issue, which then provides the Auditor-General the opportunity to provide a balanced view in his report.

I am advised that three issues were raised: the first issue was contract management, the second issue was contract variations and the third issue surrounded the industrial dispute which had a lot of attention in particular in the lead-up to the last state election. With regard to the first, contract management, I am advised that concerns were raised by the Auditor-General as contract management plans for two of the three metropolitan bus contracts were still to be finalised at the time of audit.

With respect to the contract variations, I am advised that concerns were raised by the Auditor-General that contract variations made in April 2013 were in excess of cabinet approvals and that reconciliations of the variations had not been finalised. With regard to the last one I mentioned, the industrial dispute, the Auditor-General noted that industrial action in early 2014 had resulted in missed trips by bus contractors. I am also advised that he has apparently observed that potentially there is lost revenue from fare collection.

With regard to the first issue, at the time of the audit, contract management plans had been developed under a new format to support a contract management framework but not finalised. I am advised that these plans have since been completed. I am advised that it should be noted that, whilst 'new contract management plans had not been finalised', there were still formal plans in place and that these formal plans in place that had been developed under the previous contract management framework were being followed.

Just jumping back to the contract variations issue, the second issue—which I am advised is of some importance—as advised to the Auditor-General at the time of the audit, contract variations provided in May 2013 included the cost for regular service alterations as well as the increased cost of moving eight routes from Light-City Buses to Torrens Transit. The requisite funding was approved by cabinet on 22 April 2013.

My advice from the department about the assertion that there were variations made in excess of cabinet approvals is that that issue relates to the moving of eight routes from Light-City Buses to Torrens Transit which, indeed, was contemplated in the relevant cabinet approval. I am further advised that a reconciliation of the contract variations has been finalised and reported to the Auditor-General.

On the last issue, the industrial dispute, as advised during audit and noted in the Auditor-General's Report, contract variations were executed to account for trips not operated by bus operators during the period of the industrial dispute. The advice I have here is that, whilst fare revenue could not be recovered as the quantum of the loss could not accurately be quantified, it has also been made plain to me that, generally speaking, when we provide public transport services, if any of those services are not provided then the financial position in general which we would find ourselves in might be that the excess cost of providing those services, above and beyond whatever fare revenue we might be able to recoup, would not be incurred by the government.

The quite logical and understandable assumption that many people have that, if a service was not provided and hence ticket revenue was not received for that service, the government might be out of pocket. I am, in fact, advised that, depending upon the circumstances, it could quite possibly be the case that the government has made a saving by not having to pay for a service which would otherwise have been provided.

Mr WINGARD: Just to pick up on a couple of those points, minister, the bus contract payment and the industrial dispute you talked about, I will go to that one first. Did you or the department calculate how much was owed, given that you said that it was not sought? Was that figure determined—how much was owed?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In terms of the fare revenue that was not collected?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No. My advice is that the quantum of the loss could not be estimated by the department, let alone any claim be made for that. I would have to check this, and I am happy to bring back a further and better response to the parliament but, if I cast my mind back, not that I was in a position where I had carriage of these issues at the time, I think that there seemed to be a combination of both services which were unable to be provided due to a lack of bus drivers, for example, or perhaps for some other reasons, as well as when bus services were being provided drivers perhaps exercising an activity where they were deliberately not collecting fares or potentially even perhaps advising passengers not to bother paying the fare. I am not sure we are able to estimate that, but I will just double-check, though.

To put a slightly finer point on the advice I just gave to the chamber, my advice is that the lost revenue I think the member for Mitchell is referring to is due to the bus drivers not enforcing validation of tickets, so it is not possible to accurately quantify the loss from that. Again, I am happy to check this, but I assume that, when we come up with estimations for people who are riding public transport services to and from the city, to and from work, for example, the validation on a bus, for example, is the key part of making that estimation. If we do not have that validation data, if people are not validating tickets, let alone purchasing paper tickets and then validating them, we are unable to accurately quantify the number of people who have not paid and, hence, be able to make any sort of claim for lost fare revenue.

Mr WINGARD: Following up on that, if you cannot quantify, in future industrial disputes how would you know what to charge one of the contractors? It seems to me that, if you cannot formulate a number or a figure for disputes or incidents like this in future, how much could be lost to South Australian taxpayers is the concern.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think that is a pretty reasonable question to ask. I think that, first of all, our position would be, where appropriate, and the government would not always seek to do this, but shortly after the election, for example, the Deputy Premier and I sat down with bus operators and also the union involved (the Transport Workers Union) to try to broker an outcome. Perhaps the first way of answering your question is: try to avoid the industrial dispute or at least try to work to minimise the impacts of the industrial dispute. As to what better methods or systems we might either now have in place, or perhaps could seek to develop to put in place if these situations came up again, I would have to take that on notice and come back to you with some further advice.

Mr WINGARD: In regard to the unclaimed moneys, on page 1278 it states:

SSSA [Shared Services SA] and the Department had yet to establish arrangements to review and action unclaimed monies balances. Further, Audit noted that SSSA was in the process of performing a whole-of-government review of the management of unclaimed monies.

How much money is outstanding for public transport fare evasion in fines for the department?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What page, member for Mitchell?

Mr WINGARD: 1278, Unclaimed moneys.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am having a bit of difficulty locating the reference on page 12—

Mr WINGARD: I think it is at the bottom there. My apologies.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: ...'in which controls did not operate effectively,' the last line and a half?

Mr WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will see if I have some advice on that. I will perhaps come back to the parliament with some further and better particulars about the matter which is raised under that indented heading there on page 1278, Revenue and accounts receivable.

Mr WINGARD: My apologies, minister, 1279, at the bottom of 1279. My apologies.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will just check if I have some information. Sorry for the delay, member for Mitchell. My advice is that the department is currently working with Shared Services to both ensure that their part of the unclaimed moneys register is up to date, but they also note that an

across-government project is being undertaken by Shared Services to try to standardise the processes associated with unclaimed moneys. I am not sure whether we are able to disaggregate the information to the extent which you raised about fines, for example, but if we can get that information from that register I will be happy to provide it.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, that would be greatly appreciated. Page 1282, Building management—facilities. It is outlined here that:

The Department is responsible for the oversight of outsourced facilities management services, which provide government agencies with access to planned and unplanned maintenance, minor works and other services.

It is quoted:

As reported last year, an unacceptably high percentage of facilities charges are auto-approved for payment without certification from agencies receiving the service. Audit review of system records of the extent of agencies' review of facilities charges for 2013-14 found 36 per cent of facilities charges totalling \$64 million were not certified by requesting agencies prior to payment.

Is that acceptable and how will this process change in the future?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just while Michael is searching to see if we have some further and better information to provide by way of an answer, if you go onto page 1282 there is a synopsis of the department's response to that. It seems that the automatic approval of those, from my reading of how the Auditor-General has summarised the department's response, may not just be isolated to the department, it may also be occurring with the client agencies, but I will have to double-check that.

From the two dot points underneath the third paragraph of 1283, I think the general explanation is that the auto-approval function was created to try to ensure prompt payment for services, but it should only be used—instead of a matter of course, which may seem to be the case highlighted by the Auditor—as an exception, and that there is a review requirement for these claims. So, my understanding (further) from that explanation is that the department is investigating the development of an agency notification system to make sure that these sorts of things either do not happen in the future or their incidence is minimised.

I should probably also say that the scale and quantum of contracts which are managed by DPTI on behalf of other government agencies are fairly extensive, and while 36 per cent of facilities charges and \$64 million are very significant figures, I would hope that, given the experience and the capability established within the department, we should be able to rectify this issue into the future.

Mr WINGARD: Before I hand over to the member for Bragg, I refer to page 1274 and the management of purchase cards. The department has approximately 1,100 purchase cards issued to staff and as a consequence, a significant amount of expenditure is incurred by staff using purchase cards. While this can be a cost-effective means of purchasing goods and services, there are some risks, such as poor procurement practices, inappropriate use of public funds, financial reporting errors and noncompliance with taxation legislation. There were instances of payment splitting to bypass automated authorisation card transaction limits. Gift cards were also purchased and the details of what the payments were for were incorrectly recorded. How do you justify these claims by the Auditor-General and what are you and the department doing to alleviate these concerns?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question, and I share his concern about the Auditor's finding in that respect. My very general understanding is that in years gone by there has been a significant increase in the number of purchase cards which have been made available to, for want of a better term, purchasing officers across government. In some quarters it has been seen as an attractive way to manage the smaller end procurement of goods and services, given the relative convenience of a credit card transaction rather than the invoicing accounts receivable/accounts payable mechanism which previously occurred within government agencies. Nevertheless, having so many purchase cards obviously creates a very significant opportunity for misuse, either by poor practice or, more concerningly, unscrupulous practice. Nonetheless, both are concerning.

My advice from the department is that there has been a piece of work undertaken by the department to analyse all purchase card expenditure between a set period, which was the calendar year 1 January to 31 December 2013, using a data analytics tool. It analysed over

55,000 transactions, so a very significant number, and identified what is described here as 'a number of areas for improvement'. The agency, I am advised, will develop and implement a number of initiatives which, amongst other things, should go some way to addressing the issues that have been identified by the Auditor-General.

I have to say, number one for me, and it may be a view that others share, is that rationalising the number of purchase cards, who these purchase cards are available to and making some reductions there seems to me to be an obvious one, and the department is pursuing that. On the face of it, that would seem to reduce the chance for misuse, again, as I said, either inadvertently or by design. I am also advised that we are looking at improving our practices and processes more significantly to again try to minimise the risk of that. I am aware that it is not an issue, unfortunately, which is just confined to the department, but nonetheless we are working very hard to try to minimise it, because I think, and as you implied in your question, these sorts of instances are unacceptable.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Volume 4, pages 1286-7 and also note 11 on page 1316. I will refer to the latter first. This notation, No. 11, is a further explanation in respect of written-off works in progress. I will come back to the Gawler railway line, but in respect of expenditures incurred under the Northern Expressway project, which is the other note to explain the write-off of a total of \$55.8 million, I assume from that that some \$9 million was written off in respect of the Northern Expressway project. If so, what was it for?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do not have that detail about the Northern Expressway in front of me. My understanding is that a payment was made—and I really am going from memory here, so I will have to check this and come back with a better and hopefully accurate answer to the house—from the Northern Expressway project of approximately \$12 million which, from a separate and unrelated briefing I saw, seemed to be a return of funds from the state government to the commonwealth government which was a significant co-funder of that project. I will have to take that on notice and check that because I do not have that detail in front of me.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is just that it is described as write-off of works in progress as distinct from refund to the commonwealth for a repayment, so I am not quite sure how that works. In any event, we will wait to hear what your response is.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, I am happy to bring back an answer.

Ms CHAPMAN: Pages 1286-7 refer to the Gawler modernisation project, and some history is outlined there. In short, the government decided back in 2012 that it would suspend this project. Subsequently there was a recall by the commonwealth government to refund some \$41 million—that was paid back—then in June this year the government announced that it would restart part of that project, which was the Adelaide to Salisbury component, which they would progress in 2017-18. As has now been identified by the Auditor-General, there was a write-off of a total of \$46.6 million, comprising \$28.6 million for costs in respect of the project between Salisbury and Gawler and also \$18 million as described there.

This was the subject of questions at estimates, minister—and I appreciate you were newly in the job at that point—and again, in October in the parliament in respect of some of the detail of this. I am certainly hoping now that it has caught the attention of the Auditor-General that some detail will be able to be provided. My first question is: was the government warned at any time by public servants that some of the expenditure on the Gawler modernisation project would be wasted if it was suspended? If so, when?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the deputy leader and member for Bragg for that question. She provided a brief synopsis of the history of the Gawler line modernisation project and it is true to say, casting our minds back to 2008, that the electrification of the Gawler line, along with the staged and eventual electrification of all four passenger rail lines and their two spur lines across metropolitan Adelaide, was a priority for the government. In fact, I can remember that the complete project across all the rail lines was announced, I believe, in the first week—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Madam Chair, if I may. I think the minister perhaps has not quite understood the question in respect of the warning of the cancellation which did not occur until May 2012. This is a very familiar project to the committee and indeed to the whole parliament, so I

just ask that you address your attention to what warnings you received by any of the Public Service in respect of what would be wasted if you cancelled it.

The CHAIR: The minister is answering the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, 2008 predates it by four years, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR: The minister is answering the question. I am sure he will finish off for you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the member for Bragg for that interjection. As I was saying, it has been an ongoing priority for the government to try to roll these projects out. As I recall—and I think as the member for Bragg mentioned in her explanation that accompanied her first question on this—a decision to defer it was taken in 2012, if I recall accurately, at the time of the release of that year's state budget, notwithstanding the commitment that had been made four years earlier and notwithstanding that the project had moved from being at that point in time a state government funded project to a joint state and commonwealth funded project, given the economic conditions and the decline in state revenues. Then of course there was some additional history that perhaps was not canvassed by the member for Bragg in her response, which despite her interjection, may well be germane to the question which she asked and that is that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sorry; is the purview of lengthy explanations about questions and answering solely in your domain?

Ms Chapman: I am asking a question.

The CHAIR: Order! The minister has the call.

Ms Chapman: If you want to waste time—

The CHAIR: Order! The member for Bragg is called to order. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As we were discussing, yes, this issue, the project, has been canvassed. You canvassed it in respect of a quite separate query during estimates, unrelated to the issue.

Ms Chapman: I am not getting an answer to the question.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is because you were asking questions about something completely unrelated to what we were talking about then. You have even read—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: The deputy leader is reminded that she has been warned twice in question time. That carries over into this. I am asking you to listen to the minister's answer, and I will give you the call when he has finished. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There are four other members who have been members of parliament in this chamber since March. You do set a pretty bad example.

The CHAIR: Order! Back to the question.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Sit down. Order! I have asked the minister to either finish the question or sit down. You are sitting down? The member for Bragg has the next question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you. I take it then that you did not have any warning from any public servants. I will move to the next question.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: I was trying to answer that question.

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: Since the Auditor-General's published report, have you checked to see exactly what works have been written off, given your answers made on 15 October that you were going to check that out?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I find it extraordinary, Chair, that given this issue has been canvassed in this chamber before, that I have provided answers to—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Despite having the *Hansard* apparently in front of her, she still does not seem to be able to grasp the context and the content of the responses I gave at the time. When the member for Mitchell asked me questions about this, the information I provided to the member for Mitchell was that my advice from the department is that we could only really be in a position to provide an accurate estimation as to the full extent of written-off works once the project is recommenced.

My understanding is that expenditure on works related to this project was being incurred up to December 2013, which I am advised—I have not seen the document, but I am advised—is consistent with the advice which was provided to the Public Works Committee. As I said, I have not seen that document, but that is what I am advised has been advised to that committee.

In summary, I think it is fair to say that of the works that have been undertaken to date, both the physical or construction works, for want of a better term, as well as all of the incurred what might be considered more generally across government to be operation expenditure—the expenditure on consultants for design and technical work, for early engineering estimates and so forth—it will only become apparent, I am advised, at the recommencement of the project how much of both of those different categories of expenditure is able to be considered to be useful, which then has the impact on how much of that expenditure incurred to date is deemed to be not useful and at that point in time written off.

Ms CHAPMAN: When was the decision taken to change the recommencement date for the Gawler modernisation project from 2015-16 to 2017-18, and was the potential for already incurred costs to be written off included in the decision-making process?

The CHAIR: Are you still on the same pages?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes. With respect to the first question, this was something which was announced in the recently released state budget. I cannot remember off the top of my head what date that was released. My memory is that it is usually either in late May or early June. I have to say, I cannot quite remember the point that you raised, although it sounded to me very similar to the first question you asked on this project, and for the benefit of both the deputy leader and the parliament, I am happy to take that on notice.

The CHAIR: Our time having expired, I thank the minister and his advisers for attending, and call on the next section with the Hon. Susan Close: Manufacturing and Innovation. Member for Stuart, do you have some questions?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to Annual Report, Part B, Agency audit reports, Volume 3, page 1148, with regard to automotive transformation. As part of Activity 8: Automotive Transformation, what progress has the government made in coming up with potential future uses of the GM Holden plant and site at Elizabeth?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I would like, before answering that question, to introduce the advisers I have with me: Marcus Ganley from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; I have Chris Oerman, who is Executive Director of the Government Services Group; Rick Seaman, who is the Acting Chief Information Officer; and Steven Woolhouse, who is the Director of Finance and Corporate Finances. From the Department of State Development I have Len Piro, Executive Director, Industry and Innovation; and Rick Janssen, Executive Director, Corporate Services.

The question about the future of the Holden site is still some way down the track. As you would be aware and as the chamber would be aware, we have signed a memorandum of understanding with General Motors Holden so that there will be clear communication between both the government and General Motors Holden about the future of the site. That was important because the site is wholly owned by GM and, therefore, the government wanted to ensure that it had the kind

of relationship that would mean that we could continue to communicate about options as they were presented to us.

We have from time to time had people who have expressed some kind of varying degree of interest, but to date nothing has translated into anything of any substance. Holden has, true to its agreement in the MOU, facilitated discussions about that. The reason I prefaced my answer with the point that I think we are talking about something some way down the track is that what GM have indicated is that they will be keeping the site for some years after the closure—about three, five, maybe six years—and that is because they want to ensure that they take the equipment that they are able to use elsewhere, where they will continue to make cars, and they also may want to do some due diligence around any contamination in the area, certainly an assessment.

They will also be working out what parts of the site they will want to continue to use. There is some possibility of using it, for example, to store cars as they are imported for sale through dealerships and also the storing of spare parts to be supplied to those dealerships where they maintain and service vehicles. We will continue to have the discussion and we will continue to keep the public and the opposition informed as appropriate.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As part of the jobs plan there is \$2 million allocated to review the future use of the GM Holden plant. Has any of that money been spent and, if so, on what?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Just to clarify, in the Our Jobs Plan we did ask the commonwealth to contribute \$2 million, which they declined to do. We have not ourselves set aside any money for that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So there is no money from any source set aside to do that?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same book, page 1126, with regard to purchase orders, can you explain why DMITRE officers were not raising purchase orders which, according to the Auditor-General, were required to be raised?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: One of the complexities for today, of course, is that we are reviewing an Auditor-General's Report for the year ending 30 June 2014, when DMITRE still existed. We are now in the world of the Department of State Development, which means that some of the response to the comments will be taking place under a different construction of the department and therefore different corporate services.

The judgement on the comment about the raising of purchase orders was that it was not a significant issue. However, DMITRE did undertake a review in order to ensure that it would not receive such a comment in future. That has now had to fold into the processes of the Department of State Development.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thanks, minister, and I do understand the transition issues. Do you know when that review will be complete?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I imagine that what will now be happening is that the consequences of this report will be informing the structures of the Auditor-General's Report, but if there is any more substance to that I will convey that to you and take that on notice if there is more to add.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: With the benefit of hindsight, was anything actually purchased inappropriately—the use of purchase orders was not done exactly as it should have been? Was anything purchased inappropriately?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My best advice is that there is not a concern about any particular purchase that was made, that it was just the process. That is also substantiated by the Auditor-General not having qualified his report. He has made an adverse comment about the processes only. Therefore, there is reason to assume that the Auditor was not overly concerned about the result of those processes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Do you know how many staff were involved in that breach of the purchase order protocol?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have that detail here and I will take that on notice.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to the same book, page 1127, recording receipt of goods and services. According to the report, DMITRE officers were not consistently recording receipt of goods and services in Basware prior to the invoices being paid, so receipt was not technically done properly before the invoices were paid. Has this issue been investigated?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, this is regarded as a minor breach but, nonetheless, one that requires a response. As is indicated in the Auditor-General's Report, the response was to remind the staff about the procedures, and that is continuing to happen. I cannot guarantee it will never happen again, so there is an ongoing process of making sure that standards are, first of all, understood and then that they are kept to.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Are you aware of any invoices being paid where the goods were not actually received?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will take that on notice.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same book, page 1150. Can the minister advise what the total subsidy payments towards industry development were for 2013-14? Just to explain, the reason I ask is that I am a little bit unsure about these numbers in the table on that page. Where it says 2013, is that 2012-13, and 2014, is that the 2013-14-year?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, your question about the years, that is correct.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What is the grants and subsidies budget for industry development for 2014-15? Do you have that, please?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We will take that on notice, as it is not within the Auditor-General. I have not brought that level of detail with me today.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Were any grants provided to companies with the condition that they move to the Tonsley site?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, there were, and I will provide you with the detail of that subsequently.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Can you give an indication? Do you happen to know how many, roughly, or what percentage of the total, or anything like that?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, I do not have that level of detail here, particularly as there is a distinction in your question about being on condition of moving as opposed to a company that is moving as part of what they are doing, so we will be careful in our response.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Page 1148, what was the total allocation of FTEs under Activity 7: Manufacturing and Innovation, for 2012-13 and 2013-14, and budgeted for 2014-15?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: For the year that is covered by the Auditor-General's Report, it was just under 50 FTEs, that is, 2013-14. I do not have the details for 2014-15. It is around the same, but I will get that precisely for you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: How much funding is allocated to manufacturing and innovation each year from the government's Our Jobs Plan to activity 7?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The Our Jobs Plan, as you would be well aware, is the \$60 million over four years. To disaggregate that into activity 7, we will have to take on notice. There is a lot of it being handled there but other bits are handled elsewhere, so we will disaggregate that for you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have the same set of questions essentially for activity 8 on the same page. Could you tell me the FTEs for 2013-14 for activity 8?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The Automotive Transformation Taskforce came into life at the beginning of this financial year and, therefore, there are not separately accounted for people in the 2013-14 year that is covered by the Auditor-General's Report. There is now something in the order of 17 FTEs in the Automotive Transformation Taskforce this year but there were not any held against that activity within the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Similar to activity 7, would you be able to come back with an answer about how much of the Our Jobs money is focused specifically on activity 8?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, I believe it is something like \$20 million or \$24 million or \$26 million of the Our Jobs Plan is being directly dealt with through the Automotive Transformation Taskforce. Again, that is starting from this financial year but I will get that more precisely for you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Back to page 1150 and looking at consultancies, I ask the minister to explain the increase in the number of consultancies and the increased consultancy expenses.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The increase of \$1.3 million is predominantly due to the following: there was an increase of \$2.1 million in the Our Jobs Plan consultancies which commenced in 2013-14; there was an increase of \$0.4 million due to once-off funding from the commonwealth government in 2013-14 for the National Energy Efficient Building Project; an increase of \$0.2 million due to changes in the work undertaken on the Port Pirie transformation project between financial years; an increase of \$0.2 million due to consultancy work in relation to the establishment of the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence commencing in 2013-14, which was partly offset by a decrease of \$0.9 million due to costs incurred in 2012-13 for the Public Sector Renewal Program which transferred to DPC from 2013-14; a decrease of \$0.4 million due to changes in the work undertaken on the Brukunga mine site remediation project between financial years; and a decrease of \$0.2 million due to once-off consultancy in 2012-13 for review and implementation of the South Australia-India Economic Development directions paper.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I note that the More Than Cars campaign was not on the list but I just want to be sure that none of the consultancy money went to the More Than Cars campaign.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My understanding is that it was not funded through DMITRE. If I need to alter that I will get back to you but otherwise my understanding is that it was not funded through DMITRE.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thanks, minister, and I will wait for that answer. Can you confirm whether or not the Auditor-General contacted the department regarding the More Than Cars campaign?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The advisers I have here are unaware of that so I would assume not but should someone come forward from within the department to say anything differently then I will update you on that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Back to page 1148, Automotive Transformation, which states:

Activity 8: Automotive Transformation

This activity will support companies operating within the supply chain to successfully diversify and secure alternate revenue streams to drive sustainable growth, long-term employment and potential for export revenues.

That would be terrific. Will the minister advise what work is being done under the Automotive Transformation portfolio with regard to managing the potential social issues arising out of the likelihood of increased unemployment from GM's departure from the northern suburbs?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Of course, what we primarily prepared for today is to discuss things that have occurred within the Auditor-General's scope for the department. The element that relates to that is the contract which we have entered into with Northern Connections—it is run out of DCSI—to provide the one-stop shop for people who are caught up in the supply chain (primarily, the workers) to provide a service to advise them on where they will be able to gain support. DCSI has other social services that are more geared to supporting people who are vulnerable in the northern suburbs, as well as across the state. We support the work they do but we are concentrating on the economic activity of DMITRE and the Department of State Development.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Does the automotive task force play any role in that whatsoever or is it all Northern Connections?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The support for the workers is provided through the task force. The arrangement with Northern Connections is that that is a convenient place to have a website, a physical presence and also a telephone presence to be able to answer the questions of people who are concerned about what is happening.

One of the challenges we have with the closure of Holden, although in some ways it is a good problem to have, is that we have a fairly long lead time before the anticipated closure. As we gear up programs ready to support the workers, and we are getting sorted and prepared to do that, the workers, nonetheless, while we are doing that, are deeply concerned about their future. So, it was important to us to have a front face, particularly in the northern suburbs, although it is on my mind that the southern suburbs also contain workers who will be concerned about it; there are quite a few component suppliers in the southern suburbs.

Northern Connections is that one-stop shop for anyone in South Australia who is concerned about the consequences for them with the closure of Holden. The support that is then provided to the workers—the support in terms of career assessment and retraining—is provided by the automotive task force within the Department of State Development.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: While I guess there is no direct responsibility, no funding lines, does the automotive task force contribute support or advice into that work, keeping in mind that these questions are about the social issues, not the economic or the direct employment issues?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I was just trying to clarify with the advisers whether we had a dollar figure to give you. We do provide money to Northern Connections to do that piece of work for us, but I will have to get back to you on how much that is each year that we are providing to support that effort.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What I was really trying to get at, and I might have been a bit unclear, is the social side of things as opposed to the harder economic side of things. Is the Automotive Transformation Taskforce putting in money that is meant to be directed to both those areas?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No. It is slightly conceptually difficult because a person's work is the greatest definer of their social wellbeing. If they are employed, they are already significantly better off. If they are employed in a stable position that they also enjoy, they are again significantly well off. It would not be accurate to say that our concern about the employment of people or the sustainability of companies where they work has no social dimension to it. But if you are asking more specifically about counselling, housing or welfare, that is not the province of the Department of State Development. However, if we are successful in continuing the employment of anybody, we are contributing to their social outcomes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to page 1150, looking at the services and supplies, accommodation and service costs. Was it DMITRE's target to source 50 per cent of its electricity supplies from green power in 2013-14?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have with us the detail on the level of green power, so we will take that on notice.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So, not sure what the target was, minister, or not sure what was achieved?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I personally am not sure of either, so I will take those on notice.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: When you come back, minister, if you would, would you also answer what the target was, just to confirm that, because I accept what you are saying, and also confirm what was actually achieved and, if there is a difference, come back with an explanation, please.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, absolutely.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same page, travel and related expenses: will the minister explain the large increase in travel and related expenses that are shown in the table there?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Travel went down by \$211,000 and that decrease is mainly due to the change in travel requirements between years, including the impact of the transfer of Invest in SA to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, which was effective from 5 September 2013.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Same page, bad and doubtful debts. Will the minister explain what the \$1.232 million in bad and doubtful debts relates to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There was a \$1.232 million amount in doubtful debts recognised during 2013-14. The increase in doubtful debts is predominantly due to the following: an increase of \$0.9 million due to the recognition of the National Safety Agency as a doubtful debt. The company was provided with a loan in 2010-11, however, was not able to meet certain conditions for it to be converted to a grant and, therefore, has been invoiced for repayments. Payment is in dispute and, therefore, the full amount has been recognised as a doubtful debt during 2013-14. Also, an increase of \$0.2 million is due to recognition of Priority Engineering Services as a doubtful debt as the company went into administration during 2013-14. The \$0.008 million recognised in 2012-13 relates to an increase in the provision of doubtful debts associated with the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The \$110,000 writedown, can you tell me what that is, please?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We may have the information here but you only have two minutes left, so I will take that on notice in order to allow you to ask any further questions.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thanks, minister. On the same page, looking at renewables, so right down towards the bottom of the page, why is there a considerable difference there between 2013 and 2014?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I would have to direct that question to minister Koutsantonis as that relates to his portfolio area and I do not have that briefing with me.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: With that entire section of grants and subsidies, of the bits that do relate to you, is industry development within your portfolio, minister? Can you tell me whether there were any grant applications that were unsuccessful in that area?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, of course there would be several grant applications that were unsuccessful. Are you asking for any detail about that? There may be some commercial-in-confidence issues, but we could give you a summary at least.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am not trying to breach that, but looking particularly at that increase, if I just get your section of industry development, there is obviously significant increase in the grants there. I am trying to get a feel for the take-up, essentially, and, when there is a significant increase in grants that are handed out, it might be that almost everything that was requested was given or it may not be. It is not inconceivable that almost everything that was requested was granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I do have an explanation of the increase of \$3.418 million between 2012-13 and 2013-14. An increase of \$1 million is due to cabinet-approved funding for Hills Holding Ltd restructuring, which commenced in 2012-13. An increase of \$2.8 million is due to a once-off grant in 2013-14 relating to the sale of the Renewal SA property at Felixstow, which was formerly the JP Morgan facility, and a decrease of \$0.5 million is due to cessation of funding to Business SA for trade missions, which ended in 2012-13.

The CHAIR: The time having expired for our examination, I thank the minister and her advisers and call the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Social Housing, Multicultural Affairs, Ageing, Youth, and Volunteers, and her advisers. Member for Morphett, you are going to start off are you?

Dr McFETRIDGE: The member for Adelaide and I are going to tag team on this.

The CHAIR: What page are you on?

Dr McFETRIDGE: We are on Auditor-General's Report 2014, Part B, Volume 1, page 281—Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. The question is regarding the concessions and

seniors card administration system, CASIS as it is commonly known, started in 2008 by the now Premier Jay Weatherill. Over the page on 282, it says:

The past five audits have commented on the Department's inability to comprehensively reconcile concession payments made with client details maintained on departmental databases.

Concerningly for the committee's sake, it then goes on in the next paragraph:

The Department has advised Audit that the CASIS project is expected to eventually address this matter.

Can you tell the committee what the issue is with reconciling the audit of cases and when it will be eventually addressed?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the member for Morphett for his question. As you have mentioned, this has been raised in previous audit reports and, as part of the development, DCSI (the department) has commissioned independent reviews of CASIS functionality and project management. We are looking ahead for future ICT projects. Obviously we are looking at the development of a new system with the view to actually creating a single client view of concessions. We are looking to streamline, consolidate and automate those. I think your question was in regard to the reconciliation.

Dr McFETRIDGE: For the information of the committee, it was referring to the first two lines in that paragraph about reconciling payments of client records where, for the past five audits, it has commented on the department's inability to comprehensively reconcile concession payments made with client details maintained on departmental databases.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If I recall correctly, you asked me this question during estimates and I believe I have written to you. In 2013-14, we undertook a comparison of the energy retailer records against customer records held by the department and we were unable to match 5,173 of 206,200 records held in carts which is the system for energy retailers. The energy retailers were asked to write to the unmatched customers to invite them to contact the department so that their concession eligibility could be verified and, where necessary, a second letter was sent in March 2014.

As at 30 September 2014, it was determined that the extent of overpayments was \$311,000 for 569 ineligible customers. A further \$68,000 related to 119 other customers who did not respond to the two requests to contact the department. The department is waiting for further information from retailers about a further 2,456 customers to determine the extent of any overpayment. The concessions have been stopped for customers who did not respond to either letter or who have been found ineligible. We have approached the energy retailers involved in the recovery of overpayments identified and, where an agreement has been reached, invoices have been raised with the energy retailers to recover the overpayments.

In regard to water and sewerage, there were only 132 potential mismatched customers and they have all been resolved and none had been overpaid.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On the same reference, minister, can you tell the committee again whether that was 569 energy customers with an outstanding amount of \$369,000?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think in regard to the extent of overpayments was for 569 ineligible customers.

Dr McFETRIDGE: And the monetary value?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: \$311,000.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On the same reference regarding brokerage expenses. The department purchases brokers' services from NGOs to meet individual disability services for client needs. There is a total of \$120 million being spent with most of that being spent with Disability SA. Is the minister's department trying to give more work to NGOs or is this a case where the government feels they can do best? I am concerned, though, that there are still some concerns about the management of NGOs on page 283 regarding the performance management of providers, and I will ask some more questions about that in a moment. Can the minister explain why an extraordinary amount of that total value is being used to purchase services that is not going to NGOs, it is going to another government department?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: You have mentioned the increase of brokerage care services and we have seen a slight increase there. In regard to Domiciliary Care, I am responsible for that, and we have seen that increase. I think your question relates specifically to disability.

Dr McFETRIDGE: It is the services that the department is purchasing from NGOs and the government department to Disability SA. It is a total of \$134 million that is in question in 2013-14 with \$120 million being spent with Disability SA. It seems disproportionate knowing the number of great NGOs we have in South Australia.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My answer to you would be that the significant growth in brokerage care reflects the ongoing investment in our disability support programs by the state government. It is in line with the emphasis on providing individual support services to people with disability to live and participate in the community. I would probably direct you to the Minister for Disabilities for further information.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you. On the same reference, a little bit further down, Disability SA, receipt of services, it says:

Previous audits have recommended that the Department consider improving controls to ensure that services provided are adequately received before making payments.

Does the minister's department oversee the role in conjunction with Disability SA, I suppose, in making sure that services are actually received before payments are made? If there is an issue, what is the amount that has been paid out that is in question? Has money been paid out where services have only been partially delivered or not delivered at all?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think that is a question best directed to the Minister for Disabilities because that area looks after that particular area. The department relies on a range of indicators, communications, work flows to agree services are provided to our clients. We need to strike that balance, obviously, because often we have very vulnerable clients and we need to determine between delivery of that service and how we could get them to acknowledge that, and the best way of gaining that assurance. We use a request contracts reconciliation system that electronically reconciles claims for services being billed to the client service agreement.

In addition to this, the department does sample testing to verify claims, and where necessary seeks additional evidence to confirm that services charged were delivered. We will take on board the Auditor-General's recommendations and look at how a more comprehensive approach can be derived to provide greater assurance that they have been delivered to an accepted standard and appropriately recorded.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Looking at the same reference, the Auditor points out that it is your department that contracts NGOs—or in this case Disability SA, a government department—and that Disability SA has an issue in verifying that their services, or services that have been purchased, are actually being provided before payment is being made. I suppose, not putting it too crudely, that the buck stops with you as the minister who then has to respond to this audit. I have listened to your answer.

There is a similar issue with client trust funds, on page 283. The balance of client trust funds in accounts at the end of the financial year 2014 was \$12.5 million, which it has in brackets here—\$12.3 million in another area. The trust funds cannot be used by the department to achieve its own objectives. They are not included in the controlled financial statements and are disclosed as an administered item, yet over on page 284 the Auditor says, 'The audit identified that important client files were not adequately protected against unauthorised edit.'

Minister, can you assure the committee—and we have seen this issue with the non-operating funds and the special purpose funds in the Department of Health that were used to support cash flow in hospitals—that these client trust funds are not being used for purposes for which they are not intended?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The issue has been raised and it has been remedied. The department reviewed the access to client trust files and implemented appropriate restrictions and password security. Client trust management will regularly review these access restrictions. These access restrictions are in addition to the current management controls covering the payment process.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the same volume, page 284, Requests Contract Reconciliation (RCR) system. The audit points out that the RCR system processes over \$100 million in payments to external service providers and clients. The issues that were raised by audit included the current internal audit plan, which had certain issues that have been and are continuing to be addressed to some degree. The schedule is to commence in early 2015 to complete the audit of the requests contract reconciliation system. Minister, can you tell us how much in dollar value was under question? Can you identify whether it was spent in the right area, that particular protections were in place, and how many contracts were in question?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As noted, the Auditor-General reviewed the requests contract reconciliation system and noted some areas for improvement. The Auditor-General noted that the department had responded positively to audit findings and recommendations. The RCR system facilitates the establishment and contract of payment between the department and disability service providers for the provision of brokerage services to the department's clients. In addition, the RCR system makes payments directly to clients with disability who choose to self-manage their services.

As mentioned by the member for Morphett, the RCR system in 2013-14 processed and managed the delivery of services to 3,200 clients and made over \$100 million in payments to external service providers and clients. This system was designed to replace the contract management brokerage system, which is no longer considered fit for purpose. The system is fully operational and being expanded to provide more detail.

The services provided to clients are progressively being transferred to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. The NDIS will eventually take over the management of these brokerage services, at which time the RCR system will be decommissioned.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to Volume 5, page 1696, Other control matters. The Auditor-General states that Housing SA:

...had not established a process to ensure all tenants that fail or refuse to provide proof of income are referred to the benefits review team for investigation.

Housing SA's response was that a monthly reversion report will be provided to the benefits review team. My question is: has a monthly reversion report been provided to the benefits review team and, if so, when did it start, and for what months have those reports been given?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that that process has commenced, but I do not have the date or the month that it started, so I will come back to you with an answer.

Ms SANDERSON: As far as the six-monthly review, there was one scheduled for October 2013 and one in April 2014. Could I have the completion date for each of those reviews, as the Auditor-General stated that they are not being done in a timely manner and they are taking too long? I would like to know when they were both finished.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will take that on notice.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to page 1696, going back to the first question from the member for Adelaide. What does it mean that these tenants are being 'reverted'? They are being reverted to what? Are they being kicked out or are they put on a watch list?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I understand what they do is they revert to market rents. This was something that was raised recently. Only about 12 per cent of our tenants are on market rents and that is what would happen if they do not respond.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I saw the Housing Trust Tenants Association talking about market rents and people living in Housing Trust houses who were earning \$80,000, \$100,000 or more. How many of those tenants do you have?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Are you referencing this same page?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Yes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We know that most of the people in our homes—probably over 80 per cent—are on fixed incomes, and that comes from a Centrelink payment, whether it be an age pension or a disability pension. We have about 12 per cent who are on market rents. We know now

that people do not tend to go on ongoing leases, they go on short-term leases. If someone turns their life around and they are able to increase their income, that is something we obviously support them to do. I think the idea that people are on \$100,000 is a furphy, but I would be happy to go back, have a look and come back to you.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to page 1699 regarding payroll. The Auditor-General states that 7 per cent of the bona fide reports (BFRs, as they are known) have not been certified and 25 per cent were not certified as reviewed within the required time frames. If 7 per cent of payroll reports are not bona fide, how many people are being paid incorrectly or no longer work in the department? For the 25 per cent not certified in a timely manner, how many were incorrect and what is the financial implication?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Auditor-General raised this issue and we were looking at the reports being not certified as required. The department has enhanced the bona fide system to provide follow-up reminders to managers that bona fides have not been completed within seven days. If the bona fides are outstanding at 14 days the system automatically escalates the report. In addition, the department will produce regular ageing analysis reports from the bona fide system for review by the department's Director, Quality Assurance, Risk and Business Improvement, and instances of noncompliance will be escalated to the relevant executive director.

We are also looking at other areas for improvement of inconsistency in the Basware recorded delegations and position details, and we are looking at the development of a system which allows automatic comparisons between the CHRIS payroll system, Basware and the financial authorisation register. Most importantly, the Auditor-General did not find any instances where an employee was paid erroneously for work that was not performed.

Ms SANDERSON: Same page: given audit testing found instances where leave in an attendance record was not recorded or was incorrectly recorded in the payroll system, has the minister investigated doing a full audit to ensure their accuracy, that is, a full review rather than an audit?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We are talking about some of the things that we are going to do, so we are looking at the audit escalation function added to the bona fide process to ensure the regular follow-up of returns. A process was developed to ensure that leave recorded per the leave report agreed with employee records. As noted, the process did raise the awareness of the requirements. However, further refinement is required and will be undertaken. Future verification processes will be conducted on a six-monthly basis.

Ms SANDERSON: When was that six-monthly review done? Was it a random audit or was it a full review?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that this is an ongoing verification process, rolling on a six-monthly basis starting on 1 July.

Ms SANDERSON: Page 1697: regarding maintenance having monthly reports now being expanded to include inspection details to enable monitoring of the MTC compliance with contractual requirements, this was advised to be available by September 2014. It is now November. Has this been done and do the reports now include the inspection details?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The South Australian Housing Trust is expanding the current suite of monthly maintenance reports to include inspection details, site inspected or tenant confirmed, collected at the time of processing invoices. This will enable monitoring of the MTC (multi trade contractor) compliance with contractual requirements. The modified reports have now been developed and implemented.

In July 2014, the audit and compliance assessments procedure, the Housing Trust compliance framework for MTCs, was approved and released. A new compliance inspection database has been created to record inspections by Housing SA staff. This information is then used to calculate the quality of work and a key performance indicator for each contract in accordance with the terms of the contract. Training has been delivered to regional maintenance staff to ensure a standard consistent approach is given to this process.

I was speaking with the executive team about this the other day and some of the more practical aspects of this will be taking a photograph of the completed work and that being attached to the invoice when it is sent in. These are some of the available strategies that we have. Of course, we do the site inspection and tenant confirmed, but having that photo shows that the work has been completed.

Ms SANDERSON: It says that the review would be available by September 2014. I know you mentioned something about July. Can I assume, then, that this is now underway and the reports are now being done monthly?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As I just spoke previously, in July 2014 there was a new audit and compliance assessments procedure and the compliance framework for the multi trade contractors was approved and released.

Ms SANDERSON: Can the minister advise how many MTC invoices were audited, what percentage this represents and how many were found to have discrepancies?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We will have to take that on notice.

Ms SANDERSON: Thank you. Page 1704, expenses: the report states that there was a \$15 million increase in staff costs and that was due to \$10 million being targeted separation payments and \$2 million increase in wages. What is the other \$3 million and how many staff received targeted separation payments?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: During 2013 and 2014, as part of our workforce transition plan, 79 Housing SA employees were approved to receive TVSPs, and the total cost of the Housing SA TVSPs was \$9.687 million. An additional \$71,400 was paid for payroll tax and \$2.14 million was paid for leave on termination.

Ms SANDERSON: Is there still \$3 million missing? If the increase was \$15 million and \$10 million was the TVSPs and \$2 million increase in wages, what was the other \$3 million?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am advised that there was an increase in salaries and wages and their associated on-costs due to salary indexation and converting business systems contractors to employees as part of the business systems workforce transition.

Ms SANDERSON: I thought that would have been included in the \$2 million increase in wages but perhaps I will check that with you again later. Going back to pages 1698 and 1699, regarding the water rates, what is the minister doing to ensure that both council rates and water rates are authorised for payment before disbursement occurs? Apparently this procedure used to be developed in the first quarter of this financial year, which ended in September. Has this been done and does it include water rate recovery?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We do have some systems limitations in regard to council rates as the data is not currently available for the council rate system that enables payments to be approved prior to disbursement. Housing SA is currently working on a change in the timing of council rate payment reports so they can be rigorously reviewed and authorised prior to disbursement. This review process will then mitigate the risk of incorrect payments being made to councils.

Manual council rates notices are checked by the rate calculator for accuracy before loading and system formulas are set for each council as per the notices received and gazetted at the beginning of the financial year. The number of entries in the rate calculator is checked against the number of manual notices received. This process is then subject to an independent checking and auditing process.

During 2013-14, Housing SA processed over 172,000 council rate notices with a value of \$44.307 million. The Auditor-General did not find any instances where the incorrect amount of council rates was paid for South Australian Housing Trust owned property.

The CHAIR: The time having expired, I would like to thank the minister and her advisers for their attendance.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - ABOLITION AND REFORM) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (17:34): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the abolition or reform of various boards, committees and other bodies; to streamline processes relating to various boards, committees and other bodies; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (17:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker in July this year the South Australian Government proposed major reforms to all government boards and committees in order to make government more accessible, simpler, and efficient.

We indicated that all Government board and committees would be abolished, unless it could be demonstrated that they had an essential purpose that could not be fulfilled in an alternative way.

At the heart of this reform was the intention to involve more people and organisations in government decision-making. Too often, I have found that the views provided to government are confined to a group of select people.

I want to ensure that we change this, so that more South Australians have the opportunity to be involved in the decisions that affect them and that are important to them.

While these changes will assist agencies to meet budget savings targets, I have also made it clear that I expect resources to also be reinvested in alternative community engagement activities.

The large number of boards and committees currently in existence also contribute to duplication, unnecessary complexity and inefficiency within government.

The Bill I introduce today is the culmination of a reform process that will reduce a significant amount of government red tape and contribute to the efforts of our Modern Public Service policy.

Of the 429 boards and committees in scope for this reform, the government has decided to retain 90 outright.

Of the remaining boards and committees, 107 will be abolished, 17 will be merged and 62 are subject to other reform efforts that are currently underway.

We have also identified 120 boards and committees that should not be considered government boards and committees, and we are reclassifying these.

Options for reform are still being considered for the remaining 33 boards and committees.

The final report on the outcomes of this reform has been produced and provides additional information on each of these boards and committees.

As part of this omnibus Bill we are amending 43 pieces of legislation to abolish, merge or simplify 56 boards and committees.

This includes abolishing 28 boards and committees, merging 8 and simplifying a further 20.

Through both abolitions and simplification measures, 32 fewer boards and committees will require Governor appointments – this equates on average to 96 fewer appointments for consideration by Cabinet and Executive Council each year.

This will save many hundreds of hours of work by many public servants.

Boards to be abolished as part of this Bill include the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission, Community Benefits SA Board, the Natural Resource Management Council, and the Minister's Youth Council to name a few.

The Community Benefits SA board is an example of how more South Australians can be given the opportunity to be involved in government decisions.

The Government intends to replace this board with a participatory budgeting model called 'fund my community' where the public identifies, discusses and prioritises how funds should be allocated. We will consult further on how this works in the coming months.

Another example is the replacement of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee with new community engagement models.

Previously this Committee has provided advice to the Minister on all aspects of animal welfare. As part of these new arrangements advice to the Minister will be developed following consultation and engagement tailored to the specific issue under consideration.

Mr Speaker, we are undertaking these changes because the expectations of businesses and communities have changed, and the way government works needs to change with them.

Today, businesses and citizens expect to be involved in decision-making, and are much less deferential to traditional voices of authority.

They also expect us to be much more open. That is why as part of this reform process we intend to report more regularly about appointments to Government Boards and Committees rather than just tabling in parliament each year the annual report of the Boards and Committees Information Systems (BCIS).

As part of consultation about this reform process, the Government received letters from a number of boards and committees. In the interests of openness, we will also be publishing these letters online.

Mr Speaker these reforms will also deliver a significant reduction in red tape. In this Bill, we simplify how a number of remaining boards and committees will operate.

For example, this Bill will abolish the Selection Committee for the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia.

This is not an advisory or decision-making board itself, but a statutory body whose sole purpose is to decide who sits on the industry board. Industry bodies do not want to be forced to jump through bureaucratic hoops like this to get their work done and they have told us as much.

This reform frees industry and community boards from time consuming red tape, and lets them get on with their work.

Mr Speaker, these reforms will not only make government more efficient, they will also simplify it, because when used in the wrong context, boards and committees can act to defuse responsibility and confuse people about who the ultimate decision-maker is.

This point was made in the 2003 Commonwealth Review of these matters by John Uhrig.

For example, Uhrig found that, in circumstances where a minister retains powers and responsibilities, a board may add a layer of obstruction to a Minister seeking to ensure that the CEO is acting in a way consistent with government policy.

This Bill supports improved accountability and governance. The clear example of this is the abolition of the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission.

The Commission will be led by a Chief Executive Officer, who will be directly accountable to the Minister.

Current arrangements place the Board administratively and operationally between the Chief Executive and the Minister.

The new model will have the Commission led by a Chief Executive Officer, who will be directly accountable to the Minister. The CEO will take on sole responsibility for the Commission and thus improve the Commission's accountability and ensure the State can quickly respond to tourism issues.

Mr Speaker, this Bill fundamentally is about supporting the South Australian Government's efforts to build a more modern government.

Since the election we have renewed our Cabinet with five new Ministers.

We have renewed the leadership of the public sector with five new chief executives.

And we are now renewing our structures through the reform of boards and committees.

We have challenged every government board and committee to demonstrate what value they provide to the community.

For those who have not been able to do this, we are now implementing new ways of fulfil these roles.

This Bill is the next stage in the process that will make government more accessible, simpler, and efficient.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of ADS Advisory Board which is being abolished under this Part. This clause also inserts a new definition of Parks and Wilderness Council being the Parks and Wilderness Council established under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

5—Amendment of section 9—Administration of Act to achieve objects and objectives

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

6—Amendment of section 11—ADS Management Plan

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

7—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 3

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and the transferring of the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

8—Repeal of sections 12 to 16

This clause abolishes the ADS Advisory Board by repealing sections 12 to 16 (inclusive) which provide for the establishment and membership of the ADS Advisory Board.

9—Amendment of section 17—Functions of Parks and Wilderness Council under this Act

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

10—Repeal of sections 18 to 21

This clause repeals sections 18 to 21 (inclusive) which provide for the committees, procedures, staff and annual reports of the ADS Advisory Board which is being abolished under this Part.

11—Amendment of section 22—ADS Fund

This clause substitutes reference to the ADS Advisory Board with reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is consequential on the abolition of the ADS Advisory Board and gives the functions of the Board to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

12—Amendment of section 55—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

13—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the ADS Advisory Board ceases to hold office on commencement of the clause.

Part 3—Amendment of Animal Welfare Act 1985

14—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of animal ethics committee, to be an animal ethics committee established under section 23 of the principal Act or a body approved as an animal ethics committee for the principal Act by the Minister. This clause also deletes the definition of the Committee which is being abolished under this Part.

15—Repeal of Part 2

This clause abolishes the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee by repealing Part 2 of the principal Act.

16—Amendment of section 23—Animal ethics committees

This clause amends section 23 of the principal Act to provide that animal ethics committees, which may be required to be established or consulted as a condition of a license, are to be established, and members appointed, by a licensee instead of by the Minister as is currently provided for.

17—Amendment of section 24—Procedure

This amendment is consequential on the appointment of animal ethics committee members by a licensee and provides for the quorum of an animal ethics committee established under the principal Act.

18—Amendment of section 25—Functions of animal ethics committees

This amendment is consequential on the appointment of animal ethics committee members by a licensee and deletes reference to the Minister such that animal ethics committees will be required to furnish annual reports in accordance with the regulations.

19—Amendment of section 44—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

20—Transitional provisions

Subclause (2) ensures that a member of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on commencement of the subclause. Subclause (3) provides that an animal ethics committee in existence immediately before the commencement of clause 16 continues as an animal ethics committee for the purposes of the principal Act until a date determined by the Minister.

Part 4—Amendment of ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005

21—Amendment of section 6—Membership of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Council members is removed and given to the Minister instead. This clause also reflects the proposed change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

22—Amendment of section 7—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the matters referred to in clause 21.

23—Amendment of section 8—Presiding member

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of this Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

24—Amendment of section 10—Remuneration

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the removal of the role of the Governor in the appointment process of Council members.

25—Amendment of section 11—Functions of Council

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

26—Amendment of section 13—Staff

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

27—Amendment of section 14—Annual report

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

28—Amendment of section 18—Restriction on public sports and entertainment before 12 noon on ANZAC Day

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the change in administration of the principal Act from the Premier to the Minister for Veterans Affairs.

Part 5—Amendment of Aquaculture Act 2001

29—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to delete the definition of Aquaculture Advisory Committee.

30—Amendment of section 12—Procedure for making policies

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 12 which is consequential on the abolition of the Aquaculture Advisory Committee.

31—Repeal of Part 10 Division 2

This clause repeals Division 2 of Part 10 which relates to the Aquaculture Advisory Committee.

32—Transitional provision

This clause provides that a member of the Aquaculture Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 6—Amendment of Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978

33—Amendment of section 7—Constitution of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Board members is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board.

34—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions on which members of the Board hold office

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the proposed role of the Minister, rather than the Governor, in the appointment process.

Part 7—Amendment of Classification of Theatrical Performances Act 1978

35—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of the Board, and inserts definitions of Council and Registrar, which are consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to replace the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board with the South Australian Classification Council.

36—Repeal of Part 2

This clause removes Part 2 of the principal Act which established the Classification of Theatrical Performances Board.

37—Amendment of section 10—Application for classification

This clause changes references in section 10 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

38—Amendment of section 11—Criteria to be applied by Council

This clause changes references in section 11 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

39—Amendment of section 12—Classification of theatrical performances

This clause changes references in section 12 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

40—Amendment of section 13—Conditions in respect of theatrical performances

This clause changes references in section 13 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

41—Amendment of section 14—Powers of Council

This clause changes references in section 14 from 'Board' to 'Council' and are consequential on the key measure of this Part.

42—Amendment of section 15—Notice

This clause changes a reference in section 15 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

43—Amendment of section 16—Penalty for breach of condition

This clause changes a reference in section 16 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

44—Amendment of section 17—Places where restricted theatrical performances may take place

This clause changes a reference in section 17 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

45—Amendment of section 19—Certain actions not to constitute offences

This clause changes a reference in section 19 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

46—Amendment of section 20—Evidentiary provision

This clause changes a reference in section 20 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

47—Amendment of section 21—Power to enter and view performance

This clause changes a reference in section 21 from 'Board' to 'Council' and is consequential on the key measure of this Part.

48—Transitional provisions

This transitional clause enables a request for classification made to the Board to be dealt with by the Council after the commencement of clause 36 of this measure. It also preserves and continues—

- classifications, or decisions of the Board to refrain from assigning a classification to a theatrical performance, under section 12 of the principal Act, as classifications or decisions of the Council; and
- conditions imposed by the Board under section 13 of the principal Act, as conditions imposed by the Council; and
- approvals by the Board of theatres under section 17(1) of the principal Act, as approvals by the Council.

Subclause (7) ensures that a member of the Board ceases to hold office on the commencement of the subclause.

Part 8—Amendment of Coast Protection Act 1972

49—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause makes an amendment to the definition of appointed member which is consequential on clause 50 removing the Governor's role in appointing members of the Coast Protection Board.

50—Amendment of section 8—Membership of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of certain members of the Coast Protection Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board. The Minister will also appoint the presiding member, fix the terms and conditions of office of appointed members, appoint deputies and remove appointed members from the Board.

51—Amendment of section 11—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the allowances and expenses of appointed members of the Coast Protection Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

52—Repeal of sections 15, 16 and 17

This clause deletes sections 15, 16 and 17 which provide for the constitution, terms of office of members and duties of consultative committees.

53—Amendment of section 18—Advisory committees

This clause amends section 18 to require that the Coast Protection Board must, in acting under the section to appoint an advisory committee, comply with any guidelines issued by the Minister.

54—Amendment of section 37—Regulations

This clause which is consequential on clause 52, deletes reference to consultative committees.

Part 9—Amendment of Correctional Services Act 1982

55—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

56—Repeal of Part 2 Division 2

This amendment repeals the Division of the principal Act which established the Correctional Services Advisory Council.

57—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Correctional Services Advisory Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 10—Amendment of Dog and Cat Management Act 1995

58—Amendment of section 12—Composition of Board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board.

59—Amendment of section 13—Deputies of members

The role of the Governor in the appointment of deputies of members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

60—Amendment of section 14—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of the Board from office after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia.

61—Amendment of section 16—Remuneration

The role of the Governor in determining the remuneration of the members of the Dog and Cat Management Board is removed and that role is given to the Minister

Part 11—Amendment of Dog Fence Act 1946

62—Amendment of section 6—Members of the board

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Dog Fence Board is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Board. A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated. A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is removed which is consequential on its abolition in clause 156.

63—Amendment of section 11—Casual vacancies

This amendment is consequential on clause 62 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

64—Amendment of section 12—Dismissal of member

This amendment is consequential on clause 62 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

Part 12—Amendment of Emergency Management Act 2004

65—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of appointed member and is consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to simplify the appointment process for the SEMC.

66—Amendment of section 6—Establishment of State Emergency Management Committee

This clause sets out the key measure of this Part which is to simplify the appointment process for the SEMC. The Minister is required to prepare and publish guidelines (to be known as the SEMC membership guidelines) that govern matters relating to the appointment of members of the SEMC. The role of the Governor in the appointment of members is removed. Most of the members will hold office *ex officio*, as per proposed section 6(4), however, the presiding member of SEMC will be responsible for appointing at least 2 but not more than 4 members (to be known as appointed members) to SEMC.

67—Substitution of section 7

This clause substitutes section 7 with a new section.

7—Application of Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act

This new section ensures that the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995 will apply to members of SEMC as if the committee were an advisory body and the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act were the relevant Minister. This means that the provisions of that Act will apply, requiring members to act honestly, to avoid conflicts of interest and to be otherwise subject to more stringent penalties for breach of standards of conduct than would otherwise apply.

68—Amendment of section 38—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

Part 13—Amendment of Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005

69—Amendment of section 71—State Bushfire Coordination Committee

A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated by substituting Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is amended to 1 officer of the administrative unit of the Public Service primarily responsible for assisting the relevant Minister in the administration of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004, nominated by the Chief Executive of that administrative unit. This is consequential on abolition of the NRM Council in clause 156.

70—Amendment of section 73—State Bushfire Management Plan

A reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Inc is updated by substituting Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

A reference to the Natural Resources Management Council is amended to the Minister responsible for the administration of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004, this is consequential on abolition of the NRM Council in clause 156.

Part 14—Amendment of Fisheries Management Act 2007

71—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to delete the definition of Fisheries Council.

72—Amendment of section 7—Objects of Act

This clause amends section 7 to remove a reference to the Fisheries Council.

73—Amendment of section 10—Delegation

This clause amends section 10 to remove a reference to the Fisheries Council

74—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 3 Division 2 to remove provisions relating to the Fisheries Council.

75—Amendment of section 20—Establishment of committees

This clause amends section 20 to remove references to the Fisheries Council.

76—Amendment of section 42—Preparation of management plans

This clause amends section 42 to transfer the responsibilities of the Fisheries Council in relation to the preparation of management plans to the Minister.

77—Amendment of section 43—General nature and content of management plans

This clause amends section 43 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

78—Amendment of section 44—Procedure for preparing management plans

This clause amends section 44 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

79—Amendment of section 49—Review of management plans

This clause amends section 49 to remove references to the Fisheries Council and replace them with references to the Minister.

80—Transitional provision

This clause requires the Fisheries Council to prepare a final report on its operations and submit it to the Minister, and requires the Minister to table the Council's final report in Parliament. Subclause (4) ensures that a member of the Fisheries Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the subclause.

Part 15—Amendment of Gaming Machines Act 1992

81—Amendment of section 73B—Charitable and Social Welfare Fund

This clause removes the requirement of the Minister to establish a board for the purpose of giving direction to the Treasurer as to the application of the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund to assist charitable or social welfare organisations. That direction is proposed in future to be made by the Minister responsible for the administration of the Family and Community Services Act 1972. The clause removes the provisions relating to the constitution and procedures of the board.

82—Transitional provisions

This clause ensures that a member of the board referred to in clause 81 ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 16—Amendment of Gas Act 1997

83—Amendment of section 16—Technical advisory committee

This clause provides that the technical advisory committee under the Gas Act 1997 is to be the same committee as the committee of that name established under the Electricity Act 1996 and that the committees' respective functions are combined.

Part 17—Amendment of Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004

84—Amendment of section 9—Membership of Advisory Committee

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Advisory Committee members is removed and given to the Minister instead.

85—Amendment of section 10—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause makes a minor amendment which is consequential on the removal of the role of the Governor in the appointment process of Advisory Committee members.

Part 18—Amendment of Health and Community Services Complaints Act 2004

86—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of Council which is consequential on the key measure of this Part which is to abolish the Health and Community Services Advisory Council.

87—Repeal of Part 8

This clause repeals Part 8 of the principal Act which established the Health and Community Services Advisory Council.

88—Amendment of section 75—Preservation of confidentiality

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 75, consequential on the key measure of this Part.

89—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Health and Community Services Advisory Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 19—Amendment of Health Care Act 2008

90—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to remove the reference to the establishment of the Health Performance Council. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of that Council.

91—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of HPC from section 3 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of the HPC.

92—Repeal of Part 3

This clause repeals Part 3 of the principal Act which established the Health Performance Council. This amendment is the key measure of this Part, namely the abolition of that Council.

93—Repeal of section 101

This clause repeals section 101 of the principal Act, which deals with reporting requirements by the Health Performance Council.

94—Repeal of Schedule 1

This clause repeals Schedule 1 of the principal Act, which deals with procedural matters relating to the Health Performance Council.

95—Amendment of Schedule 2—Health Advisory Councils

This clause makes a minor consequential amendment to Schedule 2.

96—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Health Performance Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 20—Amendment of Health Services Charitable Gifts Act 2011

97—Amendment of section 24—Advisory committees

This clause removes the requirement of the Board to establish an advisory committee to advise in relation to the application of funds for clinical equipment or research.

98—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the advisory committee so established ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 21—Amendment of Heritage Places Act 1993

99—Amendment of section 5—Composition of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the South Australian Heritage Council is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Council, designate a member to chair meetings of the Council and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member.

100—Amendment of section 6—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the South Australian Heritage Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister determine the term of a member and may remove a member from office in specified circumstances.

101—Amendment of section 7—Proceedings of Council

This amendment is consequential on clause 99 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

102—Amendment of section 7A—Committees

This clause amends section 7A of the principal Act to require that the South Australian Heritage Council must, in acting under the section to appoint a committee, comply with any guidelines issued by the Minister.

103—Amendment of section 9—Remuneration

This amendment is consequential on clause 99 and substitutes references to the Governor with references to the Minister.

Part 22—Amendment of Local Government Act 1999

104—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

105—Amendment of section 11—General provisions relating to proclamations

This amendment is consequential.

106—Amendment of section 12—Composition and wards

This amendment is consequential.

107—Substitution of heading to Chapter 3 Part 2

This amendment is consequential.

108—Repeal of Chapter 3 Part 2 Divisions 1 and 2

The primary purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to abolish the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel. To that end, Divisions 1 and 2 of Chapter 3 Part 2 are repealed.

109—Amendment of section 26—Principles

This amendment is consequential.

110—Amendment of section 27—Council initiated proposals

These amendments are consequential.

111—Amendment of section 28—Public initiated submissions

These amendments are consequential.

112—Substitution of Division 6

This clause substitutes Division 6 (and is consequential on the abolition of the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel):

Division 6—Submissions of proposals to Governor

29—Submissions of proposals to Governor

Proposed section 29 provides for the action the Minister may take following publication of a report under Division 4 or 5.

113—Amendment of section 30—Report if proposal rejected

This amendment is consequential.

114—Amendment of section 31—Report if proposal submitted to poll

These amendments are consequential.

115—Amendment of section 32—Provision of reports to councils

These amendments are consequential.

116—Amendment of section 34—Error or deficiency in address, recommendation, notice or proclamation

This amendment is consequential.

117—Amendment of section 303—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

118—Amendment of Schedule 1A—Implementation of Stormwater Management Agreement

Two of the amendments in this clause provide for the Minister to appoint the members of the Board of the Stormwater Management Authority (instead of the Governor). The third amendment is consequential on the amendments to the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 relating to the Natural Resources Management Council.

119—Amendment of Schedule 5—Documents to be made available by councils

These amendments are consequential.

120—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out various transitional provisions for the purposes of the amendments to the Local Government Act 1999.

Part 23—Amendment of Marine Parks Act 2007

121—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause substitutes a new definition of Council to refer to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is proposed to be established under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 (see clause 135).

122—Amendment of heading to Part 4 Division 2

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the substitution of the Parks and Wilderness Council for the Marine Parks Council of South Australia.

123—Repeal of sections 24 to 28

This clause abolishes the Marine Parks Council of South Australia by repealing sections 24 to 28 (inclusive) of the principal Act.

124—Repeal of section 30

This clause repeals section 30 of the principal Act, which is consequential on clause 123.

125—Amendment of section 63—Regulations

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

126—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Marine Parks Council of South Australia ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 24—Amendment of Motor Vehicles Act 1959

127—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 to delete the definition of review committee.

128—Repeal of section 98Y

This clause repeals section 98Y which provided for the appointment of the review committee.

129—Substitution of section 98Z

This clause substitutes section 98Z:

98Z—Review by Registrar

The substituted section provides for reviews of the decisions of the Registrar of Motor Vehicle under Part 2, 2A, 3, 3A, 3C or 3D to be conducted by the Registrar instead of the review committee.

130—Amendment of section 98ZA—Appeal to District Court

This clause amends section 98ZA to remove references to the review committee.

131—Transitional provision

This clause provides for the review committee to continue in existence after the commencement of this Part for the purpose of determining applications for review referred to the committee before that commencement.

Part 25—Amendment of National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972

132—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause substitutes a new definition of Council to refer to the Parks and Wilderness Council which is proposed to be established under clause 135.

133—Amendment of section 11—Wildlife Conservation Fund

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the substitution of the Parks and Wilderness Council for the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council.

134—Amendment of section 12—Delegation

This clause deletes a reference to advisory committees, which are proposed to be abolished under clause 135.

135—Substitution of Part 2 Division 2, 2A and 2B

This clause abolishes the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council by repealing Part 2 Division 2 which establishes and maintains the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council.

This clause also abolishes the establishment of advisory committees and consultative committees under Part 2 Division 2A and Division 2B which are to be repealed.

In substitution, this clause inserts provisions that establish the Parks and Wilderness Council. These provisions provide for the establishment of the Parks and Wilderness Council and the appointment of members by the Minister according to criteria listed in the clause. The clause also provides for the terms and conditions of membership of the Council, remuneration and allowances, the proceedings of the Council and its functions (which include functions in relation to the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005, the Marine Parks Act 2007 and the Wilderness Protection Act 1992). The Council is to be subject to the direction and control of the Minister.

136—Amendment of section 38—Management plans

This clause substitutes a reference to the Parks and Wilderness Council for the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council, an amendment which is consequential on clause 135.

137—Amendment of section 45A—Interpretation and application

This clause deletes the definition of General Reserves Trust which is to be abolished under clause 145.

138—Amendment of section 45B—Development Trusts

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust.

139—Repeal of section 45BA

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust.

140—Amendment of section 45F—Functions of Trust

This makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and which simplify the provisions of section 45F.

141—Amendment of heading to Part 3A Division 2

This makes an amendment which is consequential on the renaming of the General Reserves Trust Fund as the General Reserves Fund in clause 142.

142—Amendment of section 45M—Establishment of Fund

This clause renames the General Reserves Trust Fund as the General Reserves Fund and places it under the management and control of the Minister instead of the General Reserves Trust which is to be abolished. The clause amends section 45M of the principal Act to clarify which funds that the fund consists of, such as, fees paid for entrance to reserves other than reserves in relation to which a specific Trust has been established and determined that it is to retain such fees. The clause also makes other amendments consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and the renaming of the General Reserves Trust Fund.

143—Amendment of section 45N—Investment of the fund

This make an amendment which is consequential on the vesting of the control and management of the General Reserves Fund in the Minister.

144—Section 45O—Accounts and auditing

This makes amendments which are consequential on the vesting of the control and management of the General Reserves Fund in the Minister.

145—Insertion of Schedules 12 and 13

This clause inserts 2 Schedules into the principal Act:

Schedule 12—Dissolution of General Reserves Trust

Provisions in this Schedule abolish the General Reserves Trust which was established by proclamation under section 45B of the Act on 30 November 1978 and all members of the Trust holding office immediately before the commencement of this clause cease to hold office. All assets, rights and liabilities of the Trust will be vested in the Minister.

Schedule 13—Transitional provision relating to Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014

Provisions in this Schedule allow for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

146—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 26—Amendment of Native Vegetation Act 1991

147—Amendment of section 8—Membership of Council

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of the Council and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member. This clause also makes an amendment consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

148—Amendment of section 9—Conditions of office

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of the Council from office in specified circumstances.

149—Amendment of section 10—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the remuneration, allowances and expenses of the members of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

150—Amendment of section 16—Staff

The role of the Governor in determining the staff of the Native Vegetation Council is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

151—Amendment of section 25—Guidelines for the application of assistance and the management of native vegetation

This clause changes a reference to the Pastoral Board to a reference to the Minister responsible for the administration of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board under clause 189.

152—Amendment of section 29—Provisions relating to consent

This clause changes references to the Pastoral Board to references to the Minister responsible for the administration of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board under clause 189.

153—Amendment of Schedule 2—Transitional provisions

This clause inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

Part 27—Amendment of Natural Resources Management Act 2004

154—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council to delete its definition and amend the definition of the NRM Plan. This clause also updates references to the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000 and Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

155—Amendment of section 10—Functions of Minister

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council by giving 2 of its previous functions to the Minister, being:

(a) to prepare and maintain the State NRM Plan, and to keep under review the extent to which regional NRM plans and policies and practices adopted or applied by NRM authorities are consistent with the State NRM Plan; and

(b) to convene forums on a State-wide basis to discuss natural resources management issues, and to promote public awareness of sound natural resources management practices.

156—Repeal of Chapter 3 Part 2

This clause abolishes the Natural Resources Management Council by repealing Chapter 3 Part 2 of the principal Act which establishes and provides for the composition and functions of the Council.

157—Amendment of section 22—Establishment of regions

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

158—Amendment of section 23—Establishment of boards

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

159—Amendment of section 25—Composition of boards

The role of the Governor in the appointment of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and the Minister will appoint the members of such Boards (including a presiding member) and appoint deputies to act in the absence of a member. This clause also makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

160—Amendment of section 26—Conditions of membership

The role of the Governor in determining the terms and conditions of appointment of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and that role is given to the Minister. This clause also proposes that the Minister may remove a member of such a Board from office in specified circumstances.

161—Amendment of section 27—Allowances and expenses

The role of the Governor in determining the fees, allowances and expenses of the members of Regional Natural Resources Management Boards is removed and that role is given to the Minister.

162—Amendment of section 29—Functions of boards

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

163—Amendment of section 30—General powers

This clause makes a correction.

164—Amendment of section 35—Committees

This clause inserts an example for clarification of the power of the Minister to issue guidelines in relation to the establishment of committees by a regional NRM board.

165—Amendment of section 39—Specific reports

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

166—Repeal of section 40

This clause deletes section 40 of the principal Act which provides power for the Minister to appoint an administrator of a regional NRM board.

167—Amendment of section 45—Establishment of areas

This clause updates a reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

168—Amendment of section 48—Composition of NRM groups

This clause updates a reference to the South Australian Farmers Federation Incorporated to Primary Producers SA Incorporated.

169—Amendment of section 74—State NRM Plan

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council and gives responsibility for the preparation and maintenance of the State NRM Plan to the Minister.

170—Amendment of section 75—Regional NRM plans

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

171—Amendment of section 79—Preparation of plans and consultation

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

172—Amendment of section 80—Submission of plan to Minister

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

173—Amendment of section 81—Review and amendment of plans

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

174—Amendment of section 95—Imposition of levy by councils

This clause updates a reference to the Local Government Act 1999.

175—Amendment of section 122—Special provisions relating to land

This clause updates a reference to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005.

176—Amendment of section 129—Activities not requiring a permit

This clause deletes a reference to the repealed Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002.

177—Repeal of section 228

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

178—Amendment of Schedule 1—Provisions relating to regional NRM boards and NRM groups

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Natural Resources Management Council.

179—Amendment of Schedule 4—Repeals and transitional provisions

This clause makes amendments to Schedule 4 of the principal Act dealing with transitional provisions. This clause amends the power to make regulations of a transitional nature to apply in the case of any Act amending the principal Act.

180—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Natural Resources Management Council ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 28—Amendment of Office for the Ageing Act 1995

181—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to remove the reference to the establishment of the Advisory Board on Ageing. This amendment is consequential on the key measure of this Part, which is the abolition of that Board.

182—Repeal of Part 3

This clause repeals Part 3 of the principal Act, which established the Advisory Board on Ageing. The clause reflects the key measure of this Part.

183—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Advisory Board on Ageing ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 29—Amendment of Opal Mining Act 1995

184—Amendment of section 43—Registration of agreement

This clause makes amendments consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board in clause 189 and replaces a reference to that Board with a reference to the Minister responsible for the administration of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989.

Part 30—Amendment of Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989

185—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board to delete the definition.

186—Amendment of section 5—Duty of the Minister

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

187—Amendment of section 9—Pastoral Land Management Fund

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

188—Amendment of section 10—Power of Minister to delegate

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

189—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause abolishes the Pastoral Board by repealing Part 3 Division 2 of the principal Act which establishes and provides for the composition and functions of the Board.

190—Amendment of section 19—Grant of leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

191—Amendment of section 20—Assessment of land prior to grant of lease

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

192—Amendment of section 22—Conditions of pastoral leases

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

193—Amendment of section 23—Rent

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

194—Amendment of section 24—Term of pastoral leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

195—Amendment of section 25—Assessment of land

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

196—Repeal of sections 25A and 25B

This clause deletes sections 25A and 25B which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board. Sections 25A and 25B provide for the Minister to provide assistance to lessees in dealing with the Pastoral Board by providing access to registered members of a pool of persons suitable for that purpose.

197—Amendment of section 26—Extension of term of pastoral leases and variation of conditions

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

198—Amendment of section 31—Alteration of boundaries

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

199—Amendment of section 31A—Variation of land subject to lease

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

200—Amendment of section 33—Abandonment of land

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

201—Amendment of section 35—Penalties for late payment of rent

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

202—Amendment of section 36—Waiver

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

203—Amendment of section 37—Cancellation of lease or imposition of fine on breach of conditions

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

204—Amendment of section 38—Cancellation of pastoral lease obtained by false statement

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

205—Amendment of section 40—Notice of adverse action to be given to holders of registered interests or caveats

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

206—Amendment of section 41—Property plans

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

207—Amendment of section 42—Verification of stock levels

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

208—Amendment of section 43—Notices to destock or take other action

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

209—Amendment of section 44—Reference areas

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

210—Amendment of section 45—Establishment of public access routes and stock routes

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

211—Amendment of section 52—Powers and procedures of the Tribunal

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board.

212—Amendment of section 58—Notice to be given of cattle muster

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

213—Amendment of section 59—Right to take water

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

214—Amendment of section 61—Powers of entry etc

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board and deleting other reference to the Board.

215—Amendment of section 66—Certain debts are charges over leases

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing references to the Board with references to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

216—Amendment of Schedule—Transitional provisions

This clause makes amendment to existing transitional provisions which is consequential on the abolition of the Pastoral Board by replacing a reference to the Board with a reference to the Minister who is to assume the responsibilities of the Board.

This clause also ensures that a member of the Pastoral Board ceases to hold office on the commencement of clause 189.

This clause also provides for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

Part 31—Amendment of Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act 1995

217—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of Selection Committee from section 3 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on one of the key measures of this Part, namely the abolition of the Selection Committee.

218—Amendment of section 5—Constitution of Board

This clause transfers functions relating to the selection and appointment of members of the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia from the Selection Committee to the Minister and to organisations that the Minister considers have significant involvement in grape growing or winemaking.

219—Repeal of Part 2 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 2 Division 2 of the principal Act, which established the Selection Committee.

220—Amendment of section 26—Report

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 26 consequential on the abolition of the Selection Committee.

221—Insertion of section 28

This clause inserts a new section into the principal Act.

28—Power of delegation

This section will enable the Minister to delegate his or her functions or powers under the principal Act.

222—Amendment of section 30—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

223—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Selection Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 32—Amendment of Public Employees Housing Act 1987

224—Repeal of section 5

This clause repeals section 5 of the principal Act, which established the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee.

225—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Public Employees Housing Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 33—Amendment of SACE Board of South Australia Act 1983

226—Amendment of Schedule 1—Designated entities

This clause removes a reference to the Minister's Youth Council from the principal Act, as a result of the abolition of that Council. The opportunity is also taken to update the outdated reference to 'Non-Government Schools Registration Board' to 'Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board of South Australia'.

Part 34—Amendment of South Australian Forestry Corporation Act 2000

227—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 by redefining director so that it includes an acting director.

228—Amendment of section 9—Common seal and execution of documents

This clause amends section 9 to enable the affixing of the common seal of the Corporation to be attested by 1 or more directors.

229—Substitution of section 10

This clause substitutes section 10:

10—Establishment of board

The new section provides for the board of directors which is the governing body of the Corporation to consist of up to 5 members appointed by the Governor. A person will be eligible for appointment as a director if, in the Minister's opinion, the person has appropriate qualifications, experience or expertise to effectively perform the functions of a director of the Corporation. The section provides for the Governor to appoint a director of the board to chair meetings of the board and for the appointment of acting directors, whose terms and conditions of appointment will be as determined by the Governor.

230—Amendment of section 11—Conditions of membership

This clause amends section 11 to ensure that its provisions regarding the terms and conditions of appointment of directors of the board do not apply to the appointment of acting directors (which is covered by the new section 10).

231—Amendment of section 14—Board proceedings

This clause amends section 14 to provide that the quorum of the board is to consist of a majority of the directors in office for the time being. If a director has been appointed by the Governor to chair meetings of the board, that person will preside. If no such appointment has been made, or if the appointed director is absent, the directors present at the meeting will choose a director to chair that meeting.

Part 35—Amendment of South Australian Housing Trust Act 1995

232—Amendment of section 18—Committees

The first amendment in this clause deletes subsection (1)(a) which requires the South Australian Housing Trust to establish the South Australian Affordable Housing Trust Board of Management. The other amendments are consequential.

233—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the South Australian Affordable Housing Trust Board of Management ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 36—Amendment of South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984

234—Amendment of Long title

It is proposed to amend the long title of the principal Act so as to omit any reference to the body corporate the South Australian Motor Sport Board (the Board) which is to be abolished (and its functions are to be conferred on the South Australian Tourism Commission (the Commission)). The long title will provide that the Act is to facilitate the promotion of motor sport events in the State and for other purposes.

235—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The proposed amendments remove definitions that will no longer be required as a result of the abolition of the Board and insert a definition of the Commission. The majority of the amendments to the principal Act that follow are consequential on the abolition of the Board and on conferring on the Commission the functions and powers relating to the promotion of motor sport events in the State currently exercised by the Board.

236—Substitution of heading to Part 2

The new heading will be 'Functions and powers of Commission relating to motor sport events'.

237—Repeal of Part 2 Division 1

This Division (which made provision for the establishment of the Board) is to be repealed.

238—Repeal of heading to Part 2 Division 2

This heading is to be repealed as Part 2 will no longer need to be divided into Divisions.

239—Amendment of section 10—Functions and powers of Commission

240—Amendment of section 10AA—Non-application of Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996

241—Repeal of section 10A

242—Amendment of section 11—Commission may control and charge fee for filming etc from outside circuit

243—Repeal of section 12

244—Repeal of Part 2 Divisions 3 and 4

245—Amendment of section 20—Minister may make certain declarations

246—Amendment of section 21—Commission to have care, control etc of declared area for relevant declared period

247—Amendment of section 22—Commission to have power to enter and carry out works etc on declared area

248—Amendment of section 23—Commission to consult and take into account representations of persons affected by operations

249—Amendment of section 24—Certain land taken to be lawfully occupied by Commission

250—Amendment of section 25—Non-application of certain laws

251—Amendment of section 26—Plans of proposed works to be available for public inspection

The amendments proposed by clauses 239 to 251 (inclusive) are consequential.

252—Amendment of section 27—Power to remove vehicles left unattended within declared area

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other updates a reference.

253—Amendment of section 27AB—Application of sections 27B and 27C

This amendment is consequential.

254—Repeal of section 28

This section is to be repealed as it is no longer required.

255—Amendment of section 28AA—Declaration of official titles

This amendment is consequential.

256—Amendment of section 28A—Special proprietary interests

These amendments are consequential.

257—Amendment of section 28B—Seizure and forfeiture of goods

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other updates a reference.

258—Repeal of section 29

This section is to be repealed as it is no longer required. Schedule 1 (to be inserted in the principal Act by clause 260) makes provision for the transfer of assets and liabilities of the Board.

259—Amendment of section 30—Regulations

These amendments are either consequential or update the penalty that may be imposed for breach of a regulation.

260—Insertion of Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

Proposed Schedule 1 makes provision for transitional arrangements consequent on the abolition of the Board, including as to the transfer of staff, assets and liabilities.

Part 37—Amendment of South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980

261—Amendment of section 6—Constitution of Commission

The role of the Governor in the appointment of Commission members is removed and given to the Minister instead. This represents the key measure of this Part.

262—Amendment of section 7—Remuneration of members

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 7 consequential on the key measure of this Part.

263—Amendment of section 8—Removal from and vacancies of office

This clause makes minor amendments to section 8 consequential on the key measure of this Part.

Part 38—Amendment of South Australian Tourism Commission Act 1993

264—Amendment of section 3—Object

It is proposed to amend this section of the principal Act to reflect that the South Australian Tourism Commission (the Commission), as part of promoting South Australia as a tourist destination, also undertakes, on behalf of the State, the promotion of events, festivals and other activities.

265—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Definitions that will be otiose following the passage of this Part of the measure are to be deleted. In addition, a definition of promote, in relation to an event, festival or other activity, is to be inserted.

266—Amendment of section 5—Establishment of Commission

It is proposed to insert that the Commission has all the powers of a natural person that are capable of being exercised by a body corporate. This and another amendment proposed to this section are consequential on the Commission taking on the functions of the South Australian Motor Sport Board (to be abolished by the amendments proposed under Part 36 of this measure). The other amendment makes provision in relation to the common seal of the Commission.

267—Substitution of Part 2 Divisions 2, 3 and 4

A purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to abolish the board of directors as the governing body of the Commission and replace the board with the Chief Executive Officer (the CEO). This is achieved by repealing Divisions 2 to 4 of Part 2 and substituting them with appropriate provisions as follows:

Division 2—Constitution of Commission

6—Constitution of Commission

The Commission will be constituted of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Commission. The CEO will be appointed by the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister, on terms and conditions determined by the Governor and is, for the purposes of the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995, a senior official.

7—Acting CEO

The Minister may appoint an Acting CEO to act in the office of the CEO if the CEO is temporarily absent or unable to perform official functions. While so acting, the Acting CEO has all functions and powers of the CEO and will also be a senior official for the purposes of the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995.

8—Ministerial control

This section is substantially the same as current section 7 and provides that the Commission is subject to control and direction by the Minister.

Division 3—CEO

9—Conditions of appointment

This section provides for the conditions relating to the appointment of the CEO and is similar in terms to current section 10 except that it applies to the CEO rather than to a member of the board.

10—Saving provision

This section provides that an act of the Commission is not invalid by reason only of a defect in the appointment of the CEO or Acting CEO.

11—Delegation

This section provides the CEO with power to delegate his or her powers or functions and is drafted in the usual terms.

12—Staff and resources

This section provides that the CEO is responsible for managing the staff and resources of the Commission.

268—Amendment of section 19—Functions of Commission

The proposed amendment to this section clarifies that the functions of the Commission include the promotion of such events, festivals or activities of the State as are consistent with the object of the principal Act. A further amendment is consequential on the amendments proposed to the South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984 under Part 36 of this measure.

269—Amendment of section 20—Powers of Commission

This amendment is consequential.

270—Amendment of section 25—Protection of names

271—Amendment of section 26—Regulations

The proposed amendments in clause 270 and this clause update the penalty provisions.

272—Transitional provisions

This clause provides that a member of the board of the Commission holding office immediately before the commencement of this clause ceases to hold office on that commencement. In addition, the person holding office as the Chief Executive Officer under the principal Act immediately before the commencement of this section will, on that commencement, be taken to have been appointed as the CEO to the Commission under Part 2 of the principal Act (as amended by this measure) on the same terms and conditions, and for the balance of the term of appointment, applying to the Chief Executive Officer immediately before that commencement.

Part 39—Amendment of South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act 1992

273—Repeal of section 29

This clause abolishes the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee by repealing section 29 of the principal Act.

274—Amendment of section 31—Advisory committees

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee.

275—Amendment of section 32—Terms and conditions of office

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee.

276—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Eight Mile Creek Water Conservation and Drainage Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Part 40—Amendment of State Lotteries Act 1966

277—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

These amendments are consequential.

278—Amendment of section 4—Constitution of Commission

The primary purpose of the amendments proposed to the principal Act is to replace the multiple members who form the governing body of the Commission with the Commissioner. To that end, the amendments to section 4 provide for the Commission to be constituted of the Commissioner.

279—Amendment of section 5—Term of office of Commissioner

One of the proposed amendments to this section is consequential and the other provides that the Commissioner is, for the purposes of the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995, a senior official.

280—Substitution of sections 6 and 7

This clause deletes sections 6 and 7 of the principal Act and inserts new section 6:

6—Removal from office

Proposed section 6 ensures that the Governor has power to remove the Commissioner from office on the recommendation of the Minister on any ground that the Minister considers sufficient.

281—Amendment of section 8—Vacancy in office of Commissioner

These amendments are consequential.

282—Substitution of section 9

This clause deletes section 9 and inserts new section 9:

9—Acting Commissioner

Proposed section 9 makes provision for the appointment of an acting Commissioner in the event that the Commissioner is temporarily absent or unable to perform his or her official functions.

283—Amendment of section 11—Validity of acts of Commission

This amendment is consequential.

284—Repeal of section 12

This amendment deletes section 12 and is consequential.

285—Insertion of section 18C

This clause inserts section 18C:

18C—Tax and other liabilities of Commission

Regulation 4 of the Public Corporations (Lotteries Commission—Tax and Other Liabilities) Regulations 2012 provides that section 29 of the Public Corporations Act 1993 applies to the Commission (such that the Commission is liable to pay various taxes and other liabilities as if it were not an instrumentality of the Crown). On the Commission being reconstituted of a single member (rather than multiple members) it is necessary to enact an equivalent of section 29 of the Public Corporations Act 1993 in the State Lotteries Act 1966 because it is not envisaged in the Public Corporations Act 1993 that section 29 would be applied to a single member body corporate.

286—Amendment of section 19—Offences

This amendment deletes a reference to Chief Executive and substitutes it with a reference to Commissioner.

287—Amendment of section 20—Regulations

This clause inserts a new power to make regulations of a saving or transitional nature consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

288—Transitional provision

This clause inserts a transitional provision that ensures that a member of the Lotteries Commission of South Australia ceases to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 41—Amendment of Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992

289—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential.

290—Repeal of Part 3 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 3 Division 2 of the principal Act which establishes the Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee.

291—Repeal of section 19

This clause repeals section 19 of the principal Act which establishes the panel of assessors to sit with the District Court when the Court is exercising its jurisdiction under the principal Act.

292—Amendment of section 25—Matters to be considered in granting a licence

This amendment is consequential.

293—Amendment of section 29—Licence conditions

This amendment is consequential.

294—Amendment of section 57—Regulations

This amendment removes the power to make regulations that may incorporate, adopt, apply or make prescriptions by reference to any document prepared or published by the Advisory Committee or any other body or authority.

295—Transitional provision

This clause inserts transitional provisions that ensure that a member of the Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee and a member of the panel established under section 19 of the principal Act cease to hold office on the commencement of the relevant amendments.

Part 42—Amendment of Training and Skills Development Act 2008

296—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause removes the definition of reference group from section 4 of the principal Act. This amendment is consequential on one of the key measures of this Part, namely the abolition of reference groups under the principal Act.

297—Amendment of section 10—Functions of Commission

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 10 consequential on the abolition of reference groups.

298—Repeal of Part 2 Division 3

This clause repeals Part 2 Division 3 of the principal Act, which required the Minister to establish reference groups. This amendment represents one of the key measures of this Part.

299—Repeal of section 68

This clause repeals section 68 of the principal Act, which required or enabled the Industrial Relations Commission to sit with assessors and experts (selected in accordance with Schedule 1 of the principal Act) in certain proceedings. This amendment reflects the other key measure of this Part.

300—Amendment of section 79—Regulations

This amendment inserts provisions allowing for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

301—Repeal of Schedule 1

This clause repeals Schedule 1 of the principal Act, which required the Minister to establish panels of assessors, and enabled the Minister to establish panels of experts. This amendment is related to the measure referred to in clause 299 (above).

302—Transitional provisions

This clause ensures that a member of a reference group and a member of a panel will cease to hold office on the commencement of the respective subclauses.

Part 43—Amendment of Urban Renewal Act 1995**303—Amendment of section 7—Committees and subcommittees**

This clause removes the requirement of the Minister to establish a housing and urban development industry advisory committee and a residents and consumers advisory committee.

304—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of an advisory committee so established will cease to hold office on the commencement of the clause.

Part 44—Amendment of Wilderness Protection Act 1992**305—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation**

This clause removes the definition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee which is being abolished under this Part. This clause also inserts a new definition of Parks and Wilderness Council, being the Parks and Wilderness Council proposed to be established under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

306—Amendment of heading to Part 2 Division 2

This clause amends the heading to Part 2 Division which is consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and the ongoing performance of its functions by the Parks and Wilderness Council.

307—Repeal of sections 8 to 10

This clause abolishes the Wilderness Advisory Committee by repealing sections 8 to 10 (inclusive) of the principal Act which establish and provide for the composition and functions of the Committee.

308—Amendment of section 11—Functions of the Parks and Wilderness Council under this Act

This clause makes an amendment which is consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and gives the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

309—Amendment of section 12—Wilderness code of management

This clause provides for the Wilderness Code of Management to continue and be varied or substituted by the Minister, instead of by the Wilderness Advisory Committee, as may be required. The Parks and Wilderness Council will assume the functions of the Wilderness Advisory Committee in assisting the Minister with variation or substitution of the Code.

310—Amendment to section 13—Appointment of wardens

This clause updates a reference to the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000.

311—Amendment of section 22—Constitution of wilderness protection areas and wilderness protection zones

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

312—Amendment of section 28—Control and administration of wilderness protection areas and zones

This clause amends section 28 of the Act to provide that the Minister may direct that money paid under a lease or licence be paid to the Minister in addition to the option of being paid to a Trust established under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

313—Repeal of section 30

This clause repeals section 30 of the principal Act.

314—Amendment of section 31—Plans of management

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

315—Amendment of section 33A—Co management of wilderness protection areas or zones

This clause makes amendments which are consequential on the abolition of the Wilderness Advisory Committee and which give the functions of the Committee to the Parks and Wilderness Council.

316—Amendment of section 38A—Entrance fees etc for wilderness protection areas or zones

This clause makes an amendment to section 38A of the principal Act which is consequential on the abolition of the General Reserves Trust and the vesting of the responsibility for the General Reserves Fund in the Minister (see clause 142 and clause 145).

317—Amendment of section 41—Regulations

This clause provides for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature under the principal Act consequent on the enactment of the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Act 2014.

318—Transitional provision

This clause ensures that a member of the Wilderness Advisory Committee ceases to hold office on the commencement of this clause.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendment Nos 1 to 4:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4 be agreed to.

I thank the Legislative Council for these very fine amendments.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 5 and 6:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 5 and 6 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 7:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 8 to 14:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 8 to 14 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 15:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 15 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 16 and 17:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 16 and 17 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 18:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's Amendment No. 18 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 18 is an excellent amendment and is supported.

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN: I place on the record that the indication from the government is noted. I did receive a letter from the Attorney yesterday outlining the financial consequences of some of the amendments that have been raised, both in relation to the composition of the tribunal that is to be established for mental health matters and also legal representation in that area. In short, it seems that the government is looking to maintain the discretionary role of the President to identify what the composition should be in various cases and that some further consideration is being given to a type of legal representation scheme for those who are in need of assistance in this regard, namely, for legal representation.

What format that takes we are yet to see, obviously, but can I say that some of the financial consequences outlined are expensive, if that 100 per cent take-up rate comes to fruition. I seem to recall us talking about what the cost would be for CFS claims under a change of presumption of costs, some extraordinary amount of money, and recent announcements suggest they have sort of evaporated into a very small amount. Nevertheless, can I say that whilst the percentage rate of take-up and the percentage rate that has been taken into account for these five-year forward estimates of the costs of these initiatives are still quite substantial and we have taken that into account, it is our sincere wish on this side of the house that we have a SACAT and we have supported the bill in the establishment of the umbrella legislation and we are keen for it to be established.

I appreciate that there is still a little time to deal with some of this, in that apparently there are procedures still to be undertaken by the government to facilitate it commencing in March of next year. So, I suppose we have a little time. For the record, we are still keen to try to work through some resolution to this so that South Australians can have access to a tribunal structure to, on the face of it, give affordable, accessible and prompt relief with respect to a number of administrative matters. To that end, we are agreeable to ultimately establishing some open line of communication in this regard. Whether we do it through the formal process of a committee is one option.

Given the Legislative Council has outlined concern in those areas, I think it is probably reasonable that we sit down with them and have some discussion about it. I have not yet heard from the government with respect to the rejection of the Darley amendments, which of course relate to another matter, and as to the mover of that motion, maybe at this stage very much endorsed across the spectrum, except for the government in another place.

That may be a matter which does require a bit more attention. It may be that the government has a capacity to accommodate some other option in that regard, but I just place on the record our desire to try to reach some resolution on this and, if that occurs, we will either meet in the formal process of a deadlock committee—assuming that the Legislative Council maintain their position at this point when it gets back to them, presumably in the next 20 minutes—or alternatively on an informal basis.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the member for Bragg for giving an indication that the material we provided to her and to opposition members about the costing of these things is being taken into account, and I appreciate that. Can I indicate that I am very happy to have ongoing discussions with the member for Bragg about this matter before it is dealt with again in the Legislative Council, and I would be very pleased if we could resolve those matters in a way that did not have the very adverse implications either for the budget or, in terms of a cost recovery model, for the cost of people accessing SACAT.

One of the advantages of the model we have now is that it is relatively cheap and accessible. If we up the base cost of the whole SACAT as an organisation, the government will have to employ a cost recovery model that will increase the costs to members of the public using the scheme, and that will thereby make the scheme less than it would have been had those additional cost burdens not been imposed. So, I do welcome the comments made by the member for Bragg.

As to the other separate matter, I am going to be circumspect in my remarks about this, which is, I have to say, slightly difficult because of the peculiar way in which this matter has arisen and some of the tactics that have been employed. I will keep this pretty clear and factual because I think that would be most helpful when the matter returns to the Legislative Council, rather than pepper it with colourful language and other things, which one might be tempted to do, particularly when one appreciates—

Ms Chapman: If I can do it, you can.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —indeed, quite correct—as one does on this side of the house, the supreme irony of what the Legislative Council has done from the perspective of the opposition, but let me leave that to one side. I am putting this on the record simply so that it might be of assistance elsewhere.

On 28 October, I was asked a series of questions by the Hons Robert Brokenshire, Mr Wade and Mr Parnell regarding the information provided to the President of the Guardianship Board, Mr Moore, about the future of the board and the future of the position of the president. In light of the proposal to establish the SACAT at the time, Mr Moore applied for and was reappointed for a second term as president of the board. The gist of these questions is whether, at the time he applied for reappointment and accepted an offer of reappointment as president of the board, Mr Moore was made aware of the government's plans to abolish the board, and as a consequence the position of president, and transfer the jurisdiction of the board to the SACAT. I am advised as follows.

In October 2011, the Attorney-General (me) wrote to Mr Moore advising of the review into whether a generalist tribunal should be established. On 30 November 2011, the Hon. Tony Piccolo MP, as chair of the SACAT review, and review team members met with Mr Moore to discuss the appropriateness of transferring the Guardianship Board jurisdiction to SACAT. I am advised that no opposition to the proposal was expressed at this meeting by Mr Moore.

On 5 December 2011, the SACAT review team provided information, facilities and resourcing survey to the board. On 13 December 2011, the SACAT review team members visited the board at Collinswood and met with Mr Moore, the managing executive, and registrar of the board. A further meeting between the review team members and the board members was held on 20 December 2011, during which issues affecting the transfer of jurisdiction, including case management system, facilities and other issues, were discussed.

From January 2012 until August 2012, there was ongoing contact between the SACAT review team and the board staff regarding planning for the transfer of the board's functions to SACAT. Mr Moore was reappointed, after this time obviously, on 1 April 2013—

Ms Chapman: Was that supposed to be April Fool's Day for some reason?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That just happened to be the day—but in clear understanding of what lay ahead. That is, he was appointed for a further term some 18 months after the transfer of the board's functions into SACAT was first raised with him and had been for some time discussed with him.

Ms Chapman: Then why was he appointed for five years?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Because the legislation only permits a five-year appointment. It is a five-year term. There are many cases, member for Bragg, where we have these difficulties. For example, with boards and committees we intend to abolish, you will find that some people have been for an interim reason appointed for a term of more than a few months. That is not necessarily because that is the intention of the government because the relevant statute says appointments must be for three years, five years or whatever it might be and, therefore, we either have nobody there or we comply with the provisions of the legislation.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. In any event, honourable members should also be aware that Mr Moore advised that he was supportive of the transfer of the board's function to SACAT until early in 2014. On the 29 August, Mr Moore wrote to me advising me that 'I submit that the Guardianship Board model and way of conducting itself can and should be transferred on to the SACAT with appropriate changes'.

Ms Chapman: Perhaps he thought he was going to get the job.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Perhaps. This support and cooperation continued until March 2014, when Mr Moore advised in an advice to the department that he was 'withdrawing the Guardianship Board from SACAT'. Interesting concept, but there you are. Throughout March and April, the Attorney-General's Department and SACAT Establishment Project Team continued to include the board in its consultation and planning. The chief executive of the department both wrote to and met with Mr Moore seeking his agreement to re-engage with the process. Eventually, in late April 2014 Mr Moore indicated that he and his staff would cooperate with and assist the implementation team.

On 5 June 2014, the chief executive of the Attorney-General's Department met with Mr Moore. At that meeting the chief executive advised Mr Moore that compensation would not be payable to statutory office holders, including himself, whose appointments are terminated upon the abolition of the board and who were not successful in securing appointment to SACAT. On 6 June 2014, the President of SACAT, His Honour Justice Parker, wrote to all current members of the board providing details as to the establishment of the SACAT and the application processes for persons seeking appointment. Justice Parker in his correspondence urged all current members to apply. I am advised that Mr Moore did not apply for appointment to the SACAT in any capacity.

Ms Chapman: That's it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's it.

At 17:54 the house adjourned until Wednesday 12 November 2014 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***DISABILITY FUNDING**

64 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014). How will the \$10.4 million allocated for additional resources to the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion to support people living with a disability and for carers of people living with a disability be spent?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

The \$10.4 million funding assisted clients with the highest priority of need, through the provision of supported accommodation and respite packages, and personal support packages. The funding also assisted people with disability who were ready to be discharged from hospital to home or supported accommodation.

DISABILITY FUNDING

84 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014). How will the \$10.4 million allocated for additional resources to the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion to support people living with a disability and their carers to be expended?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

The \$10.4 million funding assisted clients with the highest priority of need, through the provision of supported accommodation and respite packages, and personal support packages. The funding also assisted people with disability who were ready to be discharged from hospital to home or supported accommodation.

DOMICILIARY CARE

88 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014).

1. How many people are currently waiting for domiciliary equipment?
2. What is the average waiting time for domiciliary equipment services?
3. How many clients who receive domiciliary equipment services are disability clients?
4. Why has funding for domiciliary equipment services decreased by \$583,000 from \$1.686 million in 2012-13 to \$1.566 million in 2014-15?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

1. During 2013-14, once a person has been assessed, the equipment program has operated without waiting lists for the supply of equipment and home modification services. Where clients are assessed by the clinical service and their needs have been prescribed, that item or home modification has been supplied.

2. During 2013-14, the average, overall supply times for equipment supplied during 2013-14, (once a prescription was received at the Domiciliary Equipment Service) were 6 days for stock items, 76 days for customised items, and customised wheelchairs (the most complex items) averaging 140 days. It should be noted that this does not take into account the time people may have waited initially to have a need assessed.

3. As at 30 June 2014, the Domiciliary Equipment Service was providing services to 4,596 adults with a disability and 1,449 children (including 220 participants of the National Disability Insurance Scheme).

4. The funding for domiciliary equipment services on page 95 of the 2014-15 Budget Paper 4, Vol. 1 only reflects the annual program for capital equipment costing over \$10,000. The operating budget for domiciliary equipment services is on page 105 which includes equipment under

\$10,000 along with all other items. The reduction of the funding for domiciliary equipment services, on page 95 of the 2014-15 Budget Paper 4, Vol. 1, from the 2012-13 Actual of \$1.687 million to the 2014-15 Budget of \$1.104 million reflects the expenditure of one-off funding received in 2012-13.

DISABILITY SERVICES

104 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014). How much has demand for disability services provided by Disabilities SA increased in 2013-14 and how much is demand for disability services projected to increase in 2014-15?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

The 13.6 per cent nominal increase in expenditure from \$345.9 million in 2012-13 in Disability SA to an estimated \$393 million in 2013-14 essentially reflects the growth in demand and the increased costs for disability services in 2013-14.

The 2014-15 budget provides a 6.4 per cent nominal increase in budgeted expenditure from \$393.0 million in 2013-14 to \$418.1 million in 2014-15 to address the projected growth in demand and the increased costs for disability services in 2014-15.

DISABILITY SERVICES

105 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014).

1. How much has demand for disability services provided by non-government organisations increased in 2013-14 and how much is demand for disability services projected to increase in 2014-15?

2. How many more additional service providers will require support in each year between 2012-13 and 2014-15?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

1. The 15.1 per cent nominal increase in sub-program expenditure from \$271.1 million in 2012-13 to \$312.1 million in 2013-14 reflects the increase in demand for disability services in 2013-14. This demand is expected to continue in 2014-15, with budgeted expenditure growing to \$336.6 million, an increase of 7.8 per cent.

2. The number of providers which may be requested to deliver disability support services fluctuates from year to year. Providers must meet and maintain certain standards to be an approved provider of disability services.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

107 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014).

1. What work is the department doing to identify and prepare families who are transitioning over the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS)?

2. Are there any delays in the state/federal rollout of the NDIS and if so, what are the reasons?

3. What in-kind contributions will be included as part of the scheme and what block grant funding will be provided?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): I have been advised:

1. South Australia is providing assistance to the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) by enabling service providers to provide client data, including names and contact details, to the NDIA where required.

Service providers have indicated that they are contacting the parents of their young clients who are in the NDIS trial age cohort to assist them to prepare for their planning meetings with the NDIA and ensure they have the information about their current level of services and the NDIA support type that relates to the service.

The state government service provider, Disability Services, has put mechanisms in place to support clients' transition to the NDIS and to ensure there is both continuity of care and safe and effective transition arrangements in place. Parents are also advised by the NDIA and current service providers that they are able to have a support person, family member or advocate with them during their conversations with the NDIA.

2. No scheme delays have been agreed upon by governments. The state government expects the NDIA to focus on how best to establish a sustainable scheme over the long term in the timeframes agreed between South Australia and the commonwealth government.

3. The state government contribution of cash and in-kind support to the NDIS has been agreed as part of the bilateral agreement between South Australia and the commonwealth. The agreement estimates the following in-kind and cash contributions over the period of the NDIS trial, though the actual mix of in-kind/cash contributions may vary throughout the trial to reflect the level of in-kind services actually used by the NDIA:

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Cash	\$2.7 million	\$9.6 million	\$16.2 million
In-kind	\$2.2 million	\$10.9 million	\$17.5 million

Transition of existing programs from block grant funding, which contributes to the bilaterally agreed cash/in-kind mix, will be on a service provider basis. Current block grant funded providers of disability services will continue to receive state funding until they can access funds from the NDIS for clients who have transitioned. A gradual step down of block grants will occur as children transition to the scheme and funds are paid to providers by the NDIA.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

The letter from Adelaide Capital Partners in respect of the Gillman property constituted an unsolicited proposal, which expressed that party's interest in the land.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

The unsolicited proposal was a detailed proposal. It contained information as to:

- the economic and strategic benefits to South Australia associated with the proposal;
- the proposed purchase price and details of land to be acquired;
- the basic details regarding the indicative structure of the transaction; and
- confirmation that the proposal did not require any direct state government funding.

However, Renewal SA, as with any responsible government agency, and to ensure that the proposal represented good value for money for the state, initially evaluated Adelaide Capital Partners' proposal with a view to determining whether an even greater level of detail was required to reach a considered conclusion as to the merits of the proposal and to determine whether the proposal should be progressed.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

A strategic assessment of an off-market transaction occurs more broadly within government (including cabinet). Renewal SA's Real Property Marketing and Pricing Policy contemplates that Renewal SA's primary concern is achieving an appropriate value for the land. Mr Hansen's evidence before the select committee confirmed that significant value was achieved.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

Adelaide Capital Partners' initial proposal contained detailed information. ACP was not provided with any information that was not publicly available.

OFFICE FOR THE PUBLIC SECTOR

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2014).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector):

There were a total of 22 candidates identified as potentially suitable for the role.

Estimates Replies

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business):

The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers. TVSPs are only one means by which an agency can achieve its FTE reductions. Others include natural attrition, not filling vacancies and not renewing employment contracts.

A budget for TVSPs is not set at the agency level. Instead, a whole of government budget provision is established, held in a central contingency and paid to agencies as required.

The contingency provision held at the time of the 2014-15 budget is shown in the following table.

	2014-15 \$m	2015-16 \$m	2016-17 \$m	2017-18 \$m
Provision	19.0	12.0	—	—

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development): I have been advised of the following:

All ministerial appointments are as follows:

Title	Estimated Full Year Employment Costs 2013-14 (\$000)
Chief of Staff	188
Ministerial Adviser	129
Ministerial Adviser	156
Ministerial Adviser	129
Ministerial Adviser	129

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

Title	Estimated Full Year Employment Costs 2013-14 (\$000)
Administration & Correspondence Officer	79
Business Support Officer	62
Business Support Officer	64
Communications Officer (0.4 FTE)	46
Information Officer	79
Ministerial Liaison Officer	105
Ministerial Liaison Officer	102
Ministerial Liaison Officer—Health and Child Development	105
Ministerial Liaison Officer, Families SA	115
Ministerial Liaison Officer, Non-Government Schools Secretariat	108
Office Manager	122
Parliament and Cabinet Officer	88
Personal Assistant to the Minister	88
Project Officer	79
Research Officer (0.6 FTE)	69
Senior Business Support Officer	69

Note: The total employment cost is based on the salary rates and leave loading rates (if applicable) of the position incumbent, plus additional on-costs of 24.4 per cent of the salary for payroll tax, superannuation, WorkCover and long service leave.