

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 19 June 2001

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chairman:**

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

**Members:**

Mr S.G. Condous  
 Mr M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith  
 The Hon. M.D. Rann  
 Ms M.G. Thompson  
 Mr I.H. Venning  
 Mr M.J. Wright

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*


---

Legislative Council, \$3 692 000  
 House of Assembly, \$5 774 000  
 Joint Parliamentary Services, \$6 205 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.W. Olsen, Premier, Minister for State Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk, House of Assembly.  
 Mr J. Neldner, Finance Manager, Joint Services Division.  
 Mr H. Coxon, Parliamentary Librarian, Parliamentary Library.  
 Mrs J. Richards, Leader, Hansard.  
 Ms E. Grove, Catering Manager, Catering Division.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think most of us know now that the estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure, but we need to run through a few of the rules. As has always been the case, the committee will determine an approximate time for consideration of proposed payments to facilitate change of departmental advisers at the appropriate times. I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition whether they have agreed on a timetable for today's proceedings and, if they have, if they could intimate that a little later. Changes to the composition of the committee will be notified to the committee as they occur. Members should ensure that they have provided the chair with a completed request to be discharged form. If the Premier undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and two copies submitted to the Clerk of the House of Assembly no later than Friday 6 July.

I propose to allow the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to make an opening statement (if they so desire) of about 10 minutes but no longer than 15 minutes. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions based on about three questions per member alternating sides. Members may also be allowed to ask a brief supplementary question to conclude a line of questioning, but I would suggest that any supplementary question will be the exception rather than the rule. Subject to the convenience of the committee, a member who is outside the committee and desires to ask a question will be permitted to do so once the

line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by the committee. Therefore, an indication to the chair in advance from the member outside of the committee wishing to ask a question is necessary.

Questions must be based on lines of expenditure as revealed in the estimates statement. Reference may be made to other documents, including the portfolio statements. Members must identify the page number or the program in the relevant financial papers from which their question is derived—and I emphasise that—for the convenience of everyone in the committee. Questions not asked at the end of the day may be placed on the next day's House of Assembly *Notice Paper*. I remind the Premier that there is no formal facility for the tabling of documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the chair for distribution to the committee. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the House of Assembly; that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length.

All questions are to be directed to the Premier, not the Premier's advisers. The Premier may refer questions to advisers for a response if he so wishes. I also advise that for the purpose of the committee some freedom will be allowed for television coverage—and I understand that they have taken that already—by allowing a short period of filming from the northern gallery. Before commencing may I suggest an afternoon and evening tea break at around 3.30 and 9 p.m. respectively for approximately 15 minutes.

I declare the proposed payments open for examination. I refer members to page 14 in the Estimates Statement and volume 1, part 1, of the Portfolio Statements. Does the Premier wish to make an opening statement?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Not in relation to this particular area. I will make a very brief comment when we move through a little later.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the leader wish to make a statement?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Not at this stage.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any questions?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No questions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no questions, I declare the examination of the votes completed. Thank you for your attendance.

---

State Governor's Establishment, \$2 132 000

**Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Mr W. McCann, Chief Executive Officer, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Ms S. MacIntosh, Executive Director, Corporate and Organisational Development.

Ms H. Butow, Executive Director, Cabinet Office.

Ms H. Parkes, A/Executive Director, Strategic Policy Division.

Ms A. Alford, Principal Financial Consultant, Corporate and Organisational Development.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I now declare the proposed payment open for examination. Are there any questions?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Mr Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement at this stage. During 2000-01, the Governor, Sir Eric Neal, has continued a very busy schedule

of visits to businesses, country regions and meeting with a diverse range of community groups. Sir Eric also meets frequently with leading national and international business people and visiting dignitaries. Earlier this month, he travelled to the United States to support the successful South Australian bid for the Police and Fire Games in the year 2007.

Government House is an important part of South Australia's heritage, but it is also an active working house and a place of business. About 10 years ago a major restoration project was undertaken at Government House to address rising damp and to stabilise the original lime sand render. At the time, a soft sacrificial render was introduced to draw salts to the surface and to avoid the destruction of the stone walls. Both the paint finish and sacrificial render are at a stage where cyclical maintenance now needs to be carried out. Tenders were let to carry out the painting work, at a cost of approximately \$174 000. The repair and painting is essential for the maintenance of the house, as is the asset management planning strategy. It is estimated that this planning and restoration should last between 10 and 14 years, as a mineral silicate paint is now being used.

More than 21 000 people have attended functions in the house and gardens during the past 12 months and enjoyed the opportunity to view the heritage asset in the garden setting. I wish once again to record my thanks to Sir Eric and Lady Neal for their outstanding contribution to the South Australian community over this past 12 months.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I echo the Premier's remarks: I think that the Governor, Sir Eric Neal, and Lady Neal have done and continue to do an outstanding job on behalf of all South Australians, as did their predecessor Dame Roma Mitchell. On behalf of the opposition, I would like to congratulate not only Sir Eric and Lady Neal but also their hard-working staff, who sometimes get overlooked in mentions in the parliament. They do an outstanding job to make sure that things run smoothly.

I will start by asking a question of the Premier about the Governor's line. There has been speculation in the newspapers about the imminent announcement of a new Governor, although the newspaper comment did say that Sir Eric and Lady Neal would be continuing until after the Queen's visit (which will be in mid-October, as I understand, following her attendance at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Brisbane in October this year). So, I envisage that there will be a couple of days' royal visit on about 11 October—the fourth anniversary of the last election.

Given this constant speculation, it might be useful for the Premier to clear up what he intends to do in terms of the timing of such an announcement. I understand that there is no fixed term for the Governor and that there has been a loose sort of arrangement over years of five years, but that can be continued and extended. I understand that the term of Sir Donald Dunstan, who was appointed by the Liberal government, was then extended by the South Australian Labor government under John Bannon. As I say, Sir Eric and Lady Neal are doing an outstanding job but, given this constant media speculation, it might be useful for the Premier to clear up this matter.

Secondly, in terms of the Premier's strong support three years ago at the Constitutional Convention for the ARM model for a head of state (which involved consultation and agreement between the Prime Minister and the federal Leader of the Opposition on the appointment of a head of state), does the Premier, given the imminence of an election after 11 October when the four year term is up, intend to embrace the

same protocol in terms of bipartisan agreement for a non-partisan position in appointing a new Governor if he intends to do so in a pre-election period?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** First, I am not in a position to clarify the matter at this stage. I have had some preliminary discussions, and last Monday I had the opportunity to canvass the views of Her Majesty in relation to this matter. I have not had an opportunity to have further discussions back in South Australia at this stage, and it would be appropriate for me to do so prior to clearing up the matter, as the leader puts it.

In relation to courtesies, I can assure the leader that the courtesies that have been extended to me in the past will be extended to him in the future.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** That remains the point: that there was no consultation previously in terms of the appointment. Given the Premier's position on the appointment of heads of state following consultation and agreement with the Leader of the Opposition, and given the imminence of an election, it has been suggested that the Premier may be announcing a new Governor prior to the Queen's visit but making him or her a Governor-designate and allowing Sir Eric and Lady Neal to continue in that position until the time of the Queen's visit, putting in the replacement afterwards.

There has been speculation, for instance, about a number of names which I do not tend to entertain. Obviously, the opposition would be concerned if someone was appointed in an immediate pre-election period. I remember Don Dunstan consulting with Steele Hall prior to the 1968 election over the advice that Dunstan would like to have seen Sir Mark Oliphant appointed. Steele Hall actually vetoed that appointment at that stage, and it was withdrawn from the palace and Steele Hall later appointed someone else. Sir Mark Oliphant was appointed about five years later.

Given the Premier's strong support and avowed principles on consultation, it would be good to see whether we could reach agreement on a suitable replacement. Some of the names being mentioned include substantial donors to the Liberal Party, although I know that it is media speculation and I know that that would not happen.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As the leader says, it would be inappropriate to canvass in this forum the names of any individuals or any suggested short list. I have said to the leader that during my time courtesies were extended to me, and I will ensure that the leader has the same courtesies extended to him.

In relation to the period of 9 to 12 October, it is anticipated that the Queen, in visiting CHOGM, as the leader said, will visit the two states that she did not visit on her previous visit to Australia last year, namely, Queensland and South Australia respectively. She will visit Queensland after CHOGM and then come to South Australia, arriving on, I think, Tuesday 9 October. She will spend the full day of 10 and 11 October in South Australia and leave Australia on Friday 12 October. Adelaide will be the departure point from Australia: I understand that the Queen will be going to New Zealand for a visit prior to returning to the United Kingdom.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Obviously, it is important for us to maximise the advantages of visits of heads of state, and I have suggested to the Premier that perhaps a visit to the Barossa (there is a new Barossa train which is being extended to Angaston) is something that could draw attention in Britain to the success of the wine industry, where it is important for our wine sales; a visit to the National Wine Centre; perhaps there could also be a visit to the Convention Centre, given that it was due to be opened the week before; and perhaps

also, given that this is the International Year of Volunteers, we could actually have an honouring of the contribution that volunteers make in our community. Perhaps we could also have a large youth gala event that involves youth from different backgrounds in arts, and so on. Obviously, it is non-partisan and bipartisan, and that is what I am pledging.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A number of organisations have submitted requests to be involved in the program, and a range of options has been put forward to the Prime Minister's office. My understanding is that the Prime Minister's office then looks at the options that apply in Queensland and in South Australia, to give a variety of program within Australia. That is then submitted to the palace. The palace will give consideration to that, and in July a reconnaissance team will visit Australia to check and advise, upon which I understand that the program that Her Majesty wishes to pursue will be advised to us. My understanding is that, whilst a range of suggestions has been put forward, at the end of the day we will simply be advised of the program that will be acceptable.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question to the Premier is about the manner in which the head of state is appointed in South Australia. Does the Premier have any aversion to the notion of having a process, rather than an insular and isolated one in which he alone may choose without consulting anybody, which he could introduce on his own prerogative, of a convocation of all members of the South Australian parliament, separately assembled in company with all the chairs and mayors of local government around South Australia meeting to elect by exhaustive ballot whomever then becomes nominated as the new head of state, whenever a head of state is elected?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, I would not be prepared to accede to that. I will be following the convention that has been in place now for a considerable time. Whilst the nomination that goes forward to the palace is under the signature of the Premier of the day, it is a matter that I would discuss extensively with my ministerial colleagues. I have also indicated to the leader the approach I would intend to take in this instance. The member for Hammond is advocating a quite new and radical approach. At this point I have not given any thought to that, and therefore I would not accede to that at this stage.

**Mr LEWIS:** It is a bit more democratic, that is all.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the State Governor's Establishment vote closed.

---

Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$47 063 000  
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$3 149 000

**Additional Departmental Advisers:**

Ms Heather Butow, Executive Director, Cabinet Office, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr Terry Tysoe, Executive Director, Major Projects Division.

Ms Pamela Martin, Director, Commercial Advice.

Ms Heather Parkes, Acting Executive Director, Strategic Policy Division.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I refer members to page 14 of volume I, part 1 of the Portfolio Statement. The Premier may make a statement if he so desires.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will make a statement which will be the basis for deliberations today. The budget that we have brought down has been firmly focused on delivering services and benefits to the community while still maintaining an ongoing requirement of fiscal constraint. We have done some hard yards and they are now starting to show results. This means the government is acting responsibly. It is not spending money it does not have and it is not running up debts that will weigh down future generations. In fact, South Australia is no longer considered a high debt state, with the debt level expected to fall below that of New South Wales and Western Australia in the next five years, according to a recent Access Economics five-year business outlook. This forecast also highlights the state's growth per head of population, which over the past five years is second only to Victoria. Unemployment growth now sits less than .5 per cent over the national average compared to more than 2.25 per cent in 1998. Retail growth also outstripped the national average in 2000.

The government has committed itself to diversifying the state's economy and concentrating on key areas of growth for the future—the automotive, defence and electronics industries. This focus has translated into the most important equation—more jobs for South Australians. The government has clearly articulated its strategic objectives and key priorities within the annual Directions for South Australia statement. Once again, this statement has been integrated with budget preparations, significantly improving the coordination of whole of government planning and budgeting. The directions statement outlines the clear linkages between government and ministerial priorities, the outcomes planned by portfolios and the services or outputs that are then provided to the community.

This budget is the fourth to be presented on an accrual output basis, and the portfolio statements are a key part of this best practice approach. They represent a consolidation of the major budgetary and financial management reforms that have been implemented—reforms that are ensuring that our public sector agencies become increasingly transparent, financially accountable, competitive and responsive. All portfolios have refined their performance measures and provided estimated 2000-01 results and 2001-02 targets for outputs where specification has been possible and usefully measurable. The aim is to provide information for analysing the efficiency and effectiveness of government services in the future using this historical data.

I would like to draw your attention to the section of the Premier and Cabinet portfolio statement covering the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Changes in the structure of the department have strengthened its policy approach, particularly in relation to the coordination and management of major projects, intergovernmental policy and strategic policy. Over the next year the department aims to identify emerging issues and opportunities to consolidate our state's strength, competitiveness and prosperity. The department will assist the government to provide employment opportunities for South Australians by supporting and facilitating projects that will provide important infrastructure, assist tourism growth, help our export industries and provide economic vitality for the state. The Adelaide to Darwin railway is just one example of the projects being undertaken and will see almost 7 000 people employed during the three-

year construction phase of the railway. South Australian companies have already won more than \$150 million in contracts, and the benefits to South Australia from the construction of the rail link are expected to be of the order to \$340 million to \$640 million gained from direct and indirect industry contracts, employment and other benefits.

The government's ongoing commitment to revitalising the City of Adelaide continues through the joint funding and collaboration of the capital city project team and the Adelaide City Council. The team is administratively attached to the department and provides executive support to the Capital City Committee, which I chair. The capital city development program includes more than 120 initiatives in the City of Adelaide, including a cooperative approach between the government, council and traders, to commence the first stage of the North Terrace development. The project aims to significantly improve the area between Gawler Place and Frome Road. It will complement the Riverbank redevelopment, the completion of the Adelaide Convention Centre and the elevated pedestrian promenade, and will reinforce North Terrace's position as Australia's premier cultural boulevard. City safety will continue to be a focus. The Safe City working group, which reports to the Capital City Committee, is developing strategies to continue to improve city safety and ensure that Adelaide is a safe city 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The South Australian government has been at the forefront of campaigning for the Murray River salinity, water quality and other related environments issues. My department will coordinate South Australia's role in the implementation of the national action plan on salinity and water quality. An expansion of the 'Save the Murray' awareness campaign will also be conducted. The department will continue to assist the government in supporting South Australian communities in regional areas. The regional budget statement details an extensive range of services and initiatives in this year's budget. Community cabinets in rural and regional locations will also continue the government's commitment to listening and responding to the needs of all South Australians. In the context of the department's role in promoting public sector reform, it will complete round two of its Leadership SA initiative, which provides development opportunities to leaders and managers within the public sector.

In keeping with the government's commitment to South Australia leading in e-learning, an online learning and information environment is being developed for executives in the public sector as part of this program. The department will also continue to implement the Public Service training package which will see 25 programs covering 500 employees being offered during the year. These programs will help ensure that agencies can effectively respond to the increasing complexity of issues they face.

New enterprise agreements for salaried and weekly paid employees will be developed to ensure wage outcomes within acceptable parameters while providing competitive, equitable remuneration structures, enhanced career opportunities and improved flexibility within the public sector.

The department's commitment to minimising the number, severity and cost of work injuries and disease has resulted in a number of initiatives including the development of an industry training plan for occupational health and safety practitioners, implementing a public sector safety culture marketing campaign, and establishing occupational health, safety and injury management performance improvement targets across the public sector.

The department will also provide advice and support to assist agencies achieve optimal assessments against Work-Cover's performance standards. A number of programs designed to promote access and equity within the state's diverse population continue to be developed through the Division of Multicultural Affairs and the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. Consultation will take place with ethnic communities to identify issues and develop options for the government's consideration. This will include regional ethnic communities who contribute to regional advisory committees. The Multicultural Access to Justice program will continue its success in breaking down language and cultural barriers and will ensure access to justice for all South Australians as it extends to new regions throughout South Australia.

Lifelong learning will continue to be a high priority as the department continues to expand the body of knowledge on this subject through the Premier's awards for post graduate research scholarships and through joint research projects with business and industry. Additionally, people from groups who have not traditionally accessed university study will be encouraged through a bursary program. Small grants from the Premier's Community Fund will continue to assist organisations that do not receive mainstream funding to provide services and support to members of our community. As a result, a number of worthwhile community programs and services will continue to flourish.

Other key areas of coordination by the department involve the implementation of national competition policy reforms, including optimising full competition payments for South Australia; a whole of government framework for a program aiming to encourage people from interstate to move to South Australia; and support for the national depression initiative which aims to reduce the prevalence and impact of depression in the Australian community.

The department is also leading the South Australian input into the development of a national cooperative scheme for regulating gene technology. The Minister for Tourism (Hon. Joan Hall) will address the role and budget of the South Australian Tourism Commission.

In conclusion, the budget papers we are considering today reflect a considered coordinated approach to the priorities of the portfolio over the coming year. We aim to consolidate the progress that has already been made and maintain business and public confidence in the state.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the leader intend to make a statement?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes, sir. It comes down to what I would call 'wrong priorities' and the difference in priorities. This government can always find money for soccer stadiums, consultants, advisers, public relations programs and television advertisements but not for the essentials. The state opposition wants to know why the cost of the Premier's own department has more than doubled in just three years at a time when our hospitals and schools are being cut in terms of finances. Over the estimates period, we want to ask a series of questions in relation to consultants.

I am also particularly keen to understand why the number of staff in the Department of Premier and Cabinet has ballooned while its cost has blown out in three years from \$15 million to \$33 million. You would have thought that the Premier's department and the Premier's office would be showing leadership to other ministers and other government departments. While they have been cutting schools and hospitals, the Premier's own department has massively blown

out—from \$15 million to \$33 million. Last year, the Premier's department overran its budget by almost \$4.8 million (or 17 per cent) to cost over \$33 million, yet our schools and hospitals were struggling with cuts to their budgets in real terms. Again, there has been a cut to the education budget in real terms with this year's expenditure being frozen at last year's levels.

We regard that as an example of where the government has got its priorities wrong. In fact, under this Premier the Premier's department continues to balloon and blow out. In 1997-98 the department cost \$15 million. Staff numbers keep increasing in the Premier's office. In 1996, the year that Premier Olsen took the Premiership from Dean Brown, staff numbers in the Premier's department were 219. That is 219 under Dean Brown; it is now 305 under this Premier. Salaries for individual staffers have also lifted substantially. In 1996, again under Dean Brown, the number of people in the Premier's department on over \$100 000 was 11; in 1999-2000, that had risen to 31—and we are yet to find out what the levels of payment are now in the Premier's department.

Again, it is the same with consultants—as has been highlighted in this morning's paper. There was an enormous public backlash over the \$115 million spent on the ETSA consultants. There was enormous public backlash in terms of Tim Fischer's appointment as a consultant to the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. He was guaranteed \$3 000 a month, whether or not he did anything; he was guaranteed \$2 000 a day even if he was away on other business but managed to include appointments in relation to the Alice Springs to Darwin railway.

The same reaction has come about in terms of former President Clinton's appointment to give a speech at the IT conference. It is interesting to know who is paying for that but, again, it is an example of money being found. Former President Clinton will be paid \$9 000 a minute or \$500 000.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The member for Schubert interrupts, but would the \$500 000 not be better spent on 30 heart bypass operations, or 40 hip operations, or eight school teachers for a year, or 45 extra university places? Again, it is about priorities.

Today, I will be calling on the government, through a series of questions to the Premier, to release in full all the contracts with all the consultants who were employed on the electricity deal, the water deal and other privatisations and outsourcing. Of course, in May there was a sudden conversation on the road to Damascus and the Premier announced a new landmark policy about a new openness on government contracts. He said that they all would be released from now on; it was all about accountability and transparency. It was a day when members on both the sides of the House after 7½ years were gobsmacked to hear the announcement.

We will put the Premier to the test. If he is serious about opening up the books on all these contracts over \$50 000, I would like to see a commitment today to release all the contracts with the consultants, plus their reports. The sum of \$115 million was spent on consultants to sell ETSA. They apparently got a success fee. What about a failure fee for consultants who have helped get this government in the mess we now face in terms of our electricity crisis which in 11 or 12 days from now will overwhelm South Australian business with massive increases in the price of electricity between 30 per cent and 90 per cent?

I want to get a commitment today from the Premier that those contracts with consultants will be released publicly so that the public knows how much they were paid individually and collectively, and also know and get an understanding about what they actually did, including the reports of those consultants. If the Premier's new charter of accountability means anything, we will see him release the details of the contracts for the \$115 million that he has spent on consultants hired to privatise ETSA. I would like to know what kind of success fee those consultants got. So, we will be asking questions in relation to consultants, the Premier's own department, and the fact that it has blown out massively while there have been cuts to schools and hospitals. Ultimately, we will be questioning the government's priorities, which are never about things such as health and education, despite all the promises that if electricity was privatised \$2 million a day extra would be spent on schools and hospitals. That has not happened. It is not in the budget, and all we have, of course, is a state now facing a massive electricity crisis of the Premier's own making.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will respond to a couple of points.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Well, I'll get a third.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thought a question was posed in—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No; in my opening statement—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Obviously, the leader does not want me to respond while the television cameras are here. That is what this is about.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No, I am happy. You have just had you go, and I want you to reply.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am happy to reply to one particular point that the leader made when he said that my department had ballooned since 1997. What he has forgotten to tell the media in the presentation that he just made is that in October 1997 there was a restructuring of the departments. In fact, as he well knows, for OMEA there were approximately 35 staff, for the Office of Public Sector Employment (92 staff), and for the Human Resources Division (36 staff) who were previously in other agencies and departments and who were consigned and consolidated in the Department of Premier and Cabinet. That is the reason, not that there has been a blow-out and ballooning in the number and cost, but simply a transfer of function from one department to another. It was a restructure. I ask the leader to take that particular point on board.

I would like to make two other points. The leader constantly indicated that there had been cuts in hospital and education funding. I vigorously dispute that point. The amount of funds that we are putting into our capital works program, and the increase in the recurrent allocation to the health services—as the Minister for Health detailed in this House post the budget being brought down—clearly indicate a substantial increase in health funding. In addition, following the Partnerships 21 program that has been put in place, there has likewise been a substantial increase in education funding. Partnerships 21 is the reason why several hundred additional staff are employed in our schools today who were not previously there. So, we are addressing the priorities of education and health and we have not cut them, as the leader has constantly indicated.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I guess I get a second go as well. Even the government itself—and your Treasurer—announced last week, in terms of the budget, that the education budget

had been frozen at the previous year's level—that is a cut in real terms. No matter how much spin you and your media advisers put on it, it is a cut to education.

In relation to the health budget, the simple truth is that you are budgeting for 111 000 fewer outpatient services in our metropolitan hospitals and about 7 500 fewer outpatient services in our country hospitals. There is not one single extra bed in the health budget. But you can find \$115 million for consultants who stuffed up the ETSA sale, and that is the difference. They are your priorities—privatisation and consultants.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As the Minister of Health announced, there will be additional beds: this year an additional \$15 million was allocated for recurrent funding for health to supply additional beds in our public hospital system, principally in the metropolitan area.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** As I said before, on 15 May the Premier announced that he had a conversion to openness and accountability from being the most secretive and unaccountable government in Australia. Apparently, the Liberals polling found that most South Australians expected a more open approach. Jeff Kennett found that out the day after his election defeat and, of course, this government based almost everything it did on what the Kennett government was doing. On that day, he said that all government contracts for goods and services would be made public, including all consultancy agreements over \$50 000. Given that the Premier's claim that his government had now seen the light and would be accountable and transparent, will he make a commitment today that during this estimates committee process, which is two weeks (previous government ministers had two weeks to respond; and we had six months last year if it was something that you did not want to release), and given his statement to the House on 15 May, he will table all the contracts, terms of reference, performance assessments and all other documents relating to the selection, appointment, performance and activities of all the consultants employed to advise the government on the ETSA sale?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I think it was on 15 May that I announced a detailed policy. I have given operational dates for that to be put in place. I have indicated a process that will be followed by the department related to contracts, and it will be honoured. I made that statement to this House and it will be followed through and honoured.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** By the operational dates, Mr Premier?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is 1 July.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** So, from 1 July you are prepared to release all consultancy contracts—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:**—including the performance, assessments and success fees?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I ask the leader simply to revisit the statement I made to this House—and it will be honoured. In relation to the throw-away line about the water contract, I thought that I had detailed almost every piece of paper on the water contract in this House a few years ago following some leaks that the leader might recall. I came into the House and dumped most of the documentation. Not all the documentation that I knew of or was aware of has already been tabled in this House.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It took the leaking of the documents to get that. The simple fact is that the Premier denied in this parliament that there had been any taxpayer-

funded polling. It was only when I was handed a copy of all the polling late one night that the government had to admit it existed.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I simply make the point that the leader has constantly said that he wanted that contract released. It has been released.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Does the Premier believe that he has committed to release all ETSA contracts relating to the consultants? Is that what he has agreed to do?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have just said—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes or no.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I do not want the leader to revisit what I have said or my ministerial statement to the House. I have given a ministerial statement: I have given a commitment, and cabinet has endorsed and signed off on a policy, and it will be honoured.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** But he is not saying whether he will release those contracts about the consultants, and I doubt very much, despite the statement of 15 May, that we will see all the consultancies and their reports and success fees being made public. That is why the Premier will not say yes. He wants to refer back to the fine print of his statement of 15 May. I just want to ask whether the Premier believes—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I intend to—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Does the Premier believe that the ETSA consultants did a good job in getting the best deal for the state and protecting industry and families against the market power of the newly privatised monopolies? Do you actually think that the \$115 million that you have spent on the consultants whom you hired to sell ETSA has ensured that they did a good job? Do you think they did a good job? Did they deserve their success fee, given the huge increase in power prices that the state now faces?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** What has been achieved (and I think very successfully for this state) is a retirement of debt from about \$10 billion in today's terms to \$3 billion, and there is a report where Access Economics indicates that our debt levels will be better than those of three other states of Australia within the next year or two. That is a repositioning of the finances in this state, and there is a gross saving of \$297 million interest. I simply ask the leader who would have paid it, had we not saved the \$297 million interest this year. Would we have been curtailed from putting additional money into education, health and police services? That is the simple choice and priority. I take the view that this government, on the basis of having significantly retired debt in South Australia, having repositioned the state financially, and now attracting new private sector investment into the state, is repositioning and marketing South Australia for its future.

Today, I had the privilege and opportunity to announce 1 000 new jobs in our automotive industry. That was not a reannouncement, as the leader suggested. We have put Supplier Park in place, and I have talked about that on a number of occasions. We have just completed negotiations with eight companies—two will relocate from Victoria; two will partially relocate from Victoria; and two from overseas will bring new functions to support Holdens in South Australia. One thousand direct jobs will be created and, according to the Centre for Economic Studies in South Australia, 5 000 indirect jobs will be created as a result. It is more important than the submarine project for the generation of new jobs and will underpin the automotive industry and enable it to retain its international competitiveness.

Air International, on Friday of this week or early next week, will sign a \$30 million contract, or thereabouts, to

build 20 000 square metres of new office and factory space at Edinburgh Park next door to Holdens: they would not do so unless they had confidence in the viability, the competitiveness and the future of this state. Automotive manufacturing firms are continuing what Email, Electrolux and BAE, from New South Wales, have done—consolidating in our state—and they would not do so without a competitive and appropriate investment environment. That is what we have created: we have created a change of circumstances and new investment. That is important for the leader's own seat because the northern suburbs will be the key beneficiaries of new investment, new jobs in our state and new opportunities. If the hard yards that we as a government have done to repair the finances of the state are going to be challenged by the leader, they ought to be challenged in the context of what is now being delivered for the state.

**Mr VENNING:** I was pleased with today's announcement about the 1 000 new jobs: it is a great positive for South Australia. My question concerns the national electricity market task force in South Australia and arises from budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24. What steps is the government taking regarding the national electricity market, in particular, the problem of obtaining supply of electricity at a reasonable price that will be experienced by 2 800 business customers in South Australia when they enter the contestable NEM on 1 July 2001?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I think this almost follows on from the leader's question. The national electricity market will impact on 2 800 businesses in this state to a varying degree. I am told that the average increase is of the order of approximately 30 per cent as it relates to those 2 800 businesses. I have asked for further advice and information on that point. There are approximately 70 000 businesses in this state.

Those that have been adversely impacted also have other balancing items. One is the very significant reduction in WorkCover premiums that was announced on 1 July last year and also 1 July this year. Last year there was a 7½ per cent reduction; this year, the reduction will be a further 14 per cent. The net benefit or saving for business in South Australia next financial year will be \$108 million saved in the area of WorkCover premiums alone. In addition, I understand that with the abolition of financial institutions duty on 1 July \$69 million will also be saved by those businesses. So, there are some balancing factors.

However, I acknowledge that there is an adverse impact on 2 800 of the 70 000 businesses and that is the reason why I, with Queensland, refused to recommit to 1 January 2003 for the next tranche of contestable customers. Unless this market matures and has a competitive base, we want to reconsider our position and I would not recommit, and I refused to recommit at the Premiers' Conference last week. As I said, Queensland also refused to commit to taking the next tranche to the contestable market.

In addition to that, at the Premiers' Conference we sought and obtained a review by NECA of the rebidding practices. I understand that that is a matter to be closely assessed. In addition to that, in relation to the operation of the national electricity market, a number of jurisdictions indicated it was not operating as it ought to. We are dealing with those issues. I have established the task force, which will report to me by the 30th of this month indicating some steps that can and should be made. We have worked for about 2¼ years and have successfully put in place private sector funding for an alternative competitive gas source from Melbourne to

Adelaide. I have spoken to Premier Bracks in relation to that and he has indicated to me that they will look at a ministerial direction in Victoria to fast-track this pipeline on their side of the border. On our side of the border this will have major project status which, hopefully, will provide the gas needed as the fuel source for additional generating capacity by about 2003. At the moment, we simply do not have a fuel source to meet any new major base load generating capacity that might come on stream.

In May I wrote to the chairman of the ACCC and asked for an investigation of the terms and conditions that apply to the market in South Australia. The ACCC is reviewing material pertaining to the current round of offers made by AGL. AGL announced that it will offer rebates of up to \$37.5 million. I have already taken up the matter with the Prime Minister. We secured it as an agenda item for COAG and there was, to my recollection, unanimous agreement around the table about the review of the market. I think that on 26 June the first ministerial council will be held for ministers responsible for energy and power in the respective states as part of this national market—and that will include Tasmania, because of the Basslink proposal that is being put in place—to review the operations of the market. Those are only some of the initiatives that we have asked for a review and assessment of. One other is for the National Electricity Code Administrator (NECA) to review the value of lost load (VOLL) and to give early attention to the rebidding rules that I referred to a moment ago.

**Mr VENNING:** I know that the Premier would be disappointed if I did not ask a question concerning drugs. My question relates to the illicit drug problem and arises from budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24. Illicit drugs in our community are a major concern, because they not only impact on drug users but also on their families, their friends and the broader community. What is the government doing to fight illicit drugs in our community?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We are taking a number of initiatives, and by and large to date this has been bipartisan. In fact, across Australia a number of jurisdictions are tackling the insidious drug trade in this country, and this requires cooperation, both bipartisan and across jurisdictions. We have drug action teams that will work in partnership with local government, health, correctional services and education. We also have programs where we have increased funding for drug assessment and treatment services and where we are intercepting drugs in prisons taking a tougher stance on management of dealers within our prisons.

Further, we have a drug court trial, which will take place over a two-year period, having commenced on 1 May 2000. This initiative aims to break the cycle of drug use in reoffending through a strictly supervised program of diverting people with drug related offences to rehabilitation and treatment services. As of 24 May this year, 235 people had been referred to the drug court; after assessment, 112 were accepted onto the program, and 49 remain active participants. We have a school education program: four officers have been appointed to work with schools on drug education and managing drug-related incidents. In 2000, over 50 schools trialled processes and materials.

We have contributed \$60 000 (I think is the amount) to the program involving Port Adelaide Football Club's AFL team. To their credit, all the AFL players are involved—I am told that nobody has opted out—and they go around to schools and encourage kids to have a healthy lifestyle. To have a football hero encourage kids to lead a good lifestyle and to

tell them that it is not smart to be into graffiti and drugs is a good way to go. That program was put to us by Russell Ebert, and to my knowledge it is going exceptionally well.

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As an aside, I commend the Port Adelaide Football Club for that. There is methadone maintenance, detoxification and counselling in prisons. We have a cabinet committee on illicit drugs, and that is supported by a chief executive coordinating group comprising the chief executives of human services, Premier and cabinet, justice, education, training and employment, and Aboriginal affairs. In other words, at the highest level of government there is cross portfolio cooperation and involvement. I want to thank the chamber for its bipartisan support. I also want to acknowledge the work done across the various portfolios, and thank the public servants who have driven the policy. We are in part making a difference, but I do not resile from the fact that we have a long way to go on the issue.

**Mr CONDOUS:** Having received the book on drugs signed by the Prime Minister which went to every household in Australia, I thought it was a good initiative to make parents aware that their children could be taking drugs and to look for the telltale signs and the changes in habits of their child in order to identify the possibility. I admired the Prime Minister for taking this step. Some three weeks later, I watched a *60 Minutes* program of which Ray Martin was the compere for the entire hour. I was impressed by this program because it involved real case scenarios of parents, whose children had become involved in drugs, relating their experiences. One thing that concerned me—and this was reiterated by every parent—was that it is fine to be told to look for the telltale signs. However, once parents discover their child is on drugs, what is available to them? The only thing available is support groups who will help parents detox the child. Doctors will then send the child for either one-on-one or group therapy to try to change the mental attitude of that child and ascertain the reasons why they have been indulging in drugs.

As this is a national problem that threatens our young people, could the matter not be brought up at the next Premiers' Conference and funds put aside for the support of young people who it is discovered are on drugs and who can be saved because they are not deeply embedded in the practice? This could be done on an Australia-wide basis. It is all right to send out a book, but it is no good if you cannot physically take your child somewhere to get the help and assistance needed.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member might recall what occurred in Western Australia, where a booklet was put out to every household giving parents the necessary information to try to identify symptoms and signs of drug taking so that they could take early corrective intervention measures. We have discussed a number of things at COAG as it relates to commonwealth funding. The state funding I have referred to in my previous answer sits alongside an additional allocation to South Australia of approximately \$13 million of commonwealth funding over four years through the program they call the national Tough on Drugs programs for schools and assessment, treatment and support programs. Part of the commonwealth moneys will include a police drug diversion initiative. The state is finalising negotiations with the commonwealth for the release of over \$9 million in funds over four years for this initiative. It will build on our current diversion options and reflect international best practice in enabling police to provide educational material, and arrange speedy access to assessment and treatment through a new and

varied range of services. For example, you bring in a different range of services to treat a different degree of drug taking within a community, so that we go beyond the narrow base that we might have at present and further expand that base with a range of different treatment services to guide people back.

The goal of the program is to provide people with early incentives to address their drug use, and it involves a graduated series of interventions that are appropriate to the seriousness of the individual's circumstances. What the member is asking for is in the process of being developed. It will be a range of different programs, and people will access those programs depending upon the extent to which they have been caught up in drug taking within the community.

Drugs, their extensive nature and growth, are just so insidious a problem in terms of trying to keep up with it and to keep a range of programs running to check it. As to the law enforcement aspect, part of our budget strategy was to put a number of police officers in a new drug-related team to attempt to tackle the problem from a number of perspectives. That is why about five or six portfolios are involved in drugs, as it involves not only education but also correctional services, the police, the health area and rehabilitation: it is right across the spectrum. The additional \$9 million of funds over four years will help us expand the range of programs. In part, what the honourable member has asked for can be addressed with those programs.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Briefly returning to the Premier's answer about increases in his own departmental staff levels and expenditure, it seems that the figures we have quoted do not 'relate to the reorganisation of DPC to include OMEA and CPE'. They only relate to the Premier's own department DPC, and the estimate for spending on DPC in 1997-98 was \$15.1 million; estimated actual outcome for the P&C for 2000-01 is \$33.1 million, so that reinforces my position in my opening statement.

I now turn to estimates committee, P&C, electricity, 'Output 1.3, Strategic Advice', which says 'improve South Australia's competitiveness and economic performance'—and to assist the Premier, budget paper 5, vol. 1, 1.7. South Australia now faces an electricity crisis, courtesy of the government's electricity privatisation and failure to prepare for the national electricity market, with businesses facing price rises averaging 30 per cent and, in some cases, as high as 100 per cent. From 1 January 2003, families in South Australia face a similar fate with an average \$220 million increase in cost. Two Fridays ago, the Premier played what I regarded as a bit of a charade with the local media. He said that he had asked for \$100 million to fix the problem and got nothing back from John Howard. He then said that he then played catch-up with the opposition—Victoria and New South Wales—in calling for a review of the national electricity market. However, I am pleased that he has supported some aspects of Labor's 15 point plan.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am pleased that the member for Schubert is supporting that—either that or he is suffering from biliousness. The Premier's press release of 8 June states that he is no longer committed to the start date for household contestability and may seek to defer household contestability beyond 1 January 2003. The Premier made that major announcement on 8 June. The Premier wants the 1 January 2003 crisis for households delayed. The government signed vesting contracts prior to the sale of electricity which capped the price at which power could be sold to certain classes of



customer. After the expiry of these vesting contracts, prices were to become deregulated.

Given that the Premier sold the assets to private companies on the basis that the price gap for families would come off on 1 January 2003, what advice has the Premier received from crown law, and God forbid from any consultants, about his legal ability to defer contestability? The Premier has made the announcement that he is seeking to defer households facing the same problems as businesses on 1 January 2003. It was a big announcement, and presumably a lot of work was done; it was not done on the run. What legal advice had the Premier received about his legal ability to defer contestability?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will respond to the question simply by saying that detailed questions on the electricity industry should more appropriately be directed to the minister responsible—

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, I said I will respond to the leader's question, but that this committee is examining the lines of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, not the lines of the Treasurer's portfolio. Having said that, I have just finished answering a question in which I indicated that at the COAG Premiers' conference meeting I was asked (as were other Premiers and chief ministers) to sign off on the original schedule for contestability and that we would recommit to the national competition principles, the national electricity market and those time lines. I indicated, as did Queensland, that I was not prepared to sign off on that. I noted in the past that Victoria, for example, shifted its contestable date for household consumers by a year.

We have a position, as I understand, that, along with New South Wales, Victoria will go contestable for its households on 1 January 2002. I indicated that we were not prepared to recommit to that date of 1 January 2003. What will occur in the next 18 months is that that issue will be revisited. Whether we are able to secure additional base load generating capacity and to secure additional peaking load plant capacity in South Australia to meet that need will depend on the steps that are taken. We will also want to see what happens in the market in New South Wales and Victoria for contestable households.

My understanding is that some increases are predicted in Victoria. In New South Wales, where the assets are still government owned, I know of two businesses that have had approximately a 50 per cent increase in their price of electricity as quoted to them in the course of the last month. In that instance, we are seeing what is happening in South Australia being repeated in New South Wales. I will seek some further detail in relation to the department. The figures I quoted were given to me by the advisers a moment ago, but I will seek some further clarification and respond because the restructuring has had an impact. I will check on the exact figures.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Repeating this, I think it is quite appropriate to ask the Premier questions about electricity. He is the one who has been making the statements and he was the lead legislator in setting up the national electricity market, which he said was an historic triumph. The Premier cannot back away from his involvement in the privatisation of the state's electricity assets.

On 7 June, the Premier told parliament that it was very important that he fly to London to talk to the international board of National Power, because he claimed that he was

asked by some unnamed person from National Power on a Saturday afternoon—

**Mr FOLEY:** At a wedding.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —at a wedding to give its expansion project some kind of endorsement and support. The Premier indicated that he was in a position to secure something good for the state by meeting with the board in London following the meeting with the fellow at the wedding. Given that National Power already announced in April of this year that it had received planning approval from his government for the expansion of its Pelican Point plant which indicated that work would begin very soon on the gas pipeline project from Victoria that will supply fuel for the extra turbine expected to be completed by 2004, and that the international board would sign off on the expansion at its November board meeting, my questions are as follows.

Exactly what did the Premier secure in his discussions with the international board of National Power in London? How did they progress the decisions that National Power has already made? What was the board's view of the current electricity crisis facing our state? Did the board have any views about the Premier's decision not to stick to the 1 January 2003 start date for domestic users to become contestable customers?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I canvassed a number of issues with the international board, and my understanding is that the international board has received a recommendation from the Australian board to commit to the 300 additional megawatts of power. However, I also understand that the international board is yet to make a final determination in relation to that, but it will be made later this year. What I wanted to do was stress the importance of the additional 300 megawatts of base load power. I wanted to indicate the discussions I had with Premier Bracks in relation to securing the gas pipeline, which was an area of concern to them.

No board is going to commit finally to a major capital project unless the fuel source is secured and guaranteed to meet the time lines in which the construction timetable will be met; that is, they have to line up. I indicated that the government would endeavour to assist and facilitate their further expansion investment, for which they have planning approval. As I understand it, that has been in place since the start of this project. Thankfully, we proceeded with Pelican Point, despite some degree of opposition.

**Mr FOLEY:** On time and on budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Not with all those Pelican Point cardboard cut-outs that followed me around for a while. I am sure the member for Hart was aware that they were well painted. Despite that opposition, we have that power plant in place. I canvassed a range of other issues with the board, as I have with a range of senior business people, which are confidential discussions. A range of options was put and the state of the market in Australia was discussed. The impact of Victoria and their return on assets in that state has been a focus for international boards. From my point of view, it was a valuable discussion.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Following the Premier's discussions, does the international board accept his decision not to stick to the 1 January 2003 start date for domestic users to become contestable customers? Has the Premier had any discussions with any of the other private owners of what was previously ETSA about the deferral of the date for full contestability, and what was their response?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In discussions I have had from time to time I have flagged a range of options that would be available to the government: not indicating specifically whether the government was going to implement but that there was a range of options available to us. National Power knows that, as it is a member of the task force. It is involved in the discussions of the task force which hopefully, on 30 June, will present a series of recommendations. I have indicated to the leader that I will be happy, after I get the report and am able to give it some consideration, for that report to be made public.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** By way of a supplementary question, is the Premier confident and has he had legal advice—something that I asked before, which is why I want to make it a supplementary—that the government will not open itself up to legal challenge by the generators about the new start date, and what legal advice has the Premier received about the delay from 1 January 2003?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As has been speculated in the media, a range of options has been put to the task force. Some have not been proceeded with by the task force but have also been debated in the public arena. I have asked for advice on a range of different options. More specifically, that advice goes in the first instance to the Treasurer, logically and responsibly, as the minister responsible. But I have asked for some further advice on a range of matters.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I note from budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24 that an amount of roughly \$3.7 million has been allocated to the task of communications strategy. Will the Premier outline some of the major achievements of the Strategic Communications Unit over the past 12 months?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The unit is responsible for facilitating whole of government marketing, promotion, providing marketing advice, monitoring promotional expenditure across the public sector and identifying areas of savings. It does that by ensuring that information on the government's direction, services, products and initiatives is presented clearly and precisely. There are a number of initiatives under 'Highlights from 2000-01', including *Directions for SA*. The Strategic Communications Unit has taken the government's strategic planning publication *Directions for SA* and revised it for broader public consumption.

The web site has also been updated, and both media now carry case studies or profiles of people from the public and private sectors who typify the progress that the state is making. The unit created the Save the Murray brand as a key vehicle for harnessing community involvement on the issue, to help educate South Australians and to help raise awareness of the Save the Murray campaign through, for example, our football teams playing in AFL matches, our 36ers and our netball teams—and they are doing all this gratis. The purpose of that is to take to the eastern seaboard the fact that this is more than just a matter of our government arguing with a government on the eastern seaboard; that this is sporting people profiling Save the Murray, which has resulted in additional pressure being brought to bear.

In relation to the Master Media Agreement, the unit administers the whole of government buying and placement of campaign and non-campaign advertising through the Master Media contract, and there have been savings put in place in billing. Members would have seen in the papers, I think on Mondays, that tenders for the government, instead of being fragmented with individual agencies all over the

place, are now consolidated, which also brings about some savings through the Master Media contract.

We have the SA Central web site. On a couple of airlines we have done some in-flight advertising on industry by third party endorsement from business people who have invested in the state, where we have that in-flight video that talks about investing in our state. The Life Journey Expo, which the Department of Human Services put in place, is a major community health initiative. We have the weapons legislation, the nurses advertising campaign (to recruit nurses) and the smoke-free homes and cars campaign, in which the Department of Human Services, once again, campaigned to protect children from the effects of passive smoking.

The 'Secrets' intrastate campaign was designed to boost dollars spent within South Australia. We have the drug strategy campaign, working with police and health authorities to convey major drug strategies to the community. Our Watercare campaign looks at the management of water, so that we are an example to the other states of conserving water. There is a range of other initiatives, but that is a snapshot of a number that the unit undertakes.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** We have made a fairly substantial investment in the Adelaide-Darwin railway. Will the Premier give an overview of the medium to long-term benefits he sees coming to South Australia financially as a consequence of that investment?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Briefly, to encapsulate the benefit of this railway line of 1 410 kilometres, my understanding is that construction has started. Two camps have been established at Tennant Creek and Katherine and the contracts have been let. In my opening statement I referred to \$150 million worth of contracts being let to South Australia so far. We expect about \$640 million worth of contracts coming to our state. I do not have the exact number, but of the order of 1 000 businesses in South Australia have registered with Partners in Rail. A small team is working through the Industrial Supplies Office with Partners in Rail and going out to companies to say that if they are not big enough to meet this contract if they team with another company perhaps they are, and asking them whether they have within their workplace appropriate practices and equipment to meet the competitive tendering process. Some success has been achieved with that.

Partners in Rail has secured the services of Tim Fischer to undertake the international profiling of the project from a trade perspective, to make sure that overseas companies start factoring an alternative transport option into their forward shipping plans. There is no good in having the line built and then asking them to use the line when they sometimes plan three or five years in advance. So, the task is to try to raise the profile and factor in the rail line and therefore their use of the rail line before it is completed. An Economic Research Consultants Pty Ltd report updated in the past 12 months gives the following estimates:

- an increase in the present value of the underlining level of GSP in the state over the 50 year period of between \$502.5 billion, or \$10 million per annum, and \$50 million per annum in discounted value;
- creation of between 1 000 and 3 000 jobs annually within the state;
- an increase in return to the state government through taxes estimated conservatively as having a present value of the order of \$30 million to \$170 million.

So, a good part of the funds we have invested in this railway line has the potential to be returned to the state in taxes and

charges. This project is particularly important. It is now only followed by an airport terminal. It seems that the airport terminal will take about as long as it has taken for the railway line to be secured, but I am assured that some progress is being made.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** In reference to ministerial codes of conduct and maintenance of standards, I note that in December 1993 the government was elected with a code of conduct for ministers in place, requiring the highest standards. Will you explain to the committee how you ensure that these standards are adhered to?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The code requires the ministers to provide statements of their personal interests to the Premier. The disclosures are recorded in a register which is held at the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and which is available for scrutiny by the Auditor-General. I have recently written to all ministers requiring them to ensure that their statements of interest are kept current—if there are any changes in circumstances at any point, those changes need to be made—and that there would be no conflicts of interest in relation to their public duties. I have also informed the parliament that the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet will advise me on any occasion when there is a potential for a conflict of interest. The register is monitored and the Chief Executive reports from time to time.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Your electricity task force report released just prior to the COAG meeting stated that there should be a review into whether the national market was sufficiently liquid to support a doubling of the VOLL price to \$10 000 in April next year or whether it should be delayed a year. This seemed rather a weak position, although it is perhaps the most that could be expected from a task force dominated by the power companies. The Premier would be aware that there is great concern about the gaining of the market under the current VOLL price of \$5 000 per megawatt hour. I am pleased that the Premier has responded when I have talked about this situation where generators can withdraw power on the hottest days, force up the price of power massively across the country and suddenly discover that they have power available to re-enter the market at the highest price and cream off massive profits.

I understand that you as Premier supported an increase in the VOLL price from \$5 000 to \$10 000 per megawatt hour. My view is simply that there need to be massive punitive penalties to make it impossible for generators to rip off South Australian consumers. They are fiddling the books and fiddling their supply. What they have been up to is close to being criminal, and I think that we need to see massive penalties to make it simply not in their financial interests in order to gain the market. So, we would like to see national legislation in place before this summer that makes it not worth while—not just against the rules. The generators will come back and say, 'It is against the rules at the moment,' but they are up to their ears in it, and if there are no penalties they will flout the rules. So, we must impose massive punitive penalties—if necessary, multi-million dollar penalties—against generators that fix prices in an unscrupulous and unethical way. You supported an increase in the VOLL price. What would it take for you to support a deferral? Were any undertakings given the new private owners of any part of the old ETSA-Optima about the future VOLL price prior to privatisation?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I indicated at the Premiers' Conference that I did not agree with an increase in the VOLL, based on recent experience and that we would ask the code

administrator (NECA) to review that. I understand that that brings in the ACCC to sign off; any change must have ACCC involvement as well as the other jurisdiction. Because it is a national market it is not simply a matter of my saying that South Australia has this position: as the leader indicated in his comments, it must be national legislation. That is the point: it must be something that other jurisdictions will agree to. I indicated that I doubted whether the increase was appropriate at this time, given the performance of the market over the course of the past six months. I think it is fair to say that that did not receive wholehearted support from some of the other officials at the meeting. However, I know that NECA is looking at the rebidding process, which is separate from the VOLL. The leader had two components to his question: one is the rebidding process and the other is the VOLL. The VOLL is being reviewed, with substantial reluctance from some of the jurisdictions, at least at the official level. However, the review has been agreed to, and I am appreciative of that fact.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** You supported lifting it to \$10 000 before, but you now oppose it.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have indicated what I said on that at the Premiers' Conference. Any change in that needs the support of the other jurisdictions. It is not a matter of South Australia saying we can stand alone, because you cannot stand alone in the national market. The other jurisdictions must agree, and you must get the ACCC and the regulators (NECA and NEMMCO)—where their respective responsibilities cut in—to sign off on it. As it relates to rebidding, this is a matter that, prior to the Premiers' Conference, I had discussed with NECCA. It had been brought to my attention that there were perhaps untoward practices that ought to be looked at. My understanding is that the national code administrator is doing a review of the rebidding practices of this last summer period. I am not sure when he will report, but I would expect that that report would be available within the next two months or thereabouts. That will give us an opportunity, prior to the next summer period, among the jurisdictions to look at that particular practice and change to the practice and any legislation which would be complementary or national legislation as a template that would be used by the other jurisdictions to overcome any untoward practices—if they are proved to be taking place.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** By way of a supplementary question, one of the other parts of the question I asked was whether any undertakings were given to the new private owners of ETSA or Optima about the future VOLL price prior to privatisation. Do you unequivocally guarantee that no undertakings were given by your government about future changes in the level of VOLL; that either before or after the sale process no deals or undertakings were given to support an increase in the VOLL price above the \$5 000 per megawatt hour?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Not that I am today aware of, but I will refer it to the Treasurer to make sure that there has not been in some other forum. I am not aware, but I will follow up the question and get an answer for the leader.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In the light of the power bill increases faced by the government of just under \$6 million a year for the next five years, and your announcement that hospitals and schools will be quarantined for much of the increase, can the Premier point to the budget line where the increased power costs are provisioned in this budget? Can he explain how schools and hospitals will be quarantined? The *Advertiser* report stated that they would be quarantined for

much of the increase. From how much? What about P21 schools? Will the so-called quarantine operate over the whole five years?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That question is more appropriately addressed to the Treasurer because my understanding is that there is a contingency line to which the Treasurer has access. It is his portfolio responsibility.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** How much of the 1 per cent efficiency measure or non-salary costs to be retained by portfolios to deal with 'emerging cost pressures' will be absorbed by the government's increased power bill costs following privatisation?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** How much of the what?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The 1 per cent efficiency measure. It refers to the '1 per cent efficiency measure for non-salary costs to be retained by portfolios to deal with "emerging cost pressures".' How much of that is related to increased power bills?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is not intended any of it.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I would be interested in the Premier's comment on renewable and alternative energy strategies in the light of earlier questions; in particular, what steps the government is taking to promote energy efficiency and encourage the development of renewable energy industries in South Australia, given that businesses are entering new contracts from 1 July this year?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In relation to the renewable and alternative energy strategy, in particular as it relates to the \$700 for the installation of solar hot water systems, I am told by the minister that the response to that has been quite significant. I am not surprised by it, but I certainly welcome that initiative which we profiled as part of the budget strategy. Supporting the solar hot water industry and its development through that rebate of \$700, hopefully, will help households save money, reduce greenhouse emissions and, therefore, make a contribution to the Kyoto agreement, which seems to be not so much an agreement internationally these days any more.

There are a number of other initiatives. We need to do more, and we recognise that we need to do more, on energy reduction and promotion of alternative energy. We are reducing energy consumption by raising awareness, increasing the use of alternative and renewable energy resources and raising the position of energy efficiency—and it is certainly on the policy agenda. In 1998, we agreed to the national greenhouse strategy—a framework for advancing Australia's greenhouse response. Under the national greenhouse strategy all Australian governments undertook to explore ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As the public sector in the state is a major energy consumer, expending over \$100 million annually on electricity, gas and petroleum, the government is therefore keen to reduce its costs by being more efficient. The Department of Primary Industries and Resources, through the Office of Energy, is developing an energy management policy for government agencies to ensure that reductions in energy use are ongoing; the Department for Environment and Heritage is monitoring output greenhouse gases and reporting nationally on our achievements; the Department of Industry and Trade is assisting generators in finding opportunities for wind powered generation production; and the Department of Transport is developing a proposal that will see reductions in energy use in the transport sector.

The government's energy use annual report 1999-2000 shows that energy demand across all public sector operations

is reducing. At present, renewable energy provides less than 1 per cent of total electricity capacity. We have (and it has been announced previously) supported projects such as the solar electricity facility at Wilpena. That was an expensive project, but it is now in itself a tourism feature as well the Wilpena Pound. It is the largest solar panel of its kind, I think, in the Southern Hemisphere. People who have a close interest in renewable energy and using solar panels, for example, are coming to look at that operation. While it was the more expensive option, I think it will turn out eventually to be a less expensive option, and it positions our state as doing something ahead of the pack on renewable energy.

We have been active in promoting the state as a future centre for wind powered generation. I know that locations on Eyre Peninsula and in the South-East are being looked at by proponents, as it relates to wind powered generation. They are very substantial capital investments. We are working cooperatively with them to facilitate, hopefully, decisions that wind power might have a place in the South Australian market.

**Mr CONDOUS:** I wonder if the Premier could outline the state government's efforts to rejuvenate the city of Adelaide as a capital city, because everyone on both sides of politics would agree that if the CBD is not working the state is not working.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I agree with that, too. The CBD is the showcase of what the state is. It demonstrates to the broader community.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is a measure of self-esteem.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is and, psychologically, it is important for our state. A few years ago it was dysfunctional. I thought there was a lack of ability between the city council and the government to work together, and it was a difficult set of circumstances. We put in place what was the Capital City Committee; and it is interesting to note that Queensland has done likewise and Melbourne is considering, as I understand it, putting in place a similar model. That committee is where I and two ministers, the Lord Mayor and two councillors meet on a regular basis to work our way through issues. For example, funds were allocated in the budget for the redevelopment of North Terrace—that great boulevard of our state. We have talked about advancing it for 20 or 30 years. The city council allocated 50 per cent and we allocated 50 per cent of the funds. Transport and planning people and city council officials have been working through what could be called the previous ring fence problems retained within their respective areas to break out and to create the opportunity to move forward.

The state has put substantial investment into the CBD, for example, the Convention Centre, the promenade, the work that has been done at the Festival Centre and that is about to be done at the library, the art gallery, the museum, the National Wine Centre and the boulevard itself. If you look at the private sector development that has taken place, it was only seven years ago—and it might not even be that long ago—that the old News buildings over the road on North Terrace were burnt out shells and just sitting there. We had the EDS building put in place, which is now fully let.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** At least we got rid of the burnt-out buildings. There are the Radisson Playford Hotel, the new apartment block and another hotel (which now fills in the other gap), and David Jones further down on North Terrace.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The EDS building is now fully let and there was concern that it might not be fully let. I do not know accurately what the position is today, but it was not so many weeks ago that we had less vacant A grade CBD space than Brisbane and other capital cities of Australia. We went through a period of having plenty of it with signs up everywhere but that has now changed. Westpac and other major corporates, because of the changed investment climate, are selling off and leasing back their properties. They would not have had that option here but it was an option that they previously had in Melbourne and Sydney.

Look at the apartment blocks that have been put in place. I can remember when we had to look at some of the contracts in place for the east end of Adelaide because they were stalling further development. With appropriate negotiation between the government and some developers, we have a proposal that allows that sort of development to take place.

Look at the difference that has occurred in the apartments that have been built in the CBD. The other day I launched the start of the old Repco building—as I used to know it and from where I bought parts—on Waymouth Street to be turned into a hotel/apartment block—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Apartments.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, apartments. The south end is now picking up this development. So, the CBD has gone from boarded up to opened up. I think the spirit of South Australia has been demonstrated differently. The University of South Australia campus started the redevelopment down there and that has now been in-filled. The skate park with the kids' involvement brings life, activity and vibrancy. The way that North Terrace has the lights through it has given it a sense of vibrancy and purpose that it would otherwise not have. The Capital City Committee has enabled us to work through a number of issues where the government and the council have had different positions. We have been able to work our way through these issues and, in some instances, have compromised to get an outcome so that we can move forward and I think we have all been the beneficiaries.

Property values have increased. Cable and Wireless has established a major new call centre development and BHP is employing 508 people. The ground floor area of the State Bank building on Grenfell Street has been totally refurbished and opened up. That comes from business attraction and investment, assistance with capital works programs, working with the Adelaide City Council and bringing about the change. These changes do not occur overnight; you have to work at them piece by piece. Each part is a jigsaw that has brought about change—and a very significant change. In the course of the last five years or so, we have seen emerge a significant transformation in our CBD. The significance of our having inner city living coming back on the agenda is that that will underpin the further vibrancy of the city, with people simply being and working within the city.

We deliberately approached a number of companies to see whether they would locate in the city not only to take up spare office space, as it was then, but also to have people in the city—in the delis, down the street, round about—to give this new sense of vibrancy of the CBD. I argue that each one of those components has worked well to rebuild the vibrancy of the city as we once knew it.

**Mr CONDOUS:** I think that one of the failings of all governments over the years has been the lack of trying to bring commercial uses, office uses, into the city and the tendency to take that out into the suburbs. The prime example is one of your initiatives, the Westpac call centre. I feel that

those 1 400 people located in the city would have generated a lot more retailing for the city. In recent times, public service offices have been located in the suburbs rather than remaining in the CBD, as they were 20 years ago. One coming up is the Investigator Science Museum, which I think is very important and one that the government should try to locate in the city not only because of the importance of the role that it will play but because it will attract a lot of interstate and international visitors to that centre. Has the government made a decision at this stage regarding the location of that utility?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No; there are three options. One is the digital precinct in the West Torrens Council area; another is for the Adelaide Franklin Street bus depot to consolidate on site and get a new bus terminal (which is long overdue in the city and is a project that needs some forward planning); and the third is related to redevelopment at the showgrounds with some consolidation of buildings there. We allocated about \$500 000 for a feasibility study several budgets ago and we are working through the three sites. In our capital works program, we intend to build a new Investigator Science Technology Centre, and it has been recommended for this private partnership infrastructure proposal. It will be a key one of those proposals that will be worked through. A unity treasury has been established. It is what we have seen other governments put in place and it is also based on the UK model, where public/private infrastructure is put in place. It has to pass Auditor-General's rules and probity and financial issues and face a number of significant tests but we are working through those. The three sites have been under active consideration by the government.

*[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Will the Premier provide a list of the names, titles and classifications of all employees within the Department of Premier and Cabinet, specifying in each individual case whether the employees are a permanent public servant or a contract employee and, in the case of contract employees, the term of the contract and when the contract is due to expire?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Prior to answering that question, as I indicated previously, I will give further classification of figures for the leader. The 1996-97 budget had a figure of \$15 million, to which the leader referred, but the year ahead, 2001-02, according to the budget papers, has a figure of \$24.6 million. The increase includes the following items: the Centre for Lifelong Learning, \$1.3 million; the Capital City Committee, to which I referred, \$700 000; the national depression initiative, \$300 000; the gene technology policy area, \$450 000; the Centenary of Federation (a one-off), \$3.4 million; the Bring Them Home proposal, \$500 000; and Olympic football—which was the staging of the football, as distinct from construction of the stadium—\$2.8 million. Those items total \$10 million. Some of those were one-off events and figures.

In relation to work force statistics, the department work force estimate as per the Portfolio Statements is 291 full-time equivalents at 30 June. We estimate this financial year at 30 June that the result will be 280 full-time equivalents. The budget estimate for full-time equivalents at 30 June 2003 is 305. The variant between the budgeted and estimated result of 11 FTEs is mostly due to a reduction of 9 FTEs from the central unattached area of the Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment, a reduction of 6 FTEs in the Division of

Multicultural Affairs, and an increase of 7 FTEs in the cabinet office.

The variant between the 2000-01 estimated result and the 2001-02 budget is due to an increase in the corporate and organisational development area, which is the financial management accounting section. It has been decided that from 1 July this function will be performed in-house: it was previously outsourced to the Department of Treasury and Finance. Therefore, the Department of Premier and Cabinet will do it itself and staff will come from the Department of Treasury and Finance to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The restructuring of the department that I mentioned previously brought in additional numbers, as I referred to in my previous answer. In relation to the details of the individuals—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is important that we know whether they are on contract and the terms of those contracts. I will repeat the question: will you provide a list of the names, titles and classifications of all employees within the Department of Premier and Cabinet, specifying in each individual case whether the employees are permanent public servants or contract employees and, in the case of contract employees, the terms of their contracts and when their contracts are due to expire?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Jan Andrews is on an executive C classification level with a salary and allowance of \$150 570, a TEC of \$169 112, and that is a permanent position. Richard Angove is on an executive B classification level at \$134 313, with a total TEC of \$160 117, and that is a contract position. I will advise the leader of the date of expiry of that contract. Margaret Elizabeth Barnett is on an executive A classification level of \$73 025, with a total TEC of \$95 423, and that is a tenured contract position. I will obtain the expiry date for the leader. David Blackstock is on an executive B level at \$106 114—that is the salary and allowance—with a total TEC of \$125 715, and he is a tenured employee. Graham Boxhall is on an executive A level at \$87 185, with a total TEC of \$115 445, and he is tenured. Elbert Brooks is on an executive B level at \$121 635, including salary and allowance, with a TEC of \$135 000; he is also tenured. Heather Butow is on an executive C level at \$151 055, with a TEC of \$182 582, and that is an untenured contract. I will get the expiry date of that contract for the leader. In fact, where there is an expiry date, I will have to get that off the contract and supply it. The list continues: Susan Carman, executive B, \$102 038, TEC \$126 952, tenured; Paul Case, executive E, \$170 545, TEC \$212 226, tenured—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A lot do. The list goes on: Margaret Caust, executive A, \$92 111, TEC \$100 523, tenured; Tony Crichton, executive B, \$91 989, TEC \$114 495, tenured—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** He is on the unattached redeployee list.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The figure is \$114 495.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In the comfort zone, or in the transit lounge. No-one knows what he does, but he is on the unattached list for that sort of money.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As the leader knows, the Public Sector Management Act has stringent requirements of any government of the day for permanent tenure, and the government has indicated to the Public Service Association that we are maintaining tenure as it relates to employment in

the public sector, and I would dare say that the leader would have a very similar policy if I am not misled. The list continues: Joy de Leo, executive A, \$98 172, TEC \$106 026, and she is now in the position of heading up the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs (OMIA); Darryl Dymock, executive B, \$116 495, TEC \$138 500, untenured, and he is in the Centre for Life-Long Learning; Rosemary Ince, executive B, \$104 336, TEC \$126 952, tenured; Dean Lambert, executive B, \$104 623, TEC of \$128 594, tenured. He is project managing a range of different projects, one of which he has oversight on being the SAMAG project; he is involved in that. Further, we have Susan MacIntosh, executive C, \$129 042, TEC \$160 803, tenured; and Michael Madigan, executive E, \$148 727, TEC \$191 190. He is designated for special projects, on the unattached—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Does that involve Simon Cope's special projects such as setting up fake websites at public expense and filming shadow ministers and ministers getting out of cars and other bizarre duties, called 'black ops' in the old days?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** They tell me that latter comment is just inaccurate—that he was not.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** You were supposed to have reprimanded him, but obviously—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will get back to the leader's question and impart the information he really wants. The list continues: Pamela Martin, executive C, \$160 566, TEC \$173 400, is tenured, and looks after the commercial operations and a number of key projects, and I will advise the contract expiry date; Joslene Mazel, executive A, \$80 076, TEC \$100 000, tenured; Warren McCann, executive F, \$196 582, TEC \$275 400, and that contract expires in October 2005; Trudi McDonald—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have grown used to and accustomed to it—executive A, \$71 033, TEC \$95 423, tenured; Anthony Nelson, executive A, \$80 084, TEC \$108 332, tenured; Heather Parkes, executive A, \$95 153, TEC \$116 453, not tenured, and contract expires October 2003; Denis Ralph, executive F, \$193 331, TEC \$246 565, Director of the Centre for Life-Long Learning; Gary Salter, executive A, \$79 825, TEC \$105 500, tenured; Simon Temple-Heald, executive A, \$81 388, TEC \$100 423, tenured; Terry Tysoe, executive B, \$106 370, TEC \$139 463, tenured; Graeme Vinall, executive B, \$95 425, TEC of \$126 952 tenured; Rod Williams, executive A, \$86 261, TEC \$93 162, untenured, and I will advise the expiry date; Elizabeth Wilson, \$105 235, TEC \$126 953, tenured, and she is a senior officer in the cabinet office; Bruce Guerin, ELG, \$124 148, TEC \$162 423; Maurice Derohan, TEC \$223 955, Agent-General, and his contract expires in the first six months of next year; Graham Broughton, EL1, TEC \$75 910, tenured; Ronald Layton, \$75 910, tenured; Jan Lowe, EL1, \$75 910, tenured; Euan Miller, EL2, \$84 831, tenured; Lange Powell, \$75 910, tenured; and Dorothy Stimson \$84 831, tenured. I will advise the expiry dates.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Going back to those original figures, at page 4.14 it has 'Premier and Cabinet coordination advice, \$33.1', but we keep going around that issue. What was the cause of the \$5 million blow-out in the Premier's department for this year? What is the cause of the rise in the number of FTEs from 280 this year to 305 next year? We have basically seen an almost tripling of the number of people

on \$100 000 or more over the past four years and a virtual doubling in the cost of running the department in the last three or four years, but a \$5 million blow-out has been identified in the budget papers.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In relation to FTEs, the budgeted total number was 291. We have an estimated result of 280, so we are 11 under establishment cost and allocation for the department compared with previous years. There is an estimate for next year of 305. I have already advised the committee where that variance will be between 2000-01, estimated 280, and the result 2001-02 (for 30 June 2002) at 305. In relation to the figure of \$10 million about which I gave some details to the leader just a moment ago, several one-off amounts have been included this year and that is why the budget for next year is \$24.6 million coming off the figure that the leader used of \$33 million.

There are programs such as the Centenary of Federation. That is a one-year program and has a one-off cost of \$3.4 million. The graduate program is also a part of that. There is an offset by a carryover of funding of \$3 million included in 2001-02 for the Leadership SA and the graduate programs. There was a delay in the take-up of the 600 graduates. We will complete the full graduate program by 30 June this year. The graduate program ran behind schedule during calendar year last and I asked that it be accelerated, which it has been, and the full 600 graduates will be coming into the public sector. So, funding is allocated for that, which is the one-off figure. So you have the Centenary of Federation, \$3.4 million, the Leadership SA and the graduate programs with some carryover, and the Olympic football—the operational side of Olympic football (the matches)—was \$2.8 million. A profit of \$800 000 was made from the Olympic football ticket sales—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I thought we were told the whole thing was profitable.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, a profit of \$800 000 was made from the operation of the Olympic series.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Was the \$2.8 million to which the Premier referred for all the matches we hosted?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, it was; it was expenditure for the matches that were hosted here.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In terms of page 1.24, line 1.4, 'Government communications strategy', \$3.7 million has been budgeted for the government communications strategy this year. Sometimes that name has been a euphemism for 'taxpayer funded political advertising'. Given that last year's portfolio statement said this expenditure would be \$4.5 million and in 2000-01 actual expenditure was \$3.7 million, will the Premier provide an assurance that only \$3.7 million will be spent on the government communications strategy in this 2001-02 election year, and that no moneys from last year will be carried forward for use in 2001-02 for political purposes at taxpayers' expense? We all know that when we see a politician on a taxpayer funded ad, it is just a cheap way of doing the party ads.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am advised that there are no funds to be carried forward. Therefore, in response to the leader's question, the allocation will be the total allocation.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** By way of supplementary follow up, I assume that the government communications strategy involves substantial market testing of issues the public needs to know more about. Before the government goes a certain way, that is, makes a decision to engage in this or that campaign, presumably it tests the ideas and details, asks questions of focus groups and so on. There are consultancies,

briefs, reports and surveys, as we understand. The Premier assures us that the expenditure is justified and in the public interest and that it is not for the political advantage of the government. The Premier also claims now to be more open on government expenditure as of 10 May this year. Given these claims, will the Premier agree to release all documents, including questions asked of focus groups, consultancy briefs and reports, terms of reference, surveys and all other documents relating to campaigns and activities undertaken by the Government Communications Unit?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am not personally aware of any focus groups. There may well have been some. I will make inquiries. In relation to the questions in a questionnaire, I know that some agencies, for example Human Services, test service provision issues, but I understand that it is not of a party-political nature. In relation to the communications area in my portfolio responsibility, I will happily take that up, but I am not aware of any and I am advised that the officers at the table are not aware of any, but I will check.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Channel 9 has two programs basically subsidised by the taxpayer—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Which ones?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Channel 9 has *Directions* and a travel program. The taxpayer funds a Channel 7 travel program and there is also now apparently a Channel 10 program called *Savvy TV*. What we would like to know is what is the expenditure on each of those programs and also what the survey responses have been. Presumably, if a government puts dollars into subsidising television programs, it wants to know whether it is getting bang for buck, value for money for the taxpayer, rather than hoping to buy off editorial support from the individual channels. It is interesting that Channels 7 and 9 have programs and now Channel 10 has one—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have not noticed a lot of editorial support.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Obviously, we would be concerned about any strings attached. The Attorney-General has said that the government will legislate against cash for comment and we wonder whether that legislation will apply to the government as well as to individuals, given that we keep being told that these programs are under the editorial control of the programs themselves, although the DIT's Communication Manager, Eric Wisgard, is credited in Channel 9's *Directions* program as a producer but not identified as being a government employee; but you do not find any of those programs criticising the government. Presumably, this is on the basis that it is just total promotion; it is advertorial.

What is the cost of the subsidies to each of those programs and will the Premier give an undertaking to release the program brief? Presumably, there is a program brief and surveys are conducted to analyse its impact and whether it is achieving the government's objectives. I believe that it is in the public interest that the Premier should release that information.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As I said, I am not aware of any focus groups, but if there have been, I will get some detail for the leader. There is a building ideas program, for example, with the Master Builders Association, Building on the Building Industry in the State, a proposal put forward by the Master Builders Association several years ago. *Directions* has been running for a number of years. That arrangement has been put in place by Industry and Trade with Channel 9. The tourism department negotiated those, but I will attempt to get

the details and/or come back directly or refer it to the appropriate minister to come back on the specific programs to which the leader referred.

**Mr VENNING:** Referring to budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24, what are the objectives of the South Australian government's Save the Murray community awareness campaign?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That has a number of objectives, the first being to highlight the vital nature of the River Murray as a resource and not to waste water, which of course brings benefits for people: if you do not waste water, you do not pay for something that you are wasting; and, secondly, to reduce impact in other areas of the environment. The health of the Murray is a serious issue because the quality of the River Murray is in decline due to, amongst other factors, rising salinity and mismanagement over a long time.

The issue of the health of the Murray is of such significance economically, environmentally and to the social future of the state that we are committed to an educational program to promote the Save the Murray message. That campaign will assist in rallying people, hopefully, but also is part of an education program to conserve water. The objectives are:

- to raise awareness of the need to save the River Murray and the need for South Australia to lead the way in doing so;
- to educate people on the ways in which they can actively help to save the Murray by saving water; and
- to involve people in and generate commitment to the Save the Murray cause.

And we put in place a number of initiatives to achieve that. I noted earlier that the two AFL teams have on their banner at all matches Save the Murray, so we badge it. In addition, the 36ers have it on their singlet or shorts, and netball carries the message on uniforms. We want to demonstrate clearly to other governments that this is more than just a government-to-government issue: this is a community issue. This is about people interacting with it. As well as taking the message, it is also an education program to save water and its usage.

**Mr VENNING:** I refer to budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24. What is the South Australian government's response to the Maralinga clean-up funded by the commonwealth and British governments, and how has the government supported the Maralinga Tjarutja people in determining the future use of the land?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** This is a particularly important issue. We gave section 400 of the Maralinga lands, about 3 107 square kilometres, to the commonwealth in trust for defence purposes in the 1950s. The commonwealth then allowed the British to use the area for atomic tests. In mid-1996 the commonwealth began a major rehabilitation program, which was finalised in late 2000. The commonwealth independent regulator, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, has confirmed that the rehabilitation met the standards agreed to by the commonwealth, South Australia and Maralinga Tjarutja at the start of the project.

On 1 March 2000 the chief executive officer of the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, Dr John Loy, wrote to the federal Minister for Industry, Science and Resources indicating that the clean-up had been satisfactorily completed at the three main test sites. In a media release issued on 17 April, Dr Loy confirmed that representatives of his department had carefully measured the main areas of the range and that the clean-up criteria laid down in the original plan had been met.

In early May 2000 the South Australian government and Maralinga Tjarutja visited Maralinga with representatives from the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency and the commonwealth, and conducted a field inspection of the rehabilitated sites to familiarise themselves with the nature of the works carried out during the clean-up operation; to assess and consider matters that should be addressed in the Maralinga Land and Environment Management Plan; and to provide a preliminary assessment of areas that may require monitoring or more detailed inspection. A report of the trip is currently being prepared.

Monitoring visits involving key stakeholders will continue. The Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency is the expert independent body with the resources and equipment to advise parties about relevant radiological issues, and will continue to do so. The rehabilitation project undertaken by the commonwealth comprised two tasks, the first being the removal of surface soil from the more contaminated areas. Over 350 000 cubic metres (just over two square kilometres) of contaminated soil and debris was removed from the surface and buried in 10 to 15-metre trenches under a capping of clean soil of at least five metres in depth.

The second task was the treatment of the contaminated debris. Eleven pits were treated by *in situ* vitrification, a process that involves passing an electric current through electrodes in the ground to melt debris and incorporate the material into a vitrified monolith or glass ceramic block. During treatment of the eleventh pit in March 1999 a sub-surface explosion occurred and, after an extensive investigation failed to conclusively identify a cause for the incident, the remaining debris pits were treated by exhumation and reburial of contaminated soil and debris.

Final reports on the outcome of the project are currently being prepared by the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency and by the Maralinga Technical Advisory Committee. The reports have been provided to the government and Maralinga Tjarutja for their comment and are expected to be completed in draft form in the next few months. The final Maralinga Technical Advisory Committee report will be given to the federal minister, Senator Minchin.

There has been consultation between the commonwealth, the South Australian government and Maralinga Tjarutja from the mid 1980s, when the royal commission on the former test site handed down its findings, and throughout the course of the clean-up. In 1993 a Maralinga consultative committee made up of representatives from the commonwealth, South Australia, Maralinga Tjarutja, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, the Maralinga Technical Advisory Committee and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission was established to conduct and monitor matters related to the rehabilitation of Maralinga.

This group has met routinely since then. The South Australian departments currently represented on the consultative committee are the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Human Services, the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs and the Attorney-General's Department. The rehabilitation project aimed to clean up the site so that it could be used by Aboriginal people living in a semitransitional lifestyle. The intention has been that, once the clean-up was completed, the site would be returned to South Australia for addition to the Maralinga Tjarutja freehold lands. The intention is to clean it up and then hand it back. The consultative committee is currently discussing a framework for the possible hand-back of that site, and they are



drafting relevant documents such as a long-term management plan and a hand-back deed of settlement. No agreement will be reached about the transfer unless the government and Maralinga Tjarutja are completely satisfied about the adequacy of the clean-up and the terms of the transfer.

There is a long history and background, and I will not go into further details thereof, other than that another Maralinga consultative committee meeting has been scheduled for 18 July this year to further refine the Maralinga Land and Environment Management Plan, which has been developed as a guide to the care and monitoring of section 400 and to continue discussions about a hand-back deed of settlement. The South Australian negotiating team will negotiate with the commonwealth on the basis that section 400 will be returned to South Australia first, with a subsequent transfer to the Maralinga Tjarutja under the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984. It will also be involved actively in the work of the Maralinga Consultative Committee to achieve the best possible result for the long-term benefit of the area and for the state as a whole. I stress that we want assure ourselves of the appropriateness of accepting back from the commonwealth prior to handing on to the traditional owners. That might take a little time.

**Mr VENNING:** That was certainly the right answer—and an important answer. I want to change tack a little and ask questions similar to those that the leader was asking in relation to guidelines for boards and committees. I refer to Budget Paper 5, volume I, page 124. What approach is the government using to assist agencies and statutory authorities to establish and operate boards and committees and to provide guidance to directors or members of government boards and committees to perform their duties efficiently?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The government released a booklet entitled *Government Boards and Committees: Guidelines for Agencies and Boards Directors* in November 2000. Section 1, 'Guidelines for agencies', deals generally with the role of the boards, the selection of directors, skills required and balance. Section 2, relating to 'Guidelines for boards of directors', deals specifically with the role and accountability of directors of government boards. Section 3, 'Information for directors appointed to boards incorporated under the Public Corporations Act', deals specifically with information for directors of boards to which the Public Corporations Act 1993 applies. Appendices include procedures for dealing with submissions to cabinet in relation to key appointments to boards, the pecuniary interests declaration form (to be used as a guide) and extracts from the Public Corporations Act which relate to the duties and liabilities of directors of public sector organisations.

Guidelines for agencies and board directors were first released late in 1995 to assist with the continuing improvement in the performance and accountability of boards and committees in key elements of the government's public sector reform program and was part of it. The guidelines were one of the first public sector publications produced in Australia which sought to improve the governance of public sector boards. They were welcomed as an advancement—and, I would add, a significant advancement—in the program of continuous improvement in the performance and accountability of boards and committees, and a key element in the government's determination to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the public sector.

The guidelines have been reviewed to incorporate the government's response to the 13th report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, as well as further work under

the heading of 'Directors' liability' and other comments received on the content and emphasis of the original publication. We incorporated the government's response to the 21st Statutory Authority Review Committee report. It was not possible for the document to be printed by the time the government's response was agreed.

**Mr VENNING:** Supplementary to that: who has access to these booklets? Can anybody get them or is only the Public Service privy to them? Where do we get them, and is there a cost? Are they open to the public?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The books of government publication would be free, and I will get one sent to the honourable member.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I know the Premier is very proud of his Bringing Them Back Home campaign. Of what does the Bringing Them Back Home campaign consist, and how many people have come back home to jobs under the program? What is the cost of the program for 2001-02, and what are the projected costs for the years 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05? It is obviously a major program with a lot of successes, given the publicity it has had. It would good to know how many people have come back to jobs created specifically under this program.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** On 26 April last year cabinet approved the allocation of funds for some research to be undertaken by the Adelaide university. That research, to the value of approximately \$50 000, was into trends into interstate migration and methods of attracting South Australians who currently live interstate to return to South Australia. The report cost \$50 000 and was finalised in January this year. Cabinet further considered the report in May this year and gave in-principle approval to the establishment of the Bringing Them Back Home program. It will target—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will continue with the answer if the leader wants; it is his question. Cabinet and a number of agencies were involved in the report, as is the process in government, so that other agencies can comment on reports and recommendations. As I mentioned, in-principle support was given in May. It had to go through the bilateral process of budget deliberations, as must all agencies and programs.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, discussions take place with the Treasurer on two or three occasions. As a result of that process, a \$500 000 program was agreed to for the next financial year. We also approved the preferred method of implementing the report, with recruitment agencies, Business Vision 2010 and a consortium of interested parties. We have approved the formation of a short-term steering committee, which will be reporting by the middle of next August. The purpose for this was to meet a shortfall in key strategic skills in the state. I think I have previously mentioned to the House that major corporations will now move capital to where the human resource talent is, where cheaper workers' compensation, land packages and construction costs are and where there is a much better industrial relations record than that of any other state in Australia. That is why some eight manufacturing companies have signed on to come to this state in recent weeks.

To return to the point, a number of companies in the defence and electronics area, particularly for software engineers, have raised with me that, even though the universities have worked cooperatively together (and I commend them for that) to look at courses to fast track software

engineers, and despite the fact that we put out a CD in our secondary schools trying to explain to secondary school students that a software engineering course would be a smart way to go because that is where some emerging opportunities are, we simply do not have enough emerging in our own education system to meet the growth.

If we do not supply these major national and international companies with these human resources, they will simply shift their facility to where the resources are. Several years ago, Clinton offered US citizenship to 180 000 software engineers in one year; and he did that because the electronics industry and the defence electronics and software engineering companies were saying, 'We will lose our dominance in the world if we do not have the skills base.' Effectively, what that did was suck those resources out of Asia and anywhere else where someone wanted to get a US passport: they went to the US and got citizenship simply because they had those skills. This is where I have been very critical of the commonwealth government and its immigration policy as it relates to skilled migration. We should have been able to attract 5 000 migrants from the Asia-Pacific region into Australia: that is what should have happened because that is the shortage we have in this country.

What we are trying to do—whilst some look at the Bringing Them Back Home campaign with mirth—is fill the gap: fill the gap that has been left by those with such skills who have gone interstate. Now that there are three or four companies, those who wanted to return, for lifestyle reasons—starting a family, or the cost of buying a home interstate—can do so. When there was just one company here, people would not come back on the basis that, if they faltered with employment with that company, there was no alternative company to go to; so we had to have three or four companies which gave some protection to these people, so that if it did not work out with one company they could still stay in Adelaide and work with another company. There are three or four companies here now, so that issue has been overcome.

The next issue is to give them opportunities to identify where the skills base is. It will be targeted and it will not be an enormous number, but it will meet some of the shortages of these major companies. If we do not do that then we will simply see them go to wherever the skills base is.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Another minister, I think it was Minister Brindal—I stand to be corrected—boasted about the success of the Bringing Them Back Home campaign. Without being in any way disrespectful, because that is not my way, this is somewhat reminiscent of Jim Hacker in *Yes, Minister*. Am I to assume that no one has been brought back home under this program? Can you actually quantify how many people have been brought home under this program?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The program is starting on 1 July. The money is being allocated—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** But it was announced last year and it was decided that it was a magnificent success.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The first allocation of funding to the program, apart from the report from Professor Hugo as to the best strategy to be employed and the recommendations to government, of \$500 000 starts on 1 July, and I have already detailed that to the Leader of the Opposition. As a result of some of the publicity when we put this policy in place last year, there were a number of inquiries. I will find out when they were diverted to the various agencies and I will seek to identify what the outcome has been.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is important to have exemplars (this is by way of comment; it is not a question) so that you can say, since this campaign has been crowed about as a success, 'We have brought this many people in; and they were these people with these jobs who used our web site to come here,' and so on.

In terms of duplication, output 1, page 1.5, strategic policy major projects division DPC, not only has the Premier allowed certain of the agencies to grow, and to grow out of control in some cases, he has also presided over massive duplication between the roles and activities of various bureaucracies. First, I am interested in the strategic policy and major projects division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. We have seen that the Premier, as Minister for State Development, has allowed duplication to flourish between his department and other parts of the bureaucracy. In 2001-02, DIT's budget will be \$195 million, despite the fact that it no longer holds major sums for the Darwin to Alice Springs railway, and there appears to be considerable duplication between parts of DPC and DIT. Obviously, it would be good to know how many people are employed in the strategic policy branch and how many people are employed in major projects.

I am concerned that these two divisions represent a substantial level of duplication alongside departments such as DIT. Indeed, a leaked document from the Chief Executive Officer of DPC, Mr McCann—he did not leak it, by the way—shows that the new strategic policy division deals with a range of issues that are or should be dealt with by other agencies, such as employment policy. It raises questions about DIT and the Department of Education, Training and Employment, the statement of economic direction, strategic industries, the automotive industry and the Productivity Commission. Again, where does that interface with DIT? And what about the Information Economy Policy Office?

The same document states that the major projects division will work on a range of projects such as shipbreaking—apparently that is still around—SAMAG, the Adelaide to Darwin railway and other activities in which we could expect DIT to involve itself. Similarly, there are a number of commercial and urban development projects with which I would have expected the Land Management Corporation to busy itself.

I understand the need for the Premier to appear to be doing something but what is 'strategic policy' doing in areas such as economic direction, strategic industries, SAMAG or the information economy that DIT or the Information Economy Policy Office cannot do? How is this not duplication? What is major projects doing that DIT or the Land Management Corporation cannot do? It seems that there has been a proliferation of different agencies doing the same or parallel things rather than a one-stop shop and a clear line of reporting. I have seen excerpts from Mr McCann's document. I think there are genuine concerns within the government about duplication and that people with all these grand titles and DIT and DPC are falling over each other on the same projects.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is not duplication, in that a major project such as the magnesium project (SAMAG) brings in a number of different portfolios. There is the question of fuel source, gas supply and power generation, and the question of mining the minerals out of the location. There are regional development aspects. In other words, a project of that nature will cut across about five or six government agencies including the transport department as it relates to the site out of Port Pirie and the environment department as it

relates to environmental considerations for sign off on the project. I have mentioned fuel source and mining operations.

Each agency with an interest in it—a legislatively required interest in the project—will therefore pursue as a major project within that agency their area of responsibility. I have found that there needs to be an over-arching coordination with many of these projects. That is effectively what major projects out of the Department of Premier and Cabinet does. It sits as a chair, if you like, of the government agencies. Let me give you a further example. In relation to Barossa Infrastructure Limited, we wanted the provision of water into the Barossa Valley for further development. Three or four agencies were involved. An individual agency on many occasions will look at its own area of responsibility without perhaps a balanced view to the whole of state interest.

The role of the Department of Premier and Cabinet is to take a whole of state interest and chair, if you like, meetings of the respective agencies to work through the issue. I found in our early years of government someone would submit a proposal and, if it went into DIT or Primary Industries and Resources, it would then do a roundrobin to the various agencies. This proposal would go around in a circle from agency to agency and never get to a set of recommendations or conclusions. In the meantime, proponents were getting anxious about the time government was taking to consider their proposals. By having a strategic oversight out of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, with its role of whole of government strategy and planning, it was able to chair, coordinate and broker an outcome among the agencies.

The leader mentioned Sir Humphrey. Agencies tend to have a silo approach. We have attempted to take away the silo approach of agencies to get whole of government thinking. I think there has been a quantum move in the public sector in that regard; I welcome it and I think the people who have embraced it have done a great service to the state. It is not a duplication of role. It is coordination and oversight. The other point I put to the leader is that as Premier the leader will hold me accountable for all things of government. Occasionally, it is appropriate for us to have independent advice of an agency. An agency might be clearly a proponent of a proposal. From that agency's point of view it might be a good proposal—and I could think of shipbreaking as one such proposal—but when you take the state's interest into account other factors come into play. The other factors would then override.

That is where the strategic overview has been important. It is a coordination; it does not strip away from the agencies the fundamental work they do. It oversees, coordinates, brokers and facilitates so that a proponent has a one-stop shop in which to lodge their application. It is not an application that then does this roundrobin among agencies and departments so that an indeterminate period of time elapses.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The simple truth is that when we talk to business people they say that they cannot get a 'yes', let alone a 'no'. They say that it is like diving into blanc-mange. In the leaked document to which I referred (Mr McCann's document), the major projects division of DPC is said to be involved in a range of things also being done apparently within the Department of Administrative Services' own major projects division. In budget paper 5, volume 2, page 8.24, it is revealed that the Department of Administrative Services is involved in the Patawalonga development, Barcoo Outlet, Pier Hotel redevelopment, Holdfast Shores, the Riverbank project and the Botanic wine and rose project. If we turn to the Premier's chapter of budget paper 5, volume

1, page 1.5, and the leaked document of Mr McCann, we see that the Department of Premier and Cabinet is also involved in the wine and rose project, Barcoo Outlet, the National Wine Centre, the Convention Centre and Riverbank.

It is not just about the other agencies I mentioned, such as DIT and Information Economy, but the Department of Administrative Services is also involved. Again, I ask the Premier: what is the Department of Premier and Cabinet Major Projects Division doing that DAIS cannot do? Why is DAIS directly involved? There were 23 people in that division at the time of its establishment. It is not a small amount of money.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** For contract purposes: as the leader would know from his time in government, the Department of Administrative Services, which has the supply board attached to it, is responsible for tendering and contract of government. That is why that is so. In fact, from a process, probity and management point of view, that is why there is separation of responsibilities in a number of instances in government.

I come back to my previous answer that it is not to duplicate the detailed work, the fine detail of that work, that is undertaken by a responsible agency. It is about oversight and coordination. The reason for it is to meet the needs of the business community to which the leader refers. Five to seven years ago, when we first came into government, we found this myriad of areas of responsibility that proponents had to meet. A proposal would go to an agency and, if the officer looking after it went on holidays for a month, invariably it would stay on the officer's desk.

If it then had to go to another agency, sometimes it just would not be sent across to the other agency in a timely way. This is designed so that a business proponent can pick up the phone and say to major projects, 'I have had this thing in this department for so long. What is happening with it?' This is designed to assist and facilitate responses to people in a timely way. Looking at the way in which new investments are coming into the state and the percentage increase compared to other states of Australia, we are now outperforming the other states. That has not happened overnight or by a wish list. Rather, it has happened because we have had a clear focus on what has had to be done. Has it been as streamlined as I would want, as timely as I would want and as efficient as I would want over the last five years? The answer is no, and that is why we have taken these measures.

I believe that this proposal is not dissimilar to that of a number of other states. The Department of Premier and Cabinet does not have, in effect, a policy of second guessing every agency; it is to facilitate, coordinate and oversight—a chairing role, if you like, to bring the projects forward.

**Ms THOMPSON:** I refer to budget paper 5, page 1.5, Coordination and Advice. Under the targets for 2001-02 is the item 'Implement a major projects display to communicate government projects and initiatives to the community'. Can the Premier provide details of the display and advise how much it will cost, as well as whether he will submit details of the project to the Auditor-General for scrutiny to ensure that this is a non-political use of taxpayer funds in an election year? This is a new item; it was not covered last year.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Centenary of Federation display?

**Ms THOMPSON:** That is not what it says. In the same section there is a separate item for the Centenary of Federation.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will have to take that on notice and get clarification from the department as to the major display that we are talking about.

**Ms THOMPSON:** My second question relates to the same page. When the proponents of the National Wine Centre appeared before the Public Works Committee in 1998, they said that recurrent funding would be covered by centre income. Given that the centre was due to open in mid 2000 in time for the Olympic Games, what recurrent funding has occurred since the start of the project and will this be recovered from centre funds?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In the 2001-02 budget, the wine centre will receive \$996 000. These funds include \$253 000 which was previously set aside in forward estimates. At the time that the 2000-01 budget was brought down, the scheduled opening date for the National Wine Centre was programmed for 1 June 2001. A series of delays due to inclement weather, industrial action and the challenges of the construction of this complex building has delayed the completion until about September this year, and I anticipate and hope that it will be opening some time in October this year. They are approximate dates.

The National Wine Centre has been funded during start-up construction by way of government appropriation. The member's question alluded to the fact that it was not operating and so could not offset its recurrent costs in that term—and that is correct. Once fully operational, the centre is required to operate according to best commercial practice. We anticipate that future operation of the National Wine Centre will be self-funding and, given the sort of bookings that they are already taking, I believe that will be achieved. There are funds which will cover opening activities, and fixed operating costs—and I think this is the point that the member is getting at—of \$493 000 for the centre from June to September and start-up costs for the business (including labour, overhead, board expenses, project management and general administration expenses), and \$250 000 for one-off, start-up opening expenses. Included in the forward estimates is \$253 000 for staff funding requirements, marketing resources and contingent against operational issues.

In addition to the foregoing appropriation, the centre will receive approximately \$240 000 rent from wine industry offices. Outgoings in relation to the tenancies are estimated at approximately \$50 000, leaving a net balance income of \$195 000. As I indicated, I hope that it will be completed and opened in the September to October period.

**Ms THOMPSON:** My third question comes in separate parts. What is the admission charge to the National Wine Centre, and does this charge get a visitor into the Rose Garden? What proportion of the total floor space of the wine centre does the admission fee give access to an ordinary visitor, excluding the cafes? What advance bookings are there for the wine centre, and what is its confirmed occupancy rate for the various private dining, education and conference facilities for the first three months of operation? How many visitors have paid an admission charge to the Rose Garden since its opening?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am advised that if someone wants to visit the National Wine Centre itself there is no charge. If they want to go into the special exhibition area, the charge is \$11 (\$10 plus \$1 GST). Whether that fee gets you into the Rose Garden is a matter for the board of the Botanic Gardens and is currently before that board. In regard to the two other questions, one related to how many people visited

the rose garden. I simply cannot answer that off the top of my head.

**Ms THOMPSON:** In regard to the admission charge, what proportion of the total floor space of the wine centre does that admit you to—other than the cafes, which you may or may not choose to go into?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We will have to have someone measure the building to delineate those two.

**Ms THOMPSON:** If you measure the plans, that will do.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will take those two components on notice.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is it the intention of the committee to now move to public sector human resource management and multicultural services?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, we will move to the next section.

#### Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr Paul Case, Commissioner for Public Employment, Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment, Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Mrs Jan Andrews, Deputy Commissioner for Public Employment.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I will ask the Premier a couple of questions referring to output class 2 in budget paper 5, volume 1. I cannot find a discrete line for the public sector traineeship scheme in the budget papers. How much has been budgeted for public sector trainees in 2001-02 and how much has been provisioned for the same program in 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will refer that to Minister Brindal and Minister Buckby because those two programs come within their areas. I am happy to refer the question to them or, when they come before the estimates committee, the member might like to ask them directly.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am happy with that because I may not have a chance to question Minister Brindal. As part of that question, could Minister Brindal also be asked for some detail about the average unit cost of employment of a trainee, including the on-costs?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will refer that to the minister.

**Mr ATKINSON:** This year's budget provisioned \$4.7 million for executive employment, public sector management development. In 2000-01 budget paper 2, page 1.44, the program I think was Leadership SA. Are we talking about the same thing? I assume that the reference in 2000-01 is the same as the program called Leadership SA on page 1.8 of budget paper 5.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is an upskilling program for senior managers of the public sector. It is a two-year initiative designed to meet an identified need for leadership development within the public sector. It commenced in late 1999 and over 940 employees registered an interest for the various development programs through the Commissioner for Public Employment, which funded 294 places on the program. The Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment commenced the second phase of Leadership SA in September 2000. In 2001 and early 2002 the following is being implemented and offered to public sectors: programs which are based on developing 200 employees at the senior management level against core executive leadership capabilities; programs targeting 70 first line managers endeavouring to obtain a qualification in public services training package—that is, a diploma of government management; development

of an online learning environment for all executives; workshops and coaching offered to executives; and participation by three senior executives in an Australian public sector leaders program. In addition, the public sector management course for middle to senior management continues to be supported and promoted through the Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment.

**Mr ATKINSON:** What has been budgeted to pay for Leadership SA in 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As I mentioned in an earlier answer, it is a two-year program and we are in the second year of that program. There is not an allocation in the out years. The success of the program will be reviewed at its completion and we will make a policy decision as to whether the program continues in this form or in another form. There have been 940 registrations of interest; 294 people underwent the program in the first year and the second year of the program is in place now. I cannot give the exact number that will go through the course but, as a result of this course being in place, I am advised that a number of agencies are duplicating it within their respective agencies, so it is filtering down and out, if you like, across the public sector. However, we will, at the conclusion of the program, prepare a report and look at whether and how we might continue the program, and in what form.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I am interested in the issue of doctors and nurses. I refer to budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.24 in regard to employee relations services and ask the Premier what the government is doing to address claims that doctors are working excessive hours in the public health system.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A new two-year enterprise agreement covering public sector medical officers became effective in March this year. The agreement provides for a 4 per cent salary increase in January this year (it was effectively backdated) and also in January 2002, a continuation of salary sacrifice arrangements of up to 30 per cent of an employee's income and a number of improved conditions of employment which address the hours that doctors are working. These improvements include paying overtime to part-time employees who work in excess of their contracted hours (unless some additional hours are worked at the request of the employee); reducing the maximum length of shifts from 14 to 13 hours; providing a minimum of eight hours off duty when employees have either worked overtime or been recalled for duty and amending the rosters for medical practitioners so that they are not required to work more than eight consecutive days and have at least four days free of duty in each 28 day roster cycle. That arrangement will be introduced no later than 1 December this year. The Department of Human Services (DHS) and the South Australian Salaried and Medical Officers Association have also agreed that during the period of the agreement the department will undertake a comprehensive review which examines all issues relating to the delivery of medical services and employment of medical officers.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I refer to the same volume and page numbers. What is the government doing to retain qualified nursing staff in the state's public health system?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Likewise a new enterprise agreement covering South Australian public sector nurses has been negotiated with the Nursing Federation. The new agreement, which will replace an agreement that expired on 31 December last, provides significant benefits for employees and should stem the migration of qualified nurses from this

state to other states. Those benefits include salaries that are competitive with those paid in other states; additional incremental steps in the classification structures for registered nurse levels 1 and 2 and an enrolled nurse; new classification for nurse specialist and nurse practitioner; a commitment to the development of a new staffing system focusing on patient needs; four weeks paid maternity/adoption leave; access to salary sacrifice arrangements; and other improvements to conditions of employment.

In addition, the government has given a commitment to use its best endeavours to employ 200 additional nurses by April next year, and has already implemented re-entry and refresher training programs to assist qualified nurses who have left the profession to return to it. It is anticipated that the new agreement will be approved by a majority of nurses and will be certified by the Australian Industrial Relations Commission shortly.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** With regard to flexible working arrangements, I refer to the same volume, page 1.24. I note in the *Daily Telegraph* of 28 May a report that some leading private sector companies were introducing purchased leave. What is the South Australian public sector doing to improve employment conditions to ensure that it is able to attract and recruit the right number of high quality employees?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The concept is not necessarily appropriate in all areas or situations; recognising the choice of arrangements is more effective. In October last, the Commissioner for Public Employment issued a determination outlining a range of voluntary flexible working arrangements which may be applied within the South Australian public sector. They include: purchased leave, which enables an employee to exchange an agreed reduction in salary in return for extra periods of leave over a specified period—usually 12 months; flexitime which enables an employee to negotiate how and when hours will be worked within agreed limits; a compressed weeks arrangement enabling an employee a nine-day fortnight by working the same number of hours over nine instead of 10 working days; and part-time and job share. Part-time work arrangements enable an employee to work less than a full-time employee, and the hours are usually fixed and constant. Job sharing is a voluntary arrangement where one full-time job is shared for two or more people.

These arrangements have been welcomed by employees and the employer organisation, and public sector managements have endorsed them as a means of better servicing clients and managing workloads around seasonal fluctuations that occur within the public sector. As a follow-up, in March the commissioner surveyed public sector agencies to gauge how the arrangements were being implemented, and I understand that the more flexible arrangements are now widely available and are being used by many public sector employees.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The Premier's budget announced a 5 per cent cut in the number of executives earning \$100 000 or more. It would be fair to say that, during your term as Premier, the number of people earning \$100 000 or more has all but doubled, that is, the number of people on \$100 000 has increased from 243 in 1996 to 481 in 1999-2000. Of course, we have had relatively low inflation during that period. Earlier the Premier read some information to us, and I might return to that. In some cases, we can acknowledge that earnings growth will move people into higher income brackets; we have to acknowledge that. In some areas of the public sector work force that is a satisfactory explanation; for

example, within the Education Department perhaps some school principals or inspectors have been tipped over the \$100 000 bracket. However, in other areas, you could not say the same thing; for example, in departments such as Premier and Cabinet, where the highly paid went from 11 to 31—

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**Mr WRIGHT:** Do you want to ask a question after me or now?

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** That was dealt with in the reorganisation of the department and its movement into Premier and Cabinet.

**Mr WRIGHT:** That is not the case. Treasury and Finance went from 10 to 34; DIT went from 13 to 24; tourism went from three to eight; and the Attorney-General's portfolio went from 20 to 72. These areas were not addressed before. They cannot simply be explained away as a result of an answer given by the Premier earlier. I have given some clear examples of huge changes in numbers that cannot be explained away simply by reforms in government. Why have we had a doubling of the number of people on \$100 000 or more while in other areas there have been cuts to jobs?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As the honourable member indicated—and rightly so—that is, with the executive band starting in the 1980s, if over a three or four year period you have an ordinary 3 per cent—or whatever it might be—adjustment, you tip an \$80 000 earner into the \$100 000 category. There are a number of instances of that. I suggest, therefore, that the \$100 000 benchmark is not the real benchmark, because the whole salary base is moving, as is the general work force base, and the public sector base over a period of five years was at about 17 per cent, in line with about what the private sector moved. Over a five year period, the private sector moved 17.3 or 17.8 per cent, and the public sector moved by about 17 per cent. It is almost lineball. When you get a shift of that nature over a number of years, it will move a greater number of people into the area. That is part of it. There has been restructuring within a number of agencies, and in those agency restructurings across the board they have brought in people at the lower level. Despite the fact that they are in the lowest salary band, they are still considered in that category which creates that number.

**Mr WRIGHT:** How much money does the government expect to save through the 5 per cent reduction in executive positions in each of the years 2001-02 and 2002-03?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A two year program will save about \$2 million and about 23 executive positions.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I refer to an earlier question and some of the comments made by the Premier (which I am happy to acknowledge) in reference to a movement similar to the private sector, because realistically we need to compete with the private sector if we are to employ good people. That does not quite sit with some comments made by one of the Premier's ministers today—and the Premier cannot answer for that—but I find it somewhat staggering that, considering the quality of people employed in the public sector, the range of skills that they have and the money that they are being paid, they cannot perform some, if not more, of the work that we are farming out to consultancies. However, that is an issue for another time.

This has always been a personal hobbyhorse of mine—and this is in no way public sector bashing, nor do I mean any disrespect to the people in this room because I am sure that you are all very good at your jobs. However, it does seem amazing to me (and I would say this to whoever was the Premier of the day) that we have a situation where depart-

mental heads are paid more than the Premier of the day. It would appear from figures—and I might be slightly out and the Premier may be able to correct me—which the Premier read out earlier that certainly one person's salary within his department is higher than his.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Most of the departmental heads are, and substantially so.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I made that point earlier, and I think that is wrong as well—

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I do not think the public of South Australia are about to entertain any Blair-like adjustment.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Perhaps not, but it appears from the figures read earlier that at least a couple of others within the Premier's department are about on a par with the Premier's salary. We all have to take some of the blame for the fact that we have hidden—and 'hidden' is probably the way to describe this—from the public gaze how this is treated by the media in particular, but it just strikes me as a very strange set of affairs that departmental heads earn much more than either the Premier or ministers of the day.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is a set of circumstances that has applied for as long as I have been a member of this parliament. It is pretty clear to me that the general public of South Australia are not in favour of further adjustments. There is a system in place that applies periodical adjustments. I know that is not about to change and I do not anticipate that it will change in the near future. Bearing in mind the merits of the case or otherwise, that is the set of circumstances that apply.

**Mr CONDOUS:** I refer again to 'Public Sector Human Resource Management', and the subheading 'People Development', budget paper 5, vol. 1, page 1.24. What is being done to ensure that the staff of public sector agencies appropriately serve the South Australian public sector and implement government policy?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Principally, 'People Development' picks up the leadership question to which I responded in another aspect to the member for Lee. There are several programs in that area. An additional area to the Leadership SA program is the implementation of Public Service training packages suited to provide a structured development for staff of the ASO1 and ASO6 level. Key activities for those agencies include the formation of a VET reference group, newsletter, regular forums, development of web site, development of online assessment and identification of panel providers.

Five pilot programs have been put in place by the commissioner. Four of those programs offer ASO1 and ASO2 level certificate three in government. One of those programs is based in Port Augusta, so there is a regional component. The fifth program offers the advanced diploma in government human resource management. Coordination of the diploma and government management is then part of the Leadership SA program. These programs to which I have just referred are in addition to the programs I mentioned when responding to a question from the member for Lee in terms of an integrated program and a structured program for development of the public sector.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I refer once again to output class 2, page 1.8, which, as the Premier would be aware, from a portfolio point of view is of particular interest to me for more reasons than one. In the fourth dot point from the bottom, reference is made to 'successfully conducted a pilot program to resolve long-term workers' compensation claims in three

agencies'. I would be very interested in some additional detail and what has been budgeted for that.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We have set up a program to look at workers' compensation costs, the long-term reduction of claims and how we might better ensure and, in practice, demonstrate to the private sector a safe work environment. In September 1999, an evaluation of long-term workers' compensation claims was undertaken across the public sector. That evaluation revealed that 38 per cent of all open claims were over two years and the outstanding liability associated with these claims was in excess of \$65 million. In 2000, a pilot program to test strategies for resolving long-term claims was implemented in the agencies to which the member has referred. A sample of claims over two years—

**Mr WRIGHT:** Do you know which agencies?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** They are all government departments. If the member wants to know the names of the agencies, I will obtain them for him. A sample of claims over the two years within each pilot agency was identified for review by external consultants expert in workers' compensation claims management. The positive results from the pilot program have seen 30 per cent of claims included in the pilot being resolved either by settlement or full return to work. The claims that have been resolved through the program had an outstanding liability of \$6.5 million. The total cost to settle the claims was \$1.1 million—a net saving of \$5.3 million.

The strategy has been embraced by the Justice portfolio, which is about to implement a program to address its long-term workers compensation claims. It is intended that that strategy be promoted across all public sector portfolios. Given the significant reduction in the number of outstanding claims and the very significant reduction in their cost and settlement, it is a matter of working our way through the claims in a focused and strategic way, and I think that the pilot program has been very successful.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If there are no further questions, we will move on to multicultural affairs.

#### **Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Ms J. De Leo, Executive Director, Office of Multicultural and International Affairs.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Concerns have been expressed to me about the politicisation of the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs (OMIA). I understand that the government has been hosting a large number of functions involving various ethnic and multicultural communities. The opposition has not been invited to a number of these, and I am sure that the Premier would agree that it is vital that OMIA both be bipartisan and be seen to be bipartisan. Indeed, the issue of bipartisanship has been essential to underpinning multiculturalism over a number of years.

The parliament has been the scene of a number of OMIA functions and recently, when I came into the parliament and happened to mention at the door that I was looking forward to the function, there was a look of horror on people's faces. That concerns me. Certainly, if we are elected at the end of this year—and I think that the election will probably be just before the Queen's visit, with the Wine Centre opening being shifted to September, the Convention Centre in September and the opening of the Southern Freeway (which apparently is going to be ripped up straight afterwards in September), but we are ready any day you want to do it—we will make sure that OMIA behaves in a non-political way.

You only have to look at OMIA's magazine to see how political it is. Bipartisanship in multicultural affairs is vitally important, so will the Premier supply the committee (not necessarily now) with a list of functions either subsidised or funded, hosted either jointly or exclusively by OMIA over the past year, the cost to the taxpayer of each of these functions and the names of all members of parliament invited?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have hosted, not OMIA: it has not been OMIA that has paid for functions. Any functions I have held have been as Premier. I have had a range of multicultural leaders from different areas, as it was suggested to me that I ought to do that. As the leader knows, we go to a whole raft of functions and hospitality is extended, and it was a simple way of repaying some hospitality. I think there were three last year, but I will be happy to get the details of how many I have had. But OMIA is not the body that is paying for those: that is done by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It has been quite extraordinary that, over the term of the government, I have had various multicultural leaders say to me at different stages that after they have invited me to speak they have been contacted by a representative of the government urging that I not be invited to speak. One year, which was quite bizarre, at a major event I was asked if I would mind not speaking quite as well as I had the previous year! So, I think there are some political fun and games going on and I want to serve notice that we will not tolerate it. If we think that OMIA is involved in politics in any way, the office will be exposed.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will defend the office. I do not think it has been, and in its dealings with me and my office it has always been independent of thought, if that is the way to describe it. I do not know who the phantom people are making suggestions about speaking commitments, but wherever I go both I and the leader speak. I do not think I have been to one function when that has not been the case.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Like the function on Sunday night?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That was the Jewish community function.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes, Vinnie was there, but not speaking. The Premier just said that at all of them there had been joint speakers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I wonder if we might have some questions, rather than a chat across the floor.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I was referring to that range of functions that the leader and I go to in the multicultural communities, and there are a number of them. The leader has always spoken at those functions, as I have. Back when I was Leader of the Opposition it was the same, and those circumstances have not changed. Sunday's function was conducted by the Jewish community, and as far as I know everyone paid for themselves.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** That was an initiative of the Jewish community and not of the government? Can I clarify that?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission was involved with it but not the Office of Multicultural and International Affairs. They have had two or three of those functions over a 12 or 18 month period, which gives an opportunity for that particular community to showcase what it is and what it has achieved as a community within a particular state or location.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I wanted to make that point because we have One Nation roving around the place and the Premier has so far refused to rule out a preference deal with Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party, despite the fact that in 1998 the Premier attacked Pauline Hanson and One Nation saying that they could 'wreck the economy', among other things. The Premier is refusing to rule out preference swaps between the South Australian Liberal Party and One Nation and, in fact, only a week ago refused in parliament to do so. He referred to earlier statements but did not specify what they were.

This is so important for Australia. I regard multiculturalism as our greatest achievement and reconciliation remains our greatest test, but if people start playing games in the area of multicultural and ethnic affairs then the whole community will be done a great disservice. That needs to be placed firmly on the record. We will not tolerate taxpayers' funds being used politically in this area for the advantage of one side. Unless there is bipartisanship, multiculturalism is threatened, and I want to make that very clear today.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will only respond that in my observation that has been so.

**Mr CONDOUS:** In budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.25, on multicultural services, we are talking about humanitarian arrivals. What is the state government's approach to the holders of the three-year temporary protection visa released from federal detention centres?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Since the commencement of release of TPV holders by the commonwealth government some 14 months ago, 1 230 individuals have been released to Adelaide from Woomera, Port Hedland and Curtin. Amongst those released are 96 families and 49 unaccompanied humanitarian minors. Approximately 500 of the TPV holders already released to Adelaide are likely to settle in our state permanently. The government has consistently maintained—and I took it to the ministerial forum recently—that the federal government has a responsibility to look after these people after having granted them protection visa status. That is, if the commonwealth government makes the policy decision that they are entitled to a protection visa, it is the commonwealth's responsibility once they have issued the visa to give support to these people, not the state government.

At the same time, conscious of the situation in which TPV holders find themselves without adequate support and the need to facilitate long term integration, the state government has provided substantial support to this group of new arrivals. In particular, the South Australian community based sector has been assisted in its role through a grant of \$30 000 issued to the Australian Red Cross to coordinate the efforts of non-government agencies. The human services portfolio alone has expended about \$1 million on services such as accommodation support, health care and emergency financial assistance. It is important for the state government to dedicate resources to the settlement of humanitarian arrivals, although it clearly ought to be done by the federal government. In the absence of federal resources there remains the need to maximise the chance for these people to take their place within society appropriately. The federal government has a clear view on it. It is a view with which I disagree and have said so publicly and at a ministerial council forum. However, I do not envisage the federal government changing its policy.

**Mr CONDOUS:** A couple of things came to my attention last weekend which were very disturbing for me, because I thought we were taking great steps forward in combating racial vilification based on colour or nationality. In one

instance a young lady is about to leave a college and transfer to another one, because she has been racially vilified in this private college. The parents went to see the principal, who was not prepared to take the necessary action laid down, which is immediate expulsion, because of the cost and loss of revenue to that college of having to expel five students. The second case was even more tragic. A young girl left another leading Adelaide college to go to another college because of racial vilification. Upon going to the second college she found that the situation there was even worse than at the previous college, so she transferred back to her original college. The taunts became even greater there, because she had previously left. Subsequently she jumped out of a three-storey building and is now a paraplegic.

In South Australia we have probably the toughest racial vilification laws of any state of Australia. I think that you as the minister should be writing to every private college and school advising them that it is the responsibility of the principals to implement the laws laid down for racial vilification, because of the effect it is having on young individual lives. Having been through this myself, I thought that in this country we were maturing very quickly in the acceptance of multiculturalism, but there still seems to be a problem in this area in secondary schools. I am interested to hear your comments about what we as a government can possibly do to inform the principals of every secondary school and private college in this state that they have a responsibility to protect young lives in what can be a very cruel situation.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The circumstances that the honourable member has outlined to the committee are not acceptable and ought not be occurring in our state. As the member rightly says, we were the first to move to racial vilification laws. They are stringent and are there for a purpose. I will look at how we might be able to communicate those broader principles. If there is a lack of understanding or awareness that we have these laws, we will do our best to make sure that that lack of understanding is fixed and corrected.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Whilst there is nothing wrong with political candidacy at all—and I am not casting any reflections—are any former Liberal Party candidates on the board of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission or appointed to OMEA?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Some time ago, the newly appointed head of OMEA was a candidate for the Liberal Party. I presume that is the point.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I understand there might be more than one.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The federal Senate.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I think it is important, in light of what I said previously about bipartisanship and the Premier's commitment in May to transparency. Are any other Liberal candidates on the board of the commission?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Of SAMEAC?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Not that I am aware of. I am not aware of anybody else who has been a candidate, but I could make some discreet inquiries.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examinations related to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet closed.



Auditor-General's Department, \$9 293 000  
Administered Items for the Auditor-General's  
Department, \$835 000

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr. K. MacPherson, Auditor-General.  
Mr. I. McGlen, Director of Audits, Policy, Planning and  
Research, Auditor-General's Department.  
Mr. T. Knight, Manager, Administration and Finance,  
Auditor-General's Department.

**Membership:**

Mr Foley substituted for Mr Rann.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare open the proposed payments. Does the Premier, the member for Hart, or the member for Lee wish to make an opening statement?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, sir.

**Mr WRIGHT:** No, I will go straight to questions if I may, sir. As the Premier is aware, the opposition has high regard for the Auditor-General and his office. Needless to say, we are especially interested in when the inquiry into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium will come down. I am not too sure whether either you or Mr MacPherson will be able to give us specific detail, but we would like some information with regard to the process. This is something which has taken a considerable amount of time, and with good reason. We certainly would not want it to be rushed, but there must come a point in time when this report is made available. I wondered whether you might be able to shed some light on that.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, I cannot shed any light on that. This is a matter that has not been a subject of discussions between the Auditor-General and myself, and neither should it be. Perhaps the Auditor-General might like to make a comment.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** I will help Mr Wright with that. It is important that I explain this fairly carefully because were I to intimate that I was doing certain things that may reflect adversely on people that could sound the opportunity for someone to bring an action for bias—and that would undermine the entire process to this point.

With permission, I will read what I have and I believe that will answer fully the issue that you raised. In February this year I substantively completed a draft report containing the tentative findings of my examination of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Redevelopment Project. On 19 February 2001 I released portions of my report containing tentative factual findings. This was released to those persons potentially affected by relevant factual findings and it was given to them for their comment.

This was done to afford the individuals affected natural justice. The persons involved were all witnesses examined in the course of the inquiry. As witnesses, they each agreed to maintain the confidentiality of their evidence in order to prevent contamination of the evidence to ensure fairness to others involved in the examination. Undertakings as to confidentiality were confirmed during the natural justice process and have been relied on by me to ensure the integrity of the examination and to avoid unfairness that could result from the premature release of tentative or incomplete findings.

During March 2001 I received and considered the written comments of various persons. In May 2001 I circulated for comment among the persons potentially affected further

portions of my draft report containing tentative but detailed findings addressing each of the terms of reference. I set a strict but reasonable timetable for the provision to me of written comments. When I set that timetable I expected to receive all written comments by 19 June.

I have encountered some delays in the natural justice process, not of my own making. Some of the delays encountered were probably inevitable. At all times I have endeavoured to balance the private interests of the individuals concerned with the public interest which requires that the results of my examination be tabled in parliament as soon as reasonably practicable. In engaging in this balancing exercise I have been guided by the advice of senior counsel engaged by me to advise on the examination process. At times I have accepted the submissions made by various individuals as to their private interests.

At this stage I do not consider it necessary to circulate modified drafts of my report to any person. I am keen to ensure that the natural justice process does not become open-ended otherwise there would be no end to the examination. On this basis I hope to receive the final written comments of individuals representing government interests in the week beginning 2 July 2001. I have already received a considerable number of written responses. Once I have taken into account all those responses, I will circulate relevant portions of my draft report to those persons who represent the soccer federation and soccer clubs for their response. Those individuals have already received and commented upon other portions of my draft report. Provided I encounter no further delays, I expect to finalise my report for presentation in the spring sitting of parliament.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I have a supplementary question. I appreciate that information and I am particularly heartened to hear that you will not allow the natural justice process to be open ended. Obviously, natural justice needs to be taken into account and I know you are doing that. I will put on record now that when I have contacted you previously—and that has been rare; I think once or twice; once I think this year and some time ago—you used those words to me. I might also say that is pretty much all you did say to me—and I understand why. I am not critical of that. I am saying that so the committee is aware that you were also strict in what you said to me over the telephone.

My concern for some time has been that this natural justice process not drag on indefinitely. Obviously, there must be that facility but in the public interest that cannot drag on too long. It has been of particular concern to me whether any witnesses have deliberately slowed down this process. That would be going against the spirit of natural justice. I think it is very important for the benefit of good government, the community and the soccer world, that the sooner this particular finding is made the better off the community will be—no matter what the finding is. I think it is critical that everyone involved takes on board the spirit that you are moving with this.

The Auditor-General did make a comment earlier that some of this was inevitable, which leads me to believe that not all of it has been inevitable. Can you confirm that no witness or witnesses are deliberately slowing down this process? If they are that is a major concern which the opposition will have to address.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** As I explained before I read the statement, I need to be extremely cautious about what I say. I would be seriously ill-advised to suggest that someone has

deliberately caused me delay. The Public Finance and Audit Act specifically provides that if I were to form the opinion that I was being frustrated in a way which was sufficiently serious, I would have the right to bring that to the notice of the parliament—and I would do so. To this point in time I have not seen fit to do so.

**Mr FOLEY:** In relation to the very lengthy and no doubt difficult inquiry into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, is the Auditor-General satisfied that he has had access to all documentation relating to the project and that there has been no shredding or destruction of documentation within government to frustrate the inquiries of the Auditor-General?

**Mr MacPHERSON:** I will answer that by saying that, if you await the report, you will understand the difficulties we may or may not have had in that context. It would be seriously improper of me to try to answer that question at this stage.

**Mr FOLEY:** I have a supplementary question. That is a stunning admission and represents a dramatic escalation in the concern that the opposition has about what has occurred with the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. Obviously, by that answer the Auditor-General is not able to say that he is satisfied; so by that answer there would appear to be some question over what has occurred within government during this process.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** With respect, it is not for the member for Hart to draw conclusions one way or the other or interpret as he sees fit. I think the Auditor-General has made a clear statement to the committee. He has detailed issues for the committee's benefit and it is not appropriate, in my view, for the member for Hart or anyone else to try to get another headline.

**Mr FOLEY:** I understand why the Premier would say that. I am entitled to have a view. I have expressed that view. I understand why the Premier would be breaking out into a sweat in terms of trying to put some political spin on that. We are now reaching a point where there are some concerns about that inquiry. The Auditor-General has indicated that he intends, provided there is no further frustration by government members, to have that report concluded and tabled.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That statement is—

**Mr FOLEY:** Hang on, he cannot interject on me.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Hart is making a statement and not asking a question, and he is interpreting the statement of the Auditor-General—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —which is inappropriate. The member for Hart is doing this for one purpose—media consumption.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** After that rude interjection from the Premier, as I said, the—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It is okay, Ivan. We know why you are sensitive.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** As I said, assuming that the Auditor-General is intending to table the report during the spring session and assuming there is no further frustration—or any frustration, if that is the point the Premier is sensitive about—can the Auditor-General table that report out of session? If it has escaped anyone's notice, the four year mark of this term of government is up on 11 October; the last sitting day of parliament is at the end of July, and it is quite possible that

parliament will not resume. If that is the case, will we see this report should the Premier choose to run to an election before the report is tabled?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** You would be aware that we moved a resolution that this report could be tabled out of session. I will check the *Hansard* record to see if there is a time limit, but my understanding—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** For the leader's benefit, I anticipate that the next election will be in March 2002.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I have just indicated that there will be a spring session of parliament. I hasten to add that I have had no discussion with the Auditor-General in relation to this matter, and there will be an opportunity for him to table his finalised report.

**Mr FOLEY:** So you are ruling out an election before the Auditor-General's report—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Waite.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That is certainly our—

**Mr FOLEY:** Hold on, the Premier is answering the question and you have called the member for Waite. I take a point of order, sir.

**The CHAIRMAN:** A point of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** The Premier is answering my question and you have called the member for Waite. I would like to hear the answer, thank you.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The chair was of the opinion that the Premier had concluded answering what had been three questions by the opposition.

**Mr FOLEY:** Well, you are wrong. He has not concluded because he was still talking.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Waite.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I refer to budget paper 5, volume 1, page 1.63. Last year I asked a question in this committee about—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I just thought the repetition was getting a bit boring. I have an interest in the issue that the Auditor-General's Department has used about \$404 000 in consultancy expenses, which I can quite understand given the scope of the office's tasks. I am interested to know what those consultancy expenses were for, because it seems to confirm the need for consultancy advice even for the Auditor-General as well as the government. Secondly, what is the Auditor-General's view on how his department manages any possible compromise of the integrity of the office through outsourcing any function to consultants in any way? Is there any process (as I imagine there would be) to ensure that control, if you like, of the audit process is not divested in any way as a consequence of such consultancies as a department would also seek to do?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will refer the question to the Auditor-General but I want to make the point about consultancies, because it has been such a topic of discussion today, particularly this morning, that we have a two-year strategy in place to reduce consultancies. I was going to mention it this morning but I overlooked it because we got onto other subjects. There is to be a reduction of 20 per cent in the range and cost of consultancies in a two-year approach. In the first year, we will be on track to reducing the cost of consultancies in general to government. In relation to specific consultancies, I will ask the Auditor-General to respond.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** There is absolutely no question concerning any issues of compromising the audit process.

That \$404 000 is the amount we budgeted for this coming year for departmental purposes. It includes the seeking of legal and specialist advice on various matters and any matters that we believe are appropriate for the audit process this year.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Some time ago, parliament was advised that all the material in the bags that went missing from the Minister for Tourism's car was copies. Can either the Premier or the Auditor confirm today that nothing that went missing from the minister's bags has jeopardised your inquiry in any way?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The inquiry is under way and the member asked me to comment on it. I cannot because I have had no involvement—and neither should I—and I have had no discussions with the Auditor-General in relation to this matter—and neither should I. I will ask the Auditor if he wishes to respond further. However, I would have thought that the inquiry is proceeding and the questions are premature and the Auditor will advise in due course.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** I can understand your question but I ask you to respect the fact that it would be totally inappropriate for me to comment on it.

**Mr WRIGHT:** So, you cannot rule either in or out today that the material that went missing from the minister's bags has in any way jeopardised your inquiry?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** With respect, the opposition can ask a series of questions—which is obviously their intent today—and the Auditor, in his opening statement, has clearly identified the course he wishes to follow and the reasons for following that course. By posing a series of questions, it goes to the heart of the inquiry currently being conducted by the Auditor. The only reason the opposition is posing these questions at this time is for media speculation and consumption. I suggest to members opposite that the most appropriate course is to re-read the Auditor's statement to the committee and allow the Auditor to continue his task unfettered.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I would not have thought that it is any big deal. Parliament has already been told that everything needed to be made available by government has been made available, including those documents that went missing from the minister's car. I would not have thought it was any big deal and that either you or the Auditor could tell us yes or no that nothing that went missing has jeopardised the Auditor's inquiry in any way.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Lee can ask the same question five different ways and my response would be the same on each occasion.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, the member for Hart interjects and wants to re-interpret as he sees fit. The member for Hart, in drawing a deep breath with the theatrics of the question and any response, wants to present, theatrically, for the benefit of the media, circumstances that are inappropriate. What we ought to—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am congratulating you on your skills: your skills at this are very good. I make the point that the auditor has made a clear opening statement in order to put down the position. He has done so, and it is my view that the auditor ought to be able to get on with the task in an unfettered manner that does not put at risk, in any way, his inquiry or report.

**Mr WRIGHT:** There is no point asking the question again or in five different ways, because the Premier has highlighted that there is no point in doing so: therefore, I am certainly not going to waste the time of the committee.

However, I am surprised and disappointed that that simple question could not be confirmed today. I think the opposition has been extremely fair over a long period with regard to this very delicate challenge facing the Auditor-General. However, we believe that time is of the essence, time is important and, for the sake of public interest, this matter cannot be allowed to drag on very much longer.

With a view to that, because the Premier was not able to finish his answer before, could he share with us the process that will take place once the Auditor-General brings down his finding? I know that he referred to whether parliament is sitting or not, but could he share with us how that report will be made available—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr WRIGHT:** Only once; I only want to hear it once—and can he confirm that there will be no election before the Auditor-General's inquiry is made available to the taxpayers of South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I certainly expect that to be the case. I repeat—and I have said so publicly for some considerable time—that the next election is scheduled for about March next year, and I have been consistent with that. In fact, this House passed a resolution for a March election in the year 2006.

**Mr FOLEY:** Why would you risk another summer, John?

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, it does not make any difference.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** So, that story will not hold up now. That's the point, isn't it?

**Mr FOLEY:** Why risk another summer?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** My point is that I have consistently said March next year. There will be a spring sitting of parliament, and the Auditor-General has indicated that that is the time frame within which he is working.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** On the same subject of the inquiry, I ask the Premier, and through him the Auditor-General, what level of contact during an inquiry is appropriate from an opposition. Associated with that, what contacts have occurred between either the leader or any of the front benchers of the opposition in respect of the inquiry? Thirdly, has there been any contact initiated not by the Auditor-General's office but by members opposite that might have sought to influence the inquiry in any way?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** If the Auditor-General wishes to respond, he may, but I would have expected, thought and believed that the Auditor would have acted independently of any of us and at all times.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** I am certainly open to listen to anybody at any time, as you may be informed of certain things, but nobody has influenced me whatsoever. I can give you an absolute assurance of that.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I suppose this is a supplementary question. It is not whether the Auditor-General had been influenced but, rather, whether there had been contact and whether there had been any effort to influence which, of course, is a totally different issue.

**Mr MacPHERSON:** Unequivocally, absolutely not.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Good; thank you.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** And there would be no doubt in my mind that the Auditor-General would, at all times, act independently.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions of the Auditor-General? If not, I declare the examination of the votes closed.

---

South Australian Tourism Commission, \$53 048 000  
Minister for Tourism—Other Items, \$6 708 000

**Witness:**

The Hon. J. Hall, Minister for Tourism.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B. Spurr, Chief Executive, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr C. D'Ortenzio, Commercial Manager, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Ms P. Del Nin, Chief Executive, Adelaide Entertainment Centre.

Mr P. Griffin, Finance Manager, Adelaide Entertainment Centre.

Mr P. van der Hoeven, Chief Executive, Adelaide Convention Centre.

Mr M. Delgado, Project Director, Adelaide Convention Centre Redevelopment.

Mr M. Elliott, Financial Controller, Adelaide Convention Centre.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed payments open. I refer members to page 15 in the Estimates Statement, volume 1, part 1 of the portfolio statements. I invite the minister to make an opening statement; then I will invite the member for Hart to make a similar statement.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The South Australian tourism industry sector has been an award winning performer over the last 12 months. In November last year, South Australian tourism operators won five national awards in Canberra which was more than New South Wales and Victoria combined, including the accolade in the major festivals and special events for our own Jacobs Creek Tour Down Under. For the second year in a row the Clipsal 500 Adelaide took out the promoter of the year award in the Shell championship series V8 super car gala dinner, and just last month Tasting Australia won a prestigious 2001 Jaguar award for excellence, recognising the substantial role this event plays in promoting Adelaide and Australia as a food and wine destination nationally and internationally.

Our Secrets domestic marketing campaign also achieved national acclaim, winning the Tourism and Leisure category of the Australian Marketing Institute's national awards in October last year. Our marketing and major events strategies are working spectacularly well in increasing visitor numbers, length of stay and expenditure. It is timely to consider the impact of this industry throughout the state. Tourism injected a staggering \$3.1 billion into our economy in 1999, and it continues to grow. Indeed, tourism is responsible for 10 per cent of the state's economic growth. The total tourism sector generates approximately two-thirds of the state's agricultural exports, and its value is similar to that of our mining exports.

Latest figures show that the state's tourism industry supports 36 000 full-time equivalent jobs, employing twice as many people as our mining industry. This makes our tourism industry as significant as the automotive sector or agricultural production in terms of employment. This

government has a number of important strategies in place to build on the growing successes of our industry and to further increase overall visitor numbers by 5 per cent in the year 2001-02. With regard to marketing, the SATC has further developed the state's competitive strengths in food and wine, nature-based tourism activities and new sectors such as cruise shipping. In a determined effort to maintain our position as the premier wine state of Australia, the SATC commissioned a cellar door research program. It found that in 1999, 940 000 visitors in South Australia visited a winery, spending \$342 million in the process.

We also know that one-third of our international and 20 per cent of our interstate visitors visit a winery during their stay. This compares most favourably to the national average of 11 per cent for international, and only 4 per cent nationally. This program was supported by the development of a number of wine trail publications to assist in better servicing this highly lucrative market.

The cruise shipping industry world wide has an estimated worth of \$17 billion per annum, and in 2000-01 a record five cruise liners docked in South Australia, bringing nearly 5 000 visitors plus more than 2 000 crew members, contributing an estimated economic benefit of \$3.4 million in export income. The national award winning Secrets domestic marketing campaign passed the two-year mark in September last year. So far this campaign has attracted more than 50 000 additional visitors from the Victorian and New South Wales markets in which it has been active. This has so far resulted in an economic net benefit of more than \$35 million to our economy. The campaign has focused on our reputation for 'the good life' and as a nature based tourism destination, and it was expanded into the south-east Queensland market for the first time late last year.

Secrets has also taken on an intrastate focus, encouraging Adelaide travellers to explore beyond the gateway of the city to discover their own backyard. Regional tourism's importance to the tourism industry is evidenced by more than 3.2 million people visiting regional South Australia until September 2000, contributing \$762 million to the regional economy. Our new tourism web site, southaustralia.com, came online in February this year, and received 92 000 hits in its first month of operation which was more than double what the old site recorded in 12 months, and about 30 per cent of these hits were from overseas. With an increasing number of would-be travellers turning to the internet for travel information, the site has the potential to increasingly expose South Australia to the worldwide market.

Events secured and supported by AME since 1994 have generated an estimated \$279 million in economic activity. Interestingly, research shows that for every dollar the state government spends on major events, \$11 is returned in increased expenditure and media exposure. In 2000-01 alone, 11 events that were sponsored or managed by AME generated an estimated economic impact of \$33.2 million. The SATC is taking the lead and is celebrating Australia's Year of the Outback and the International Year of Ecotourism in 2002, and I will be extremely happy to provide some more detail on these events later.

The year 2002 will also see South Australia celebrating Encounter 2002, held from January to April next year, which is an event with unique opportunities to celebrate the bicentenary of the Flinders and Baudin expeditions. Associated with Encounter 2002 will be the development of a number of Encounter trails in and around the coastal communities, as well as a number of unique and special events, celebrations

and commemorative landmarks developed through the Encounter community grants program.

In a major coup for our state—and I am sure we all know—we have won our bid to host the World Police and Fire Games in 2007 in Adelaide. Our staging of this spectacular international sporting event will enhance our reputation as a premier major events destination and generate additional tourism spending. A conservative estimate of 10 000 competitors, plus families and event tourists from more than 50 countries around the world, we estimate will have an economic impact in the order of \$30 million for our state.

Other recent and significant major events bid victories include: Australia and New Zealand Police Games in 2005; Australian Duathlon Championship held just last weekend, plus 2002 and 2003; Australian University Games in 2001 and 2006; Southern Regional University Games in 2003; Women's World Cup Golf at the end of this year; and Australian National BMX Championships in 2003, 2004 and 2005. The SATC also administers a regional events and festivals program which allocates \$600 000 to support another 60 events across all 12 state tourism regions in 2000-01, including a number of well-known events such as the Bartercard Glenelg Jazz Festival, Barossa Vintage Festival, Coober Pedy Opal Festival, and so on.

In relation to infrastructure and building for the future, the government is helping to build for the future by providing funding support for first-class tourism infrastructure. As we know, we are preparing for the imminent completion of the Adelaide Convention Centre expansion and the National Wine Centre, and hopefully a resolution of the Adelaide Airport upgrade, plus the Adelaide to Darwin rail link project and the many tourism opportunities that that will present. In 1987, Australia's convention and exhibition industry was worth \$450 million, but just 12 years later in 1999 South Australia's industry alone was worth a staggering \$540 million. The value of this industry to our economy is clearly apparent and is further support for this government's investment in the upgrades and expansion of the Adelaide Convention Centre.

The Adelaide Entertainment Centre has faced a challenging year with both the Olympics and a lower Australian dollar reducing international touring activity across Australia. However, through entrepreneurial product and further developing the niche functions market, the management of the centre has moved to insulate itself from the uncertainties of the international touring market. We are also investing heavily in our tourism regions—infrastructure and roads—for example, Yorke Peninsula and Kangaroo Island, where last month I opened the final link of the complete sealed ring-route around the island. We have initiated a highly visible tourism signage program throughout regional South Australia and upgraded airstrips and basic amenities throughout the far north and outback.

Success as a tourism destination relies upon vision, planning and a commitment to invest in our future. More tourist roads, airstrips, visitor centres, attractions and developments are being opened up than ever before. Our government has laid a strong foundation for successful public and private sector partnerships and is determined to work on the 'catch-up' needs of additional tourism infrastructure.

In relation to accolades and challenges, without doubt our tourism industry has been one of the state's great success stories in recent years, with visitor growth impacting positively on employment and the economy. We now have operators who approach tourism as a serious business, who

know and seek to satisfy the expectations of today's travellers who, themselves, are extremely spoilt for choices and who are more informed and more discerning than ever before. We are fortunate also that we have a great team at the SATC led by Chief Executive, Bill Spurr. We have an impressive team of people at the Adelaide Convention Centre led by Pieter van der Hoeven, the Adelaide Entertainment Centre by Pamela Del Nin and Andrew Daniels at the Motorsport Board.

In addition to these individuals and their teams, I pay tribute and thank the board members of the SATC, the Adelaide Convention Centre, the Adelaide Entertainment Centre and the Motorsport Board, plus the Wine and Tourism Advisory Board, for their personal commitment and support—their efforts are greatly valued. We should not lose sight of the fact that tourism is the largest and fastest growing industry sector in the world, and, as such, it is a fiercely competitive market, with much of our real competition for future growth coming from overseas, not necessarily interstate.

This government has a number of strategies in place to grow beyond our current success and stay ahead of the competition. In finalising my remarks, I refer to the December 2000 five year outlook report produced by Access Economics, a leading firm of economic forecasters, which says:

South Australia has some claim to being Australia's untold success story of the past few years.

Our tourism industry sector is enjoying unprecedented success. I passionately believe that investment in this industry will benefit South Australia's economic and employment future.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the member for Hart have an opening statement?

**Mr FOLEY:** Absolutely. Limited to the extent that it is—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise to the minister for my poor attempt at humour at the beginning of the night—I thought I could try to lighten things up a little. The only point I make is that the opposition clearly acknowledges the very important role of tourism in our economy and the work of the Tourism Commission, a product of—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Just control yourself. As I was saying, the Tourism Commission is a product of the Leader of the Opposition in his time in government, and clearly a body which works very hard and which does a very good job in promoting tourism for South Australia—no argument at all from the opposition in that regard. Whilst the minister and I have many a political difference, it would be churlish of me not to acknowledge the passion and endeavour in the way in which the minister applies herself to her portfolio.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** Clearly, some issues that we will get to during the course of the night will make the minister think that I am a bit of a hypocrite for making that comment. Prior to the dinner break, we are looking at the Convention Centre, the Entertainment Centre and I assume also the Office of Venue Management, which is an interesting body and about which I would like to ask a few questions shortly on how it operates. Firstly, whilst I am the shadow tourism minister, as the minister knows, I am also the shadow treasurer and I would like to raise some matters relating to financing the

Convention Centre's major capital works upgrade, which at this stage is running over budget. Will the minister confirm the amount of over expenditure expected with the venue? I note in the capital works budget that the Convention Centre is still listed as a total cost of \$85 million. However, that cost is subject to revision and at this stage I think we are looking at about \$6 million. Will the minister confirm the final cost as best she can?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I cannot confirm the final cost, and the member for Hart would understand why, but at the moment our estimate is between \$5 million and \$7 million, which is somewhere between 6 per cent and 9 per cent over the original projected figure of \$85 million.

**Mr FOLEY:** Will the minister advise how the cost overrun is being provided for in the forward estimates, given that it is still listed as \$85 million? Have the forward estimates of the capital works budget been adjusted to take account of that cost overrun?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am sure the member for Hart will be interested to know that some time in the next week or so a special submission will be taken to cabinet to address how to handle the additional money that will be required for the completion of the Convention Centre. At this stage, I am sure he would understand that it is impossible for us to put a figure on it until the building is complete and we have taken control of it at the end of September. We have put our best estimates together at the moment and that will be encapsulated in a cabinet submission taken and resolved in the next couple of weeks.

**Mr FOLEY:** Clearly, there will be contingencies within either the minister's budget line or the Treasurer's to provide for that cost overrun. Is that the matter to which the minister is alluding?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am not too sure how the Treasurer expects to handle that at this stage, but I am sure the shadow treasurer will be questioning me or the Treasurer some time in the next few weeks about the method of payment. As I said, the member would be aware that, until the building is complete, our best estimates at this stage are what I have discussed publicly and it will go to cabinet in the next couple of weeks.

**Mr FOLEY:** I must say from the outset that the opposition acknowledges the work of Pieter and the team at the Convention Centre, given the strategic importance to our economic development of the upgraded Convention Centre. I might add that it was another Labor government initiative, as members would recall, which has proven quite successful. We certainly welcome the upgrade and look forward to it, but I am sure that members would appreciate our interest in ensuring that it is delivered as closely as possible to budget. Can the minister confirm that the opening date of the extensions will be 28 September, and will he say who will be opening the Convention Centre?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The opening date is Friday 28 September. On Saturday the 29th there are a number of formal and official functions, and the whole weekend will be a weekend of celebrations and activities throughout the centre.

**Mr FOLEY:** Do you know who is opening it? I assume it would be the Premier, and I would not begrudge him the opportunity to open it.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The Premier will be doing the official opening, and some of the first invitations have started to go out. I am sure that the member for Hart, if he is free, will be delighted to join us.

**Mr FOLEY:** If I get an invitation. I do not normally get one from things to do with the Tourism Commission.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** That is most unfair and the honourable member knows it.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** In light of the fact that we have been discussing the Convention Centre rebuild, will the minister elaborate on the information on page 1.38 of volume 1, budget paper 5, which outlines the financial plan for the Convention Centre; and will she tell us what benefits the project is likely to bring to South Australia now and in the future? What return will we get on this fabulous investment?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** It seems to me that the Convention Centre extensions are already starting to become an important part of our landscape. As I noted in my opening remarks, the general convention industry in Australia in 1987 was worth \$450 million and now, just 12 years later, in South Australia alone that figure is \$540 million. It is quite extraordinary. I have to say that Pieter van der Hoeven and his team down at the Convention Centre have done a stunning job. The fact that it is now for the second consecutive year in the top 10 convention centres in the world says a great deal for the way in which it operates.

Interestingly, for every \$10 that is spent locally for each conference delegate only \$1 is actually directed towards conference expenses. The remaining 90 per cent of the expenditure is directed towards accommodation, shopping, restaurants and entertainment, so one can see that the benefits for the state are very widespread. It is forecast that the economic benefit by 2005-06 will be \$57 million.

Some of the benefits in terms of employment thus far have been extraordinary, but so are some of the predictions. For 2005-06, it is estimated that the Convention Centre will have created an additional 970 jobs, and by 2010-11 an extra 1 700 jobs, and I think that is pretty impressive. The actual jobs that have been created during the construction phase number around 500, and the total jobs that are supported, including those of suppliers, is around 1 250.

There has been some recent research from Barry Burgan of Economic Research Consultants which estimates that the incomes generated within this state will pay back the capital costs of this investment within three years. But the benefits do not stop there. Since the project's inception, the Convention Centre has secured new business worth in excess of \$120 million, and the new centre already has an occupancy rate of 90 per cent for the first nine months after the new facility is operational, and new bookings are already being taken for 2012.

A number of the conventions that we have secured could not have been accommodated without the expanded space, and I would like to mention just a couple. We have the Australian Wine Industry Technical Conference later this year; the International Wine Conference, again later this year; the World Congress of Information and Technology that we have all been hearing so much about, for next year; Newways Convention, again next year; the Microsoft Technology Education 2002 Conference; the Aged and Community Services National Conference; World Lotteries; the International Federation of University Women Conference in 2004; International Paediatric Nephrology Association, 2004; International Federation of Social Workers World Congress, 2004; and the World Congress of the International Society of Surgery in 2007.

None of those conferences or conventions could have been won by South Australia without the expanded facilities that we have. There are a couple of interesting statistics that I am

sure the members for Waite, Schubert and Colton will be interested to know. The space down at the new centre would enable you, if you were of a mind, to park a jumbo jet in the main hall of the Convention Centre. It is quite an extraordinary facility. The extended facilities will provide more than 10 000 square metres of pillarless floor space, and the banquet facility will be able to accommodate more than 4 000 guests.

The new kitchen, as I understand it, is the largest kitchen operating rationale equipment in the world and has the capacity to produce 27 000 meals a day: 9 000 meals per sitting can be produced within 20 minutes. It is quite an extraordinary convention facility, and I am sure that we will be very proud of it over the coming months.

It is evident that one of the main aspects of the Convention Centre is the fact that it now operates and is part of a very exciting riverbank precinct. We have talked about the opening in September, and I believe that this is a grand opportunity to thank everyone who has been involved in trying to get this rather special building finished on time.

It has been quite a feat, when you look at some of the issues that we had to confront during the extremely hot months of December, January and February. To still be able to say here quite confidently that we will be able to open it on time is amazing, and I pay a tribute to all those who have been involved.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Seeking further elaboration on that, I note that there are some fairly interesting looking construction techniques have been applied in building the centre. Will the minister give more detail on that construction approach and talk about the success of that new technology?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The collaborative approach that has been used to construct the Convention Centre is, I understand, the first of its kind in South Australia. It has, so people tell me with great pride, enabled the delivery of the highest quality construction with no compromise to the design integrity of the building. It is a process that was used to set an excellent precedent for the rest of the industry and future government projects within the state. I would have to say it has involved a very steep learning curve for all in the industry and government who have been involved in this process. Essentially, it was decided to use this collaborative approach because of its being a large building with a significant budget sited on one of our most visible CBD locations. It was the first project to adopt the new Riverbank principles, as we know, with the sweeping design facing the river and not turning its back on it. It promotes pedestrian movement along North Terrace through to the river with the construction of a very generous north-south pedestrian link. We should all be very pleased that that will happen because of the very friendly entry and access point, contrasting somewhat with the rather confused access point that we have now at the Hyatt.

I suspect that the collaborative approach is something we will all hear more about in the future, with significant state government projects. It facilitates all the stakeholders working together and it is meant to remove the conflict that is so common in traditional contracts. The project team tells me that had we adopted the conventional method of delivery there was no way that this project would have been able to be delivered on time. The collaborative approach changes the culture from one of adversity and conflict to a more collaborative environment of no blame and common goals. It is seen to be an innovative approach, and essentially it means that the project contractor plays an important role in owning the project and its objectives, such as time, quality and cost. The

key difference from the traditional contract is that the collaboration process enables the contractor to use the construction expertise in issues of design, management and time and quality.

In terms of progress, all trade works or packages have now been tendered for, and as we know the construction program is well advanced, because we are nearly 90 per cent through construction. The project has a number of work faces, and approximately 250 construction workers are still on site. It has successfully met key milestones so far, such as the completion of the new kitchens by February 2001. It was a major logistical feat, and the completion of interface works allowed a major function to be held in the exhibition hall in March, just a couple of months ago.

I could go into some of the difficulties that have been experienced on the site. We know that we had the hottest summer for more than 100 years, with more than 14 days where the temperature was over 37 degrees, when the work site had to be closed down. I could discuss many other aspects of the convention centre because there is immense pride in what has been achieved so far. You might like to know that they have already taken their 9 000th booking, which means that we now average over 500 bookings per year. It is fair to say that there is a general view that the collaborative approach that has been used has been very successful. The level of ownership by all members of the project team is very positive, and it is fair to say that the team is very pleased with the results so far. We will see and hear more over the coming months.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I refer to volume I, page 1.41, concerning the Entertainment Centre. From a quick look at the figures I would have to congratulate you on increasing the sales of goods and services, which is a good result. I notice that, although costs there have gone up, they have not gone up proportionately, so obviously the bottom line has improved even without the grant revenue, and that is commendable. I would be interested in the minister's description of what the future holds, what the plans are for the Entertainment Centre and our future strategy to build on that success of the past 12 months financially and in all other respects.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Like all entertainment centres around Australia, the Adelaide Entertainment Centre has faced a pretty challenging past 12 months, because the core business of the centre, which is essentially international touring acts, has been affected by three very important factors: the Olympic Games, the low Australian dollar and the introduction of the GST. Touring was disrupted both pre and post Olympics, and the exchange rate has had an extraordinary impact on the profitability levels for tour promoters. These factors are affecting not only the Adelaide Entertainment Centre but are also noticeable across the country. Despite this, I think the Adelaide Entertainment Centre has managed to stage some spectacular concerts, and that is a tribute to the versatility of the Entertainment Centre.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Yes, you are doing a great job. I think it is fair to say that Pamela Del Nin and the team at the entertainment centre have had probably one of their toughest years in terms of coping with the economic environment, but despite that they have had an amazing set of highlights. These include Bardot, Superstars of Wrestling, the Rock Eisteddfod, The Cure, John Farnham, Matchbox 20, ACDC, the Wiggles, The Desperate and Dateless Ball, Petula Clark, Deep Purple, Bob Dylan, Kiss, the Clipsal 500 Dinner Gala Evening and

Kylie Minogue who, as usual, proved to be extraordinarily popular.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am delighted. I cannot confess to having attended either concert; obviously, I had something else on. That is a tribute to the very innovative approach that the centre's management has taken this year, which has included taking on a promoter role. Due to the fact that fewer acts are touring Australia, the AEC, in conjunction with similar venues throughout the country, has had to undertake more of an entrepreneurial role and to create product to stage at the centre. I understand that Petula Clark in cabaret was an excellent example of that. I do not know whether the member for Hart enjoyed it but I am told that many people did. This cabaret style show included (so I am told, but perhaps the member for Hart might be able to give us a few more details) a pre-performance dinner on the floor of the centre with Petula Clark, who then performed to both dinner guests and show-only guests. The feedback from the event has been extremely promising.

I am told that another highlight of the centre's performances this year has been the strong functions calendar. The AEC management has diversified the business base of the centre by developing very much a niche functions market. The Rubicon Room and Spotlights function centre provide excellent venues for weddings, other functions and even pre-performance dinners. By developing this niche market the AEC is moving to insulate itself against the fluctuations of the international touring market, which is outside its control. The event activity is again expected to remain at the levels experienced in 2000-01, so it is important that the AEC continue its excellent push into becoming more entrepreneurial with events and capitalising on its niche in the functions area. In conclusion, as the member for Hart reminded me earlier, members may be interested to know that this year marks the 10th anniversary of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. I hope we will all be supportive and engaged in some of its celebrations over the next 12 months. I suspect that everyone in the chamber would join me in wishing the centre a very happy anniversary and congratulating it and its management team on their excellent work to date.

**Mr FOLEY:** I remember when Johnny Farnham launched it many years ago. Before I hand over to the member for Lee I want to say that I was at the convention centre on Saturday night for a fabulous, historic night—the Magpie Team of the Century. Peter, your staff did an excellent job on the night. I pass on to them my congratulations on their extraordinary, outstanding service. There were 1 100 people, and it was catering of superb excellence. How they cater for so many people so quickly and efficiently is beyond me, but it was an excellent night.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Minister, I have a couple of questions in the area of Office of Venue Management. You would be aware, I suspect, that the opposition has a draft copy of an agreement between the minister's Office of Venue Management and the South Australian Soccer Federation, prepared in February of this year, regarding the management of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The agreement states that the Adelaide Force has failed to pay any of the hiring fees for National Soccer League games played at the stadium in the 2000-01 season, and that the Soccer Federation is unable to pay for the costs of operating and managing the stadium. The agreement also states that the Office of Venue Management will take over management of the Hindmarsh stadium, together with all the debts accumulated by the Soccer

Federation, in relation to the operation and management of the stadium. Has an agreement between the Office of Venue Management and the Soccer Federation now been signed; and, if so, does it contain the elements contained in the draft agreement?

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Ms Pamela Martin, Director, Commercial Advice, Department of the Premier and Cabinet

**The Hon. J. HALL:** What the member for Lee may not be aware of is that the Office of Venue Management is not assigned to me until 1 July, and the negotiations that have been taking place have been the responsibility of the Deputy Premier. Ms Martin has been involved in those negotiations, and I will ask her to give you some details on this.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Some of the details related to the financial aspect with respect to the Adelaide Force and also the Soccer Federation not being able to pay their financial commitments during the 2000-01 season.

**Ms MARTIN:** The government has been dealing with both the Soccer Federation and Adelaide City Force in an attempt to resolve the issues that have arisen down at the stadium. The stadium's finances were based on three teams playing there: that was a rugby team that went broke, the other soccer team that seems to have disappeared and the Adelaide City Force. Adelaide City Force has been in parlous circumstances. I can take on notice who exactly entered into the agreement. I think the Deputy Premier signed on behalf of government with the Soccer Federation in relation to the management of the stadium but I will check that and let you know when that was signed.

The Office of Venue Management was set up to be the administrative unit that would do that, because the deal with the Soccer Federation was an isolated deal, and it has rights to purchase back the management of the stadium if it can make it work and if it can pay back to government all that has been spent on it. So, we wanted the costs isolated into one unit. There has been an agreement signed, and the Office of Venue Management is at present administering the stadium, although that is quite a difficult matter.

The Adelaide City Force has paid for some services for the stadium this year: I believe it has paid the Venue-Tix costs payable each match. There is a set fee for the match and they have not yet paid the balance of the fees. There is an arrangement in place with government that when other amounts due to the soccer club from government get paid, those amounts will be deducted out of them. I am afraid it is all connected.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Can I be advised of the total debt accumulated by the soccer federation which has or will be forgiven by the government? Can we have a figure with respect to the arrangement that has come to pass with regard to debt of the soccer federation?

**Ms MARTIN:** I can get that information for you, but I do not know what it is at the minute.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I will interrupt at this stage and give a commitment to the member for Lee that the Deputy Premier is the minister who has been handling these negotiations. I am happy on his behalf to take that question on notice and give you access to whatever material he has negotiated.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I am seeking your guidance, sir. Is it more appropriate to ask these questions of the Deputy Premier?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair would suggest it is and the opportunity will be provided tomorrow.



**Mr WRIGHT:** I am happy to take up that invitation, so perhaps we can pursue this line of questioning tomorrow.

**Mr FOLEY:** In relation to the World IT Congress on Conventions that is happening in February next year, is it correct that the government is underwriting that event in excess of \$10 million?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Again, the minister in charge of that conference is the Minister for Government Enterprises, Dr Michael Armitage, and that is the appropriate minister to whom to direct that question.

**Mr FOLEY:** The portfolio statement on page 1.38 shows a continuing decline in the net asset value of the Entertainment Centre by \$1.8 million per year. The government's green book—the budget bid by all ministers—leaked to the opposition in an ongoing process, where we have access to the highest level of information within government on a need-to-know regular basis—and we can always get our leaks out of cabinet normally within two or three weeks, sometimes within 12 hours—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! It would be helpful to the committee if the member for Schubert did not speak at this particular time.

**Mr FOLEY:** I do not think you want to touch me up on leaks; I have had some interesting experiences. The green book that was leaked to us—the first time in the state's history that an entire budget bid was leaked; and I can assure you there will be none of that in a Labor government—includes bids by ministers for funding of initiatives. The minister bid for \$40 million in that process for an upgrade of the Entertainment Centre but was unsuccessful—and, before I give anyone any room to move, I cannot for one moment give any indication that the next tourism minister will be any more successful. Can the minister comment on her views on the current state of the Entertainment Centre and how serious this issue is in terms of the ongoing viability of the centre?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I can see that the member for Hart is clearly approaching the dinner break and in need of a drink because his sense of humour is getting somewhat warped as we get to 6 o'clock. In terms of the Entertainment Centre itself, it is no secret that there has been some ongoing discussion for a number of years about the future of the Investigator Science and Technology Centre. There are differing views as to where it should be located. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has given a commitment to support the Investigator Science and Technology Centre, and that has been loudly trumpeted by various committees and individuals. I do not know to what the member for Hart is referring when he says 'before anyone gets excited about the future'.

In relation to my bid for \$40 million, the member for Hart would be well aware, if he read the document, that that included an amalgamated centre or amalgamated site for the Investigator Science and Technology Centre itself and an upgrade and rejig of the Entertainment Centre. Again, if the honourable member read the document, he would have observed that \$29 million of the \$40 million was for the Investigator Science and Technology Centre itself. In terms of capital upgrade of the Entertainment Centre, the honourable member would be well aware that it is 10 years on and the whole future operation and aspects of the building must be reviewed and will be over the next few years. As it relates to the Investigator Science and Technology Centre, I do not know what commitment the Leader of the Opposition has given as to where he would like to see it go. A number of

people think it should go to the Entertainment Centre. Certainly, board members have a different view as to where it should be, and I guess it will be an ongoing debate for some time in the future.

**Ms THOMPSON:** My question refers to the Convention Centre and the Riverbank promenade development. What would have been the impact on the Convention Centre had the Riverbank promenade development not proceeded?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The Riverbank promenade project is the responsibility of the Treasurer, so I do not want to comment too much on that. I am on the Riverbank committee, and I would have thought that some of the material and information which I have provided already to the committee about the success of the Convention Centre thus far shows that it is a great centre and a great catalyst for the development of the Riverbank project. I think it is an exciting project—although I know the member for Reynell has differing views on that. So far, community consultation and support from all the stakeholders involved in it indicates that it will be a magnificent project for the state, and certainly it will have a new centre and focus in the city as it progresses. The interest in the whole centre is great. I believe probably it would not have been given the impetus to proceed had the Convention Centre not been enjoying so much success, as it clearly is.

**Ms THOMPSON:** We all agree the Convention Centre has been a great success and we recognise the need for extensions. There is some difference of opinion about the extent of the extensions. There was some discussion earlier about the height of the ceiling being critical to the expense of the Convention Centre extensions and some debate about the value of having, I think, an 11 metre ceiling instead of a nine metre ceiling. My recollection is that going from to an 11 metre ceiling, or whatever it is we have, added about \$10 million to the cost of the Convention Centre. Of those conventions that we are pleased to welcome to the state, how many will be using the full ceiling height?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I will ask Peter van der Hoeven to answer some of those details.

**Mr VAN DER HOEVEN:** I will not name some of those conventions because we are in final negotiations with them. There are three. One, in particular, is an exhibition that is currently being booked with us for five consecutive years, and this particular exhibition would not have come to us if we had not had this ceiling height. But for the client who does not want at this stage to make public that this event is going to occur, I will keep that for a later date.

Having said that, I believe that many of the other larger exhibitions, as part of the conventions currently booked, are a result of being able to supply them with enough space for ceiling height so that they can build specialist stands rather than the normal nine by nine stands.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I thank Peter van der Hoeven for those remarks and add one thing for the member for Reynell. Mr Manuel Delgado has reminded me that the height of the Convention Centre, as we currently have it built, is an agreed international standard height for a certain number of international conventions, and once you go lower than that you wipe off the rest of them.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I want to make one quick point. I am not sure whether it is appropriate that I ask you, sir, to do it, but it is critically important tomorrow that when the opposition comes to ask questions about the soccer stadium we are not given advice such as, 'You cannot find a budget line in this particular area' and/or 'I do not have the appropriate advis-

ers.' We have taken your advice in good faith, sir. There is a series of questions that we want to ask about the soccer stadium. Could I request that the Deputy Premier be made aware of that? We have taken your advice on good faith, sir.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Additional Departmental Adviser:**

Mr A. Daniels, Chief Executive, South Australian Motorsport Board.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I remind the committee that we are dealing with the proposed payments relating to the South Australian Tourism Commission.

**Mr FOLEY:** I have a number of questions tonight as I endeavour to work through the minister's budget. I am sure that the minister has been put under sufficient scrutiny that the public can have confidence in her administration of the tourism portfolio. I refer to page 1.34 in the Portfolio Statement in budget paper 5 and the performance of the South Australian Tourism Commission. Looking at the 2000-01 budget, there seems to have been a blow-out in the budget for this financial year. Can the minister explain the apparent estimated result for budget year 2000-01 where there is a \$5.5 million blow-out?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I presume the member for Hart is referring to page 1.34?

**Mr FOLEY:** That is it—other supplies and services, budget \$44.75 million.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am sure the member for Hart will be delighted to know that in fact it is not a blow-out—I know those words are used quite loosely occasionally. It is carry-over funds from the previous year committed to infrastructure spending but the bills had not been paid before 30 June.

**Mr FOLEY:** I will accept that because it seems quite a reasonable explanation. Let us look at your office.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Yes, certainly.

**Mr FOLEY:** I did not realise the question was such a problem. As there has been a significant increase in your budget for the forthcoming period, can you please explain the reasons for such a significant increase in funding for your ministerial office.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am assuming the member for Hart is referring to the minister's office and the figures 661, 777 and 543?

**Mr FOLEY:** That sounds right to me.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The increase for 2001-02 is an additional staff member for the operation and admin. of the office.

**Mr FOLEY:** A supplementary question, sir, if I may. How many new advisers have you hired in the past 12 months?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I replaced one of my advisers who left. At the time of the estimates committees last year, I think I had one adviser and I now have two—Mr Chris Argent and Mr Michael Clark—and Miss Amanda Price, who is on secondment from the Tourism Commission and was with the infrastructure unit, who handles the increase in infrastructure funding and some of the specific tourism projects.

**Mr FOLEY:** I am interested in the total cost of the tourism budget for television and newspaper advertising placed within South Australia and the contributions to the production of television programs and feature articles. As the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, it is with some concern that the opposition has noted that the taxpayers of

South Australia are currently paying for the production and delivery of television product on Channel 7 for the *Discover* program, Channel 9 for *Directions* and *Postcards* and now we find that Channel 10 gets a crack at it with a youth program at 4.30 p.m. on Saturday. I have to say that I am not too sure how many young people would be sitting at home glued to the television at 4.30 p.m. on Saturday. If they are, one would prefer them to be outdoors. It is a concerning development in the way government operates and something that the opposition, should we be fortunate enough to win the next election—and I acknowledge that there is only a slight chance that we could—we would want some hard evidence and facts as to the benefits of the quite extraordinary largesse provided to our commercial television stations here. You are clearly prepared for the question, and it may well be in the case of *Postcards* and *Discover* that some argument could well be put forward that it is a reasonable use of taxpayers' money. I am not sure that such an argument could be mounted for *Directions* and the nonsense on Channel 10. I would be interested to hear your advice to this committee on that matter.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am absolutely delighted to respond to this question because it is something about which I feel particularly strongly. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has expressed specifically the views that he has about the programs *Discover* and *Postcards*. There a number of reasons why I think he is wrong and why I hope I can persuade the opposition of the virtue of continuing to support that investment in the sponsorship and support of those programs.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. HALL:** No, I am not. You always talk about bipartisan support and I am hoping that will continue. The reason that sponsorship of those programs is so important is, first, they are produced and made here in South Australia, and that is a very important component for us to recall. Equally, there is no doubt that tourism in this state is undergoing a huge increase and great success at the moment. One of the reasons—and the reasons are complex—is that South Australians are learning and understanding more about the great product we have here. In the 1998 calendar year, 3.7 million South Australians travelled within their own state but by December of last year that figure had jumped to 3.8 million, which is an increase of 200 000 South Australians travelling around their state in just two years. That increase, I contend, is 5 per cent in our state against a 3 per cent national decline. As I said, the reasons are many and complex, but I contend that marketing what we have here in South Australia to South Australians in conjunction with a whole range of other activities is important.

For example, in relation to the *Postcards* and *Discover* television programs, our involvement with them is through sponsorship, story ideas and staff. Their ratings show how important a component they are to the success of our tourism. I will come back to the amount of money that is invested which is divided between the marketing budget and regional budgets. I am sure the member for Hart knows—and I imagine that the member for Lee knows about this—that the Bracks government in Victoria believes that there are significant benefits in sponsoring such programs. They are so enthusiastic—and we are talking about a Labor government—that they have committed \$250 000 to their *Postcards* equivalent program and in a news release of 18 February the Victorian tourism minister said:

This program will also give us the opportunity to promote the new Victorian website 'visitvictoria.com'.

He goes on to say that 'the exposure that the program provides for Victorian tourism is valuable' and that the 'return on this investment is considerable'. I am sure that the opposition would agree that *Postcards* and *Discover* are enormously popular television programs. *Postcards* has an average weekly audience of between 150 000 and 200 000 viewers. *Discover* has an audience of between 120 000 and 150 000 viewers per week. *Discover*, which was only launched late in 1988, last month recorded its largest audience, peaking at 200 000 viewers and averaging over 189 000 for the episode on 26 May. The program has achieved a season high of 45 per cent of viewers for the time slot and is ranked 16th in the list of the week's most watched programs, placing it ahead of *Better Homes and Gardens* and *The Great Outdoors*. Since 31 March *Discover* has achieved an average viewing audience of 140 000 throughout metropolitan Adelaide.

One of the reasons that those figures are very important is that the tourism operators featuring on those programs tell the most extraordinary stories about what it does for their acceptability and to their number of telephone inquiries for days, weeks and, in some cases, months following. The Leader of the Opposition has not inquired about a matter about which I am very enthusiastic, namely, our support for the *Out and About* segment of the *Advertiser* which appears, as I am sure members know, on the last Friday of every month. That reaches 55 per cent of South Australians who want to spend their holiday time in South Australia and has a readership of 148 000. I think our involvement and sponsorship with *Out and About* is extraordinarily important, and the figures prove that. The SATC provides funds for an advertising package which includes a monthly editorial feature. We provide photographs and price-based travel packages for that particular segment and we have budgeted to continue our sponsorship and involvement with the *Out and About* program in the coming 12 months.

The commission is also investing part of its intrastate marketing budget on the FiveAA metropolitan radio station which has a potential average audience of 155 000 listeners over the age of 18. I am sure the opposition understands why we consider that the reason it is so important to keep up that sort of sponsorship is the intrastate tourism market which is worth roughly \$1 billion, and that is very commendable. However, South Australians are still spending \$870 million outside our borders. We believe that our support of this type of program and the exposure it gives South Australians to what they have in their own back yard is very important and, whilst the minister would like to pull 20 per cent of that \$870 million back here into South Australia, the commission has said that, realistically, I should be satisfied with 10 per cent in the first year. However, we will keep pushing on that.

I think that the value and complexities of promoting our own product inside our own state must be understood, plus the fact that, in my view, it is very important for us to have two local programs produced in South Australia. The objective of both Channel 9 and Channel 7, I imagine, would be to sell and swap components of both of those programs with their interstate counterparts when they do wrap-ups at the end of the year. Channel 7 goes through parts of Asia.

I urge the member for Hart and the member for Lee to try to persuade the Leader of the Opposition that expressing concern about the investment in these programs is actually

not a sensible thing, because it is very valuable. I imagine that the tourism operators of this state would be able to provide sufficient information as to the damage that would be done to their businesses and to the industry generally if the sponsorship and support of those programs were discontinued, for whatever reason.

**Mr FOLEY:** Unlike the current Treasurer, who is clearly a soft touch, on the off chance that there is a Labor government after the next election, I can assure you that the Labor minister for tourism will have to give a better show than that when confronting me for a bilateral discussion about the tourism budget because, as somebody who will be the chair of the Labor's razor gang, they would want to put in a bit better performance when trying to justify the expenditure of taxpayers' money on four commercial television stations.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the member for Hart have a question?

**Mr FOLEY:** In all of that, you have not answered the question: what is the expenditure on the *Discover* and *Postcards* programs?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I apologise. I get so enthusiastic about the success we are enjoying in the tourism industry that I forgot to give the figures. *Postcards* receives a total sponsorship package of \$95 000—

**Mr CONDOUS:** For how long?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** That is for the 12 months.

*Mr Condous interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Yes—and *Discover* receives \$100 000. Essentially, 50 per cent of that is from straight out of the SATC marketing budget and the other 50 per cent is contributed by the regions and their marketing budgets.

**Mr FOLEY:** That is a better answer. You should put those numbers up at the beginning, not at the end.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I forgot, because I get so excited about the results we are getting. In case the member for Hart chips me for not giving him the other figure, we sponsor the *Out and About* insert in the *Advertiser* on Fridays to the amount of about \$90 000, which works out to be about \$7 500 per region over the 12 months.

**Mr FOLEY:** Does it cost \$95 000 for a full year of the *Discover* program?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** It is \$95 000 for *Postcards* and \$100 000 for *Discover*.

**Mr FOLEY:** That is the full-year cost, and the station picks up the balance?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** And other advertisers. *Discover* would not have started without our initial commitment to sponsor. Of course, the significant sponsorship that the SATC has provided has enabled them to sell advertising to get the program to air, and then clearly the advertisers are seeing the benefit of the big reach, and the audience speaks for itself.

**Mr FOLEY:** It costs much less than the *Directions* program, and that is one I can assure the minister is right in our sights.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** As I am sure the member for Hart knows, that is not my responsibility.

**Mr FOLEY:** I know, but that is a cost counted in the millions.

**Mr VENNING:** We all would agree that the *Postcards* and *Discover* programs are absolutely fantastic. I cannot believe we are getting those programs for the figures the minister quoted. Why are these programs not made available in video or disc form? Apparently they are not. The programs are so good that it is a pity to be able to see them only once

and not have them available for purchase in video form. That could be the loss of an excellent opportunity.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** As I would imagine is increasingly becoming more obvious, the programs are strictly commercial operations. I would be very happy to raise on behalf of the member the possibility of these programs being made available. One thing the SATC does not do is interfere with the program. We make sure that we provide any amount of material and story ideas from our operators through our public relations unit. However, in terms of editorial content and interference, it is strictly a no-no and we would not be involved. I am happy to raise that issue with them.

**Mr VENNING:** I raised that matter with Keith Conlon a few weeks ago, and it was apparent that people are willing to buy them. I refer to Budget Paper 5, volume 1, page 1.22. How has the South Australian Tourism Commission worked to ensure that all South Australia continues to foster its reputation as a premium wine and nature-based tourism destination?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The member for Schubert is well known for his absolute passion for his area, and we understand that the Barossa is an extremely important component of the electorate of Schubert. It is interesting to note that the South Australian Tourism Commission's product development unit was originally set up to develop and enhance specific sectors of the tourism industry. Obviously, one of the most important aspects of that is to continue to make sure that South Australia is the premier wine tourism and nature-based tourism state. We have been working very closely with these industries throughout the state.

The member for Schubert would know that in late 1999 I established the Wine Tourism Advisory Board specifically to identify strategies for future growth and to implement and leverage off the recommendations of the national wine tourism strategy. We all know that South Australia produces 50 per cent of Australia's wine and a staggering 70 per cent of our nation's exports. Members would not therefore be surprised to know that one of the first initiatives of the Wine Tourism Advisory Board was to support the research to look at wine tourism in South Australia. Some of the figures that have come out of it have been absolutely fascinating and impressive for us, because 37 per cent of international visitors to South Australia visit one or more of our wineries, and that is very much higher than the national average of 11 per cent. Given that the Wine Centre will be opening soon, I am sure that it will add together with some of the great results from the cellar door research.

The research was conducted into the five major wine regions of the state, and it showed that, in 1999, 940 000 visitors in South Australia went to a winery, and they spent \$342 million in the process. So, the research provided us with a snapshot of what wine tourists want and what they expect. It has given us a benchmark from which to increase our focus on wine tourism.

It was also found from this research that 78 per cent of cellar door visitors are day trippers, and the remaining 22 per cent are overnight visitors. So, it is not surprising that 90 per cent visit the cellar door for wine tasting, and 80 per cent want to purchase wine. Of course, they are very important figures for the wine regions to take advantage of. An interesting range of other factors influences the region, including spending quality time with a partner or seeing nature and natural attractions. However, we will not go into some of those details, because it might take up too much time.

The last point I would like to bring to the attention of the member for Schubert is that in terms of the opportunities for South Australia it has become increasingly obvious that our international wine reputation and the opportunities in nature-based tourism are great opportunities to grow the tourism industry significantly in the future. So, if you put together wine-based tourism with all the nature-based tourism such as the Year of the Outback, Year of Ecotourism, and so on, you will have great competition coming from our state in the future. In the interests of time, I shall not pursue some of the other aspects of what I could say in reply to that question.

**Mr VENNING:** That was a brilliant answer, because the industry is booming, and we can all share in that. The minister and her department had a large part to play in that. In this morning's media it was stated that the wine industry and the wine regions are the most trusted in our community. I refer to Budget Paper 5, volume 1, pages 1 to 20. What is the government doing to support and develop tourism in regional areas and improve in the long term infrastructure for the benefit of the industry and the local communities?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** It gives me much delight to answer a question like this, because the Tourism Development Fund is an incredibly important fund and is able to generate great benefits across the regions. It is worth reflecting on the number and magnitude of tourism projects that have received grants since the fund commenced in December 1999. In 2000, 38 minor projects to the value of approximately \$1 million were approved, and in addition to that there were eight major projects in infrastructure totalling some \$4 million over a three year period.

In the year 2000-01, two intakes of applications to this fund occurred. It saw 55 projects worth \$1.6 million being supported and two major projects totalling \$1.3 million also being approved; part of that was the state experiential signs and the Fleurieu artificial reef projects, both magnificent projects. In addition to that fund is the minor infrastructure projects fund. The first round for this year saw 31 projects (worth around \$800 000) being supported and a further five projects (worth around \$160 000) have received their approval under the new outback fund, which, I am very proud to say, was included in this year's May budget.

There are enormous opportunities for infrastructure spend in our state, because there is a lot of catch-up to do, and as we keep increasing tourist numbers the need for top quality infrastructure will continue. One of the major infrastructure projects that we have been able to include in this year's budget is to further improve the facilities at the Head of the Bight. I am sure every member who has visited that site would consider it to be one of the most magical parts of our state, especially when the southern right whales are present, and I am sure that they would understand the need for us to improve the facilities. The expenditure of \$800 000 in upgrading facilities and extending them in cooperation with the local communities will be an important project for us.

There is also the need to upgrade visitor information centres because as more and more tourists come to our state they will require top quality information on what they can do if we want them to stay in the regions and spend their money. Some of the first upgrades will occur at Berri, Quorn and Clare. Of course, we then have the expenditure on the Goolwa-Victor Harbor railway stations and Steamranger tourist train upgrades. We have the Yorke Peninsula infrastructure fund, and we all know that Yorke Peninsula has a range of opportunities, but, to date, it has not had as much investment in its infrastructure as it needs. I could talk for a

long time about all the infrastructure opportunities, but, in my view, it is important for the committee to understand that whilst the installation of a new loo, a new parking lot or a new visitors centre might not seem very much, when you want tourists to stay longer in an area and to spend more money, top quality infrastructure becomes a vital part of any successful mix in the future.

**Mr FOLEY:** We will get on to loos and infrastructure a little later. Has the government settled its outstanding legal case with the former CEO of the Tourism Commission, Ms Carole Hancock and, if so, for how much?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I thank the member for Hart for the question. I am a little disappointed that it did not come from the member for Lee, but I am sure the member for Lee would understand why I have to refer to my notes to get the wording right. For the last couple of years we have had a similar question during estimates and I understand and respect the reason for the question. I will not go back through all the detail that is already on the record, but I would repeat everything that has been said for the last two years. However, I still say, as this matter is still before the court, I am not in a position to give a final answer, although possibly it is not too far away.

**Mr FOLEY:** A supplementary question, if I may: what are the costs to government to date in defending this action? It should be quite appropriate to have that put on the public record.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** We do not have that figure because SACORP, as the member would understand, is handling that side of it, but I think I can get the figures.

**Mr FOLEY:** While we are on legal action, what is the current status of pending legal action between the Le Mans and Panoz group and the government over the government's appalling handling of the Panoz Motorsport race in South Australia?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Again I will choose my words carefully, because, as the member for Hart would be aware, some matters are still outstanding and these matters are currently subject to negotiations between the solicitors acting for Panoz Motorsport Australia and the Crown Solicitor's office, and it has been agreed thus far that these negotiations will take place in confidence and, as such, it is inappropriate for me to comment on details at this stage. However, the member for Hart would be well aware that Panoz Motorsport Australia has made public remarks about its interest in pursuing aspects of the race.

**Mr FOLEY:** Will the minister at least broadly cover the issues that are in conflict without going into too much detail? What are the areas of conflict between government and Panoz?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I do not think I am in a position to do that.

**Mr FOLEY:** Let me try it from another angle. Are these legal costs associated with the race already staged, the Race of 1000 Years, or are these claims against the government for the loss of future income?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I believe it would be appropriate for me to say that there are probably aspects of both.

**Mr FOLEY:** Meaning?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The member outlined two areas. The first relates to the race that was staged on New Year's Eve and, secondly, possibly areas of the potential of future races. Both those matters are currently under discussion.

**Mr FOLEY:** That is a significant development and is a significant point. We are talking about the potential recovery

of moneys by the Panoz group for dollars that it believes are owed to it from the one race we had, but the potential litigation or the potential—

*The Hon. J. Hall interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** No, what I have said is that the minister has said that there are two elements. One element is for Panoz to recover moneys from the last race that it thinks it is owed. The more substantial contingent liability now on government is whether or not we are exposed to significant litigation for the loss of income from future races. That puts it into a significantly new league of dollars for the taxpayer.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I think the member for Hart misunderstood what I said in relation to the two categories. As it relates to the Race of 1000 Years, issues are under discussion. I believe it is too difficult for me to try to respond rather openly to some of the questions raised by the member for Hart. If he looks at all the remarks that have been made on the record in the House thus far, and the opening response that I gave to his first question, and given that there are negotiations between the solicitors taking place at the moment and there is an agreement and a commitment has been given that the negotiations will take place in confidence, I think it is inappropriate for me to go any further.

**Mr FOLEY:** Clearly, the state is facing potentially multimillion dollar claims from the Panoz group, and I can understand—

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The member for Hart is absolutely out of control in what he said in that. That is clearly not true and I think it unfair for him to make an accusation that is clearly wrong about a multimillion dollar claim when I have said that there are negotiations taking place and it is just not appropriate for me to go into the detail. It is outrageous for the honourable member to suggest that there is a multimillion dollar claim.

**Mr FOLEY:** Believe it or not, minister, I can say what I like in this chair.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** But you ought to have some responsibility.

**Mr FOLEY:** If you want to up the ante and the tempo on Le Mans, let's go right ahead, because I have plenty in reserve.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I'm sure you have, but you ought to be minimally responsible on this one.

**Mr FOLEY:** I choose to do what I want to do because I am not the minister who brought Le Mans and Panoz to Adelaide; who expended \$8 million of taxpayers' money and then treated Mr Panoz in such an appalling manner and have now—

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** On a point of order, we are getting into debate. We should be asking questions. I would ask you to bring the honourable member to order.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The chair has shown some flexibility in providing the opportunity for comment, but I would ask the member for Hart to come back to a question and concentrate on questions and seeking advice, which is really what the estimates are all about.

**Mr FOLEY:** I can sit here until 10 o'clock: that doesn't bother me. I can tape *West Wing*: I don't have to get home to watch it. In the absence of the minister providing this committee with more substantial information than she has, the allegation I put on the record and which I put on the record at an Economic and Finance Committee hearing is that our state is facing potentially multimillion dollar legal claims. If that is not the case, the minister is free to advise the committee otherwise.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I have advised the committee otherwise: it is an outrageous allegation. However, when there are delicate legal negotiations and discussions taking place, the member for Hart knows as well as anyone else in this chamber that when they take place in confidence it is highly inappropriate for me, for him or for anyone else to break the commitments that have been given.

**Mr FOLEY:** I am not in the process of breaking any commitment, because I am not a party to these negotiations. I am not sensitive about the Panoz Group: I am not the one who brought Panoz to Adelaide. I am not the one who oversaw the Le Mans race. I am not the one who has been responsible for the appalling treatment of Mr Panoz and his group. I do not feel sensitive about it. If the minister is sensitive about it and the Premier is sensitive about it, as you should be, that is fine. But you cannot be critical of an opposition that, from day one with the Panoz group, extended the hand of bipartisanship and delivered bipartisanship.

We are not the ones who kicked Mr Panoz in the guts and sent him packing out of Adelaide and who are now finding ourselves in the court over compensation. Whether it is multimillions or hundreds of thousands of dollars will be decided by others, not by me. But if I make an allegation that it could be multimillions and the minister denies that, that is fine; that is the art of politics. I can assure the minister that getting sensitive with me about the handling of Le Mans is not something that particularly bothers me, because my hands are clean on that. Did cabinet agree to scrap the Le Mans car race and therefore the advice given to Panoz was based on a formal cabinet decision?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** As I said at the beginning of this discussion on Le Mans, given negotiations that are going on I am not about to start answering detailed questions that may have an effect on the outcome.

**Mr FOLEY:** I am sorry, but my question, repeated again, is: did cabinet make a formal decision not to support the running of Le Mans this year?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I started this by saying that there are negotiations going on between Panoz Motorsport Australia and Crown Law over some outstanding issues. I am not about to start responding individually to questions that may affect those negotiations. The member for Hart can ask me 15 different ways and I will come back to that response.

**Mr FOLEY:** If I may, Mr Chairman, the minister is clearly frustrating this committee, because whether or not a cabinet decision was made surely cannot impact on any outstanding legal matters relating to the government. This is a committee of the parliament: the minister's executive is drawn from this parliament; cabinet is responsible and answerable to this parliament. I simply want to know: did cabinet make a formal decision to scrap Le Mans or was this a decision of the Premier outside the cabinet process?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I stand by what I said originally. I am not about to go into the detail.

**Mr FOLEY:** This is an outrageous abuse of the parliamentary estimates committee—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Can I ask a question?

**Mr FOLEY:** No, you can't, not until I have finished.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The chair will determine who will ask questions.

**Mr FOLEY:** What I am saying, Mr Chairman, is that, if the minister wants to turn this committee into a farce, let us continue along this track. I am asking a simple question: I am not asking for details relating to the legal negotiations

between government and Panoz legal advisers. I am asking a simple question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** I am going to ask this question whether you like it or not, Mr Chairman. It is a simple question—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you want to stay in the chamber?

**Mr FOLEY:** It's a simple question. I want an answer.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The minister cannot escape answering it. Martin, sit back and relax. My question, Mr Chairman, is: did cabinet formally resolve to scrap the Le Mans car race, yes or no?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** There has been a range of statements made about this issue since February this year. The Premier has made the announcement about Le Mans and the stand-alone race that will not be taking place this year. A number of statements have been made to the parliament, and all of them I would stand by. However, I come back to the choice of words that I made earlier as the member for Hart started to ask these questions. I am not going to deviate from the remarks I made earlier about the negotiations and discussions that are taking place between the solicitors acting for Panoz Motorsport Australia and the Crown Solicitor.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Because we are all getting so bored with the same question over and over again, I would like to change the subject and go to volume 1, page 1.20 and page 1.23 regarding 2002 being the Year of the Outback. What are the South Australian Tourism Commission's plans to improve long-term infrastructure in the outback with a view to gearing up that asset for future tourist potential?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** As I have said on a number of occasions, I think Australia's Year of the Outback in 2002 promises to be one of the most memorable years in the history of this state's tourism industry and possibly that of other states as well. The outback of South Australia is blessed with the most amazing, outstanding natural attractions, a unique indigenous culture more than 40 000 years old, and a fascinating history of European settlement, discovery and development.

However, the Year of the Outback is much more than just a passing recognition of our culture and history, because it creates a once in a lifetime opportunity to promote existing outback attractions and destinations by focusing national and international attention on the region. It will provide an enormous opportunity for South Australia to promote itself and take back the branding as the gateway to the Outback. In addition to that, through infrastructure works, it will allow us to create a lasting legacy for our Outback communities. Therefore, it is important that the South Australian Tourism Commission is taking a leading role in this national event. It will provide significant funding from this year's budget for both event programs and the new infrastructure works. Also, the Year of the Outback will give the international community an enormous opportunity to see a different side of Australia. As you, sir, would know, we have allocated \$6.7 million over the next three years for infrastructure projects in the Outback, and I am enormously pleased and very proud of the opportunities that that will give the state.

A full-time coordinator has been appointed to work on this project, and a number of events are being planned. The Great Australian Outback Cattle Drive is one of them, and it has certainly already had enormous interest internationally. The Outback to Adelaide Bushwalk is another one of the events, and the 2002 Bicycles—an Outback Odyssey—is another important one. From South Australia's perspective, mother

nature has been rather kind to us by providing us with the most stunning of all spectacles, which is the total solar eclipse to take place on 4 December.

As I have said previously, unless you are bobbing around in the Indian Ocean, South Australia will be the best place in the world to see this amazing natural phenomenon. It will start from Ceduna and move across the Outback in an arc, taking in places such as Lyndhurst, Farina and Arkaroola. The whole event will take place over three seconds, but it will be magnificent. The astronomer associations throughout the world that are showing an interest in this are quite amazing, and we expect a great influx of visitors.

Another interesting aspect of the Year of the Outback celebrations will be the fact that (so I am told) Lake Eyre is nearly full as we speak. So, all those tourists who wanted to come to South Australia this year to see the dry lake bed, having seen the water in it last year, will be coming back again to see the amazing bird life and the spectacle of water in Lake Eyre, and that in turn creates an extraordinary interest in all the other surrounding areas that, such as Marree, William Creek and Muloorina. Having informed the House earlier this year that William Creek became the third busiest airport in South Australia for five months of last year when there were take-offs and landings every 15 minutes, with the influx of water into Lake Eyre again I have no doubt that the Outback will be one of the great spectacles.

Some of the infrastructure projects that we will be supporting range from camping and stopping-over areas, toilets, shelters, rainwater tanks, fire places, litter bins, signage and easier access along the Birdsville, Oodnadatta and Strzelecki tracks. Visitor attractions will be developed such as the Blinman heritage centre, Coober Pedy historical trail and the Marree interpretive facilities, and there will be additional signage at points such as Oodnadatta, Marree and Wadlata. You can imagine some of the jobs that will be created as we start moving into this area. A few more key priority areas around the Lake Eyre region will be looked at, and then there will be interest in Innamincka-Coongie Lakes and Dalhousie-Simpson Desert. So, they are some of the areas on which we will be concentrating.

Without doubt, the South Australian Outback is one of the most hauntingly beautiful, spectacular and contrasting areas in the world. We have no doubt that, with the program of events that is being planned and the opportunities we will all be involved in through 2002, the expenditure from international and interstate visitors in our state will be enormous. If you add that to the fact that 45 per cent of international visitors claim that nature based tourism is one of the reasons they want to come back to Australia, there is no doubt that our state will have to capitalise on all the opportunities that this will give to us. So, we are determined that the South Australian Outback will be an absolute must-see destination, certainly for 2002 and beyond, so that we will be involved in all the economic benefits that it will bring to our state and the communities in the Outback. It will be a celebration of people, places and activities in 2002 and beyond.

**Mr FOLEY:** Clearly, we will not make much head room on the Le Mans race. In a way I can understand that, because there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that my question about whether or not a cabinet decision was made in no way could or would affect any litigation. In fairness to the minister—and I have made this statement in the parliament before—we know what happened. I have no doubt that the minister was attempting to negotiate an outcome that would balance the requirements of the Panoz group with her desired

outcomes in terms of the benefit to South Australia, and in the lead-up to a luncheon of the Liberal business group at the Hilton her Premier made an executive decision on his own for a cheap political headline that night that has since caused the minister significant embarrassment, stress and tension. I can understand why the minister is finding it difficult to answer these questions. That is unfortunate, but I can understand the position in which the minister finds herself.

I am sufficiently fired up that I will move my energies away from Le Mans and get on to something else that is of interest to me, and that is the V8 motor car race. What was the financial outcome of this year's motor car race and what, if any, deficit is being funded from the budget for this year's event?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The figure has not yet been finalised, but it will be by the end of the month. Clearly it will be an audited figure and will be tabled in the parliament in the annual report. There is \$500 000 in the 2000-01 budget, and it appears that there will be a deficit somewhat in excess of that amount, but the figure is not finalised yet. When it is finalised it will be tabled in the parliament.

**Mr FOLEY:** As a supplementary question: I do not know very much about the operations of the Motor Sport Board and the V8 race, because the Motor Sport Board has not offered the opposition a brief as to its operations. That is fine; it can operate in its own little world. What is the nature of the agreement with the Motorsport Board? What is the nature of the agreement with Mr Tony Cochrane? I am interested, on the off-chance we win the next election, what I will inherit.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** While I am looking for my notes on this, I am sure the member for Hart would acknowledge that it is a magnificent event and certainly this year proved to be no exception in terms of attendance over the three days and community support. I am absolutely certain that I could offer the member for Hart a briefing on the way in which the Clipsal 500 operates.

However, in relation to the specific question you asked about AVESCO or Tony Cochrane and the operation of the race, there is a race staging deed which the government has entered into. We are committed now to a contract which secures the race in Adelaide until 2008. Clipsal is the naming rights sponsor for the event at this stage until 2003. The race staging deed provides that AVESCO provide the cars, the drivers and the TV. As part of the arrangement, the government promotes the race and sells the tickets. The original deal was 1999 to 2003; that has been extended from 2004 to 2008.

**Mr FOLEY:** What do Mr Cochrane and his AVESCO group get out of the race? What does the taxpayer pay Mr Cochrane?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am advised that it is commercial in confidence but Mr Daniels thinks that that information was provided to the Public Works Committee in 1998, prior to the original race. It was certainly provided as commercial in confidence to that committee.

**Mr FOLEY:** Can we have it now?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Our agreement and contract with AVESCO provides that it is in confidence. I think I would need to seek legal advice as to whether it could be given in confidence. Given that it has already been given in confidence once to the Public Works Committee, I am happy to take that up and come back to the member for Hart on that issue.

**Mr FOLEY:** Sorry, but I am not interested in receiving that figure in confidence. The figure is either provided to me on the public record or, on the off-chance we get into

government, I will deal with that as an issue—should we find ourselves in government. I do not know who Mr Cochrane is. I understand Mr Cochrane is a good buddy of the Premier, but he has not made any effort to contact the opposition. He is obviously happy with his seven or eight year agreement with the government.

Mr Roger Cook is Chairman of the V8 Motorsport Board. What is the payment to Mr Roger Cook as Chairman of the V8 Motorsport Board?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The South Australian Motorsport Board has nine members. The Chairman gets \$15 000, the Deputy Chair gets \$11 111 and the remaining members get \$9 500.

**Mr FOLEY:** Mr Cook is also Chairman of the Tourism Commission.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Yes.

**Mr FOLEY:** What does he get as Chairman of the Tourism Commission?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The Tourism Commission board has eight members. The Chairman receives \$18 150 and the remaining members receive \$12 100 remuneration.

**Mr FOLEY:** He is also on the SA Water board and the Major Projects board. My recollection is that under the former Labor government the Grand Prix board members did it for nothing.

**Mr CONDOUS:** I was on it for six years and got nothing; and we were happy to do it.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I was not a member of parliament at the time. Certainly, I was not the minister. I cannot comment on that because I actually do not know. If the member for Hart would like me to pursue that matter, I would be happy to do so.

**Mr FOLEY:** I was responding to something from the member for Colton who was a former member of the board. I know we are touching back on Le Mans, but I said this during debate at the time of the legislation. I must confess that I am not a petrolhead. As someone who may one day be Treasurer, I look at all major events and circuses, and all sorts of things, with some degree of scepticism and will want all these projects put under rigorous assessment as to the value of them.

It seems to me that an international element to a motor carnival had benefit to it. I said in my contribution at the time of Le Mans that a Le Mans stand-alone or V8 stand-alone was simply not sustainable in the medium to long term. Why could we not bring together Le Mans and the V8s, perhaps Le Mans at the beginning of a week and V8s at the end of a week, or Le Mans on a Saturday and V8s on a Sunday to give us both a domestic and international flavour to motor racing; offset the costs quite significantly to give us something unique? Why did the government not pursue that as a serious option?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am a petrolhead, so it is very easy for me to give a personal view but it is far more difficult for me to give a view as the minister. As the member for Hart would probably remember, the original intent of the Le Mans race coming to Adelaide was as a stand-alone, one-off special event that Don Panoz, as the founder of the Le Mans series, wanted to stage to celebrate what was, in his view, the race of 1 000 years, for the new millennium. Certainly, there were some difficulties that we all expected we would encounter for a race such as that being staged on New Year's Eve. During the debate, I think the member for Lee and the member for Hart raised this issue of combining the two races. I think I am on record as saying my ideal would have been a racing

carnival over 10 days with a whole lot of events and activities between the two events on either weekend. The government was involved with the staging of the first race as the stand-alone Race of a Thousand Years. The Clipsal 500 had run two by that stage and it was not an option. I will go no further than that.

**Mr FOLEY:** Was the Motorsport board keen to stage an event in partnership with Le Mans?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The Motorsport board is a board of government and responsible to the Minister for Tourism. It is on record that the government contracted the Motorsport board to not only build the circuit but also to obtain an international track licence. So, there was a great deal of cooperation. I pay tribute to the Chief Executive, Andrew Daniels, who worked very closely in the lead-up to the race because, with the Clipsal 500 being held a few months afterwards, he probably had quite a few dark circles under his eyes. There was a cooperative working arrangement because the Motorsport board was the body that had to build the track.

**Mr FOLEY:** As I have said, I am not a petrol head, I did not attend this year's race and I have not been approached by anyone from the Motorsport board or Mr Cochrane or AVESCO, who I am told has a high opinion of the Premier, or Roger Cook. I understand that the three of them get on well together. They may want to speak to the opposition one day but maybe they only talk to government.

I think it was last weekend that I watched with interest the V8 motor race in Canberra; there did not seem to be a lot of people watching the race. Is it feasible—and I am prepared to extend the hand of bipartisanship—that we could attract Mr Panoz back to Adelaide? Could we look at having a race in November-December? Could we get Mr Cochrane from AVESCO, who is a good mate of the Premier, and Roger Cook (I have never met either of them) to consider holding their car race in the latter part of the year, which would give us the opportunity to have more of an international flavour? Is that possible?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** One of the things I have learnt as a minister is to try to avoid answering hypothetical questions. I have met Tony Cochrane a number of times and there is no way known that I would ever take the liberty of supposing what Tony might think or do; venturing down that track is not something I will do. However, I have been advised that, whilst the member for Hart (and I can see that it is really breaking his heart) has not had a briefing about motor sport, I might see what we can do to encourage him to know and understand the drills because we have a rally coming to South Australia in July with that great driver Ed Ordinsky. It will be a fantastic event. I hope the member for Lee can do something about his colleague because there is a serious gap in his education if he does not enjoy car racing. I am advised that, prior to the first race of the Clipsal 500, the opposition had a briefing at the request of the Premier. I am not too sure who it was, but the member for Hart should not feel left out because the opposition did have a briefing. I accept that there has been bipartisan support for the initial establishment of the race.

**Mr FOLEY:** I do not feel left out in any shape or form. I am not running short of opportunities to be briefed on activities of government. Mr Panoz and his group, and Mr Rainsford and Mr Spurr and others were conscious enough of the need to consider both sides of the political spectrum and were very keen to brief the opposition on a number of occasions.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** And were pleased to do it.



**Mr FOLEY:** Yes, but for some reason the V8 people seem comfortable with the Premier and their mate John and care little for the opposition, and that is fine; we will deal with that in government. As I said, my razor gang will have a lot of work and the V8 motor sport car race will be—

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am really concerned that the member for Hart keeps talking about the razor gang in all these activities. As I have demonstrated with some of the responses I have given tonight, bearing in mind the contribution made by the major events unit and the SATC and a number of the events that we have been talking about, I would have thought of great interest to him would be (a) the economic benefits it brings to the state; and (b) certainly the very substantial numbers employed in this industry. So, he should not get too excited about any of these things.

**Mr FOLEY:** What is the budget of the AME this financial year?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am sorry, but the member for Hart interrupted me when I was in the middle of a statement and I did not hear what he said.

**Mr FOLEY:** What is the budget for the AME this year?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** It is \$9.2 million or \$9.3 million. One of the figures I used earlier is that for every dollar invested in major events there is an \$11 return, and that information comes directly from the 1999-2000 year when the events supported by investment made by AME returned a \$110 million economic return to the state.

**Mr FOLEY:** Are you telling me that a major event has a multiplier of 11?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I am not saying every major event: I am saying that with the major events investment in this state for every \$1 invested there is an \$11 return and that the year 1999-2000 is the example.

**Mr FOLEY:** Who does the economic modelling for a multiplier of 11?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** A number of individual companies do modelling such as this and a number of examples are accepted Australia wide. The Economic Research Consultant, Barry Bergan, Director, has done some as well as Ernst & Young. The figures are on record from the last Masters Games held here. The member for Hart can be cynical and get enthusiastic about what his future opportunities may or may not be but the reality is that it is accepted by some of your Labor government colleagues in other states. Certainly, the figures we have used after our great victory of winning World Police and Fire Games are extremely conservative compared with the figures that your colleagues in Queensland were bandying around before they had actually won the event.

**Mr FOLEY:** Trust me, I am not getting over-confident about my chances in the next election. It is just that the thought of coming back here next year for my ninth opposition estimates is so depressing that it is much easier to be optimistic, hopeful, arrogant and everything else. The alternative is just too horrific to think of. In fact, if I am in opposition next year I probably will not be here: I will take the fortnight off and the world will still revolve. Trust me, minister, that after eight years in opposition you will do exactly what I am doing. What is the international marketing budget of the department for the forthcoming year? There has been a significant increase.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The increase for this year is \$1.5 million, so it puts it up to around \$7 million. Again, that is a great investment because the difficulty, as the member for Hart and the member for Lee would be well aware, is that the decrease in the Australian dollar means that international

marketing has to be far more creative in the years 2001 and 2002 than perhaps a decade ago when the dollar was worth considerably more than it is at the moment. It has been very difficult, I suppose, for agencies such as the SATC to get appropriate value for our dollar in the international market. That is one of the reasons why the SATC, by conscious decision, spends so many of its marketing dollars working with the trade rather than with the consumer. I am sure you would understand the benefits: in markets such as Japan, America, Europe and Britain, working with the trade and allocating money to cooperative marketing campaigns with international carriers and the big tour operators is much better value for your dollar than going directly to the consumers. So, while I would have liked more, as I am sure you would understand, to invest in the international arena, I am very pleased that we got the increase that we did.

**Mr FOLEY:** Last year I went overseas and I will put on the public record that the tourism commission—and I have already mentioned this to Mr Spurr—is exceptionally well serviced by Lyn Tuit in Europe. I think Lyn does an excellent job. She looked after me in a very professional manner, well above her requirements and her remuneration. She did an excellent job. I was surprised at the positioning of Kangaroo Island in the international marketplace and how it is considered by the tour operators in Europe, in particular, as a real icon and drawcard for international tourists. Why has this government, after eight years in office, allowed the main entry point from mainland South Australia to Kangaroo Island to be left in such an appalling state? People travel from the other side of the world to come to Kangaroo Island and are met by nothing short of third world infrastructure at Cape Jervis. You mentioned the toilets earlier. I am told that these are not very nice toilets and that there are cobwebs and everything in them. You have had eight years to get this right. Why have you failed to properly provide the infrastructure needed to give us a quality of service between mainland South Australia and Kangaroo Island?

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** We have been out for eight years. The ferry was not even there when we were in government. You cannot keep blaming us.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** First, I thank the member for Hart for acknowledging the great job of our representative, Lyn Tuit, and her team in France. They are quite superb and they are getting great results.

**Mr FOLEY:** I am not sure there is a team. It is a solo operation. She does very well.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** No, we have added to that—on your recommendation, I might say. The operation in France is wonderful and the figures coming out of France are truly heartening. Most of us have no doubt that Lyn and her efforts are a very major component of it.

The remarks that the member for Hart makes about Kangaroo Island are well appreciated and understood, and he might be interested to know that Kangaroo Island is one of the destinations in this state that has more international visitors than interstate visitors. It is very tight but, in fact, the last available figures show that international visitors outnumber interstate visitors at this stage. Certainly, research conducted by the ATC in Europe clearly shows that the concentration on Sydney Harbour—as in bridge, rock and reef—in perhaps the last decade is about to be replaced by a concentration on nature-based activities, and KI is certainly sitting in the top five as a recognised destination in this country. I think that what is happening on Kangaroo Island

and, indeed, the change of focus and the need for international tourists to have an authentic experience in Australia will be a great advantage for Kangaroo Island.

Specifically, I come to the point that the member for Hart mentioned, and that is the condition of Cape Jervis and Penneshaw. I look forward with great enthusiasm to spending the \$200 000 that we have allocated for facilities at both entrances. My understanding is that Sea Link is ready to contribute to the money that we have allocated. At the moment, I would not like to put a date on when we will start expending the money, but we are awaiting the transfer of Ports Corp to the Department of Transport before doing so. When the new loos are finished, I will make sure that the member for Hart gets a personal invitation to go down and experience them.

**Mr FOLEY:** I gather from what you are saying that the tourism commission has provided for appropriate expenditure from its funding lines for the upgrade of Cape Jervis, but perhaps the transport minister is letting the side down. Ms Laidlaw's brother-in-law spends a lot of money on consultants and information economy, and whatever else he does. I assume there is a problem with brother and sister-in-law.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I always get very nervous when the member for Hart starts making assumptions, but I reiterate that we look forward to spending the money as soon as possible.

**Mr FOLEY:** Clearly, the transport department has to get its act together and Ports Corp has to get its act together. I think it is time, minister, that the government looked at these small infrastructure issues with a common purpose and resolved what is really unacceptable. I can appreciate that you are doing the best you can in trying circumstances.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** As I am sure the member for Hart knows, the tourism commission and Major Events are extremely good at expending money on what we consider to be investment with great returns for the future.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I acknowledge a couple of things. I was shadow minister for tourism for a period, and in that period the Le Mans—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr WRIGHT:** Yes, I am going to ask a couple of questions, if I may.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr WRIGHT:** Would that be all right? I acknowledge that the minister ensured that my colleague, as shadow minister in the area of responsibility for Treasury, and I were well briefed. We were delighted to support the Le Mans car race in a bipartisan way. The briefing we received was of high quality with much detail; that is not the type of briefing you necessarily always get. I refer not just to tourism but across all areas where you come into contact with people. We certainly appreciated that. The minister deserves some acknowledgment for the role she played there, because getting the Le Mans race to South Australia was a coup. It was a success, and the crowds were good. It would appear that there were some problems, because the Premier stepped forward and announced that we would not be proceeding.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**Mr WRIGHT:** Is that right? I am not so sure you are right about that. I was rudely interrupted; I apologise for your colleague, Minister. As Minister for Tourism, I presume you supported the continuance of Le Mans?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** My views on this subject have been well canvassed in the parliament. Some months ago, I made a personal explanation setting out in some detail my preferred

position, and I am not about to deviate from what I have already said to the parliament.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I take that as a 'Yes.' We have Tourism Commission officers here. The Tourism Commission, led by the board and Mr Spurr, supported the continuance of the Le Mans race for the sake of good tourism in South Australia.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I do not profess to speak for a whole range of individuals, but the major events unit of the SATC has a very specific objective, and that is to make sure that we have a 12-month calendar of fantastic events that attract visitors from the international arena, from interstate and from all over the state of South Australia. A calendar of events that you would look at now is quite different from a calendar of events you would have looked at, say, three or four years ago. Those down months between the end of May and perhaps the end of August are now starting to get good events to fill them. I pay tribute to the Motorsport Board and Andrew Daniels in particular for the rally that is about to start in a couple of weeks time.

It is important for all tourism commissions or their equivalent in all states to make sure that events are part of their operation. So, some events you continue with; some you change; some you grow; and some you do not proceed with. That is the way it goes. We can all have our favourites. It is fair to say that, if I had to name four or five of my top favourites, they might change from year to year. However, we have a great calendar of events in South Australia, and I am pretty proud of it.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The shadow minister for tourism spoke earlier about the combination of the Le Mans and Clipsal 500 races, and it does not matter whether it was to happen within the same weeks or over a weekend—and the minister would know what I am talking about. Did the minister put a proposal of that nature to the government?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** My memory is a bit hazy, but I have a feeling that during February or March this year in a fairly detailed statement to the House I outlined a proposal that I thought was a great idea. It did include topping and tailing with an international motor sport event and a national motor sport event with an international motor show, and a whole lot of other events in the middle. The concept was something that was being and had been discussed. However, the reality is that a decision has been made, and there is no point in pursuing some of those details because at this stage they cannot be pursued.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I would like to finish by making the comment that in this area and other areas the Minister for Tourism has chased tourism aggressively and has been successful. However, in this area she has been let down by her Premier. She has been rolled by the Premier—and I do not blame her for this.

The matter of invitations to functions might have come up briefly before dinner, and it certainly came up when we were going through the budget line with the Premier. Indeed, the shadow Treasurer may have made the odd comment about it, as well. In my time as shadow minister for tourism, the minister, the Tourism Commission and major events certainly looked after me very well, and ensured that I had the opportunity to go to these events if and when I could. That is not always the same with all ministers. That is a disappointing feature of this government. When we come to government, if any of our ministers behave like that, I will tell them not to behave like that. I was brought up in the old school where it was taught that good government is about involving the opposition and making sure it is acknowledged.

The Minister for Tourism has behaved correctly in that way, but some of her colleagues have not done so. They are the lesser for it, and it is noted not just by the opposition but by people in the industry and in the community. They ask us why we are not at functions, and they think we have been invited. When it has been pointed out to them that the government has not even shown us the courtesy of inviting us to some of these activities, they are astounded. That is a weakness in this government and the Premier should address it straight away. The Minister for Tourism has not failed in that area one little bit.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Mr Chairman, on behalf of all officers who have joined me here this evening I would like

to thank you for your chairmanship of the committee and the committee members for their involvement. I would also like to thank all the officers from the SATC, Convention Centre, Entertainment Centre, Motorsport Board and Pam Martin who was here earlier for their role in making this go relatively smoothly during the evening.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the votes completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.09 p.m. the committee adjourned until Wednesday 20 June at 11 a.m.