

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Friday 18 June 2004****ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chairman:**

The Hon. R.B. Such

Members:

Ms F.E. Bedford
 Ms V.A. Chapman
 Ms V. Ciccarello
 Mr E.J. Meier
 Mr G. Scalzi
 Mr J.J. Snelling

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Courts Administration Authority \$63 679 000
 Administered Items for Courts Administration Authority
 \$30 000

Witness:

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice.

The Hon. J.J. Doyle, Chief Justice, attended on behalf of the Courts Administration Authority.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr G. Thompson, State Courts Administrator, Courts Administration Authority.

Mr T. O'Rourke, Director, Corporate Services, Courts Administration Authority.

Mr M. Church, Manager, Financial Services, Courts Administration Authority.

Mr B. Cossey, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Attorney-General's Department.

Mr A. Lamb, Chief of Staff, Attorney-General's Department.

The CHAIRMAN: The estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions. The committee will determine an approximate time for consideration of proposed payments to facilitate changeover of departmental advisers. Has that been done?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, it has.

The CHAIRMAN: Changes to the committee membership will be notified as they occur. If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than Friday 23 July. The minister and the lead speaker for the opposition can make a brief opening statement if they wish. A flexible approach to questions will be adopted based on approximately three questions per member. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule. A member who is not part of the committee may, at the discretion of the chair, ask a question. Questions must refer to lines of expenditure in the budget papers. I will not ask members to read those page numbers because it takes up a lot of time. Unless members

stray, I will not call them back to reading out the precise page number, etc.

Members unable to complete their questions during proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the House of Assembly *Notice Paper*. There is no facility for tabling of documents before the committee. However, the same rules apply as for the house. If it is purely statistical and limited to one page, it can be incorporated in *Hansard* with the concurrence of the committee. All questions are to be directed to the minister, not to the minister's advisers. The minister can refer questions to an adviser for a response. I also advise that for the purposes of the committee there can be some television coverage from the northern gallery.

I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Attorney-General, do you wish to make a brief opening statement?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Bragg, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Ms CHAPMAN: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions?

Ms CHAPMAN: I will be referring largely to Budget Paper 3, the second chapter, and also Budget Paper 4, Volume 1. The latest report of the Supreme Court judges states:

Currently, the government is exploring the possibility of a private-public partnership to redevelop the Supreme Court. Whilst pursuing this avenue may be economically advantageous, it is time there was a public commitment to a new building, regardless of the funding source. The duration of such a project from inception to completion is likely to be lengthy. Judges urge the government to make a decision on the redevelopment of the court and publicly announce the project as a priority for state infrastructure.

The latest report of the Courts Administration Authority contains similar sentiments. That report also says that the Courts Administration Authority is itself 'considering the possibilities'. The only budget allocation is on page 2.17 and is \$30 000 for minor building works to address the occupational health and safety standards. Could the Chief Justice provide the committee with some illustration of the detriments or difficulties that are suffered in having to operate in the old building?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: They are many and varied. Just off the top of my head, the public suffers because of very basic things such as a lack of adequate toilet facilities. If you are in No. 1 Supreme Court and you want to go to the toilet, you have to down the stairs, out into Gouger Street, around the corner into King William Street and then back into what our staff refer to as 'lavatory lane' (because it is a series of ancient toilets). That perhaps exemplifies the types of facilities which the public have to put up with.

Our staff are in rooms which, on a casual glance, might look quite impressive. They are large rooms but they are poorly ventilated. In a number of places we have three staff in one room, which is inefficient and not comfortable for them. The layout of the building is productive of inefficiencies. Those of you who have been there will know it is a bit of a rabbit warren if you have to find your way around. I can go easily from one week to the next and not see judges who, I trust, are working there all the time but are in another part of the building; they are in another part of the building and it takes a while to get there in order to see them. That is productive of inefficiency.

We believe that in a new building we could achieve staffing efficiencies simply due to a better layout. It is bad for the public and it is bad for our staff. It is not just a matter of comfort but also a matter of efficiency. There are parts of the place that are decidedly down at heel. We use courtrooms Nos. 4 and 5 only when we absolutely have to because, in terms of appearance and everything, they are just of an unacceptable standard. Again, there are courtrooms we can barely use. I suppose the other thing is that, if you walk around the place, you see books and papers spilling off shelves because, being an old building, there is a lack of adequate cupboard and shelving space.

There are many and varied things. We are trapped in a bind because we are unsure where we are going; whether to spend a lot of money on the building or, as we have been doing in recent years, spend a minimum (thinking we should not spend more than the minimum) until we know what will be happening.

Those things occur to me, off the top of my head. The other thing—and this is certainly something of which we are becoming more aware—is that, with the new Federal Court building going up nearby (which will be a very impressive building) in a sense it is unsatisfactory to have the state's highest court in accommodation which to the public would look 'down at heel' compared with the Federal Court building. There is a certain symbolism attached. It is desirable that the parliamentary building be an impressive public building, so I think it desirable that the Supreme Court building be an impressive public building.

Ms CHAPMAN: Given the historical importance of the Supreme Court building, is it fair to assume that the court's plans for a new building will leave the old building intact? What will be the cost of the model or type of facility the Courts Administration Authority has in mind? What other possibilities are they considering for the funding of a new building?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I would think the old Supreme Court buildings on Gouger Street are protected by state heritage and we would be required to keep them—although of course not the cream brick building out the back. From time to time the government has given thought to a courts building on the site of the old tram barn, which is to be owned by the Catholic Church Endowment Society. It is a possibility that the tram barn site may be developed as courts and we would become a tenant of the Catholic Church Endowment Society at that location. We are waiting to see what are the best choices: whether to redevelop the Gouger Street site and use the land out the back or become a tenant of those who own the tram barn site.

Ms CHAPMAN: I take it that the ownership of the property on the corner of Wright Street and King William Street is still intact and available for development?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: Do you mean the Federal Court site?

Ms CHAPMAN: What was the original Federal Court property, which was transferred as part of the exchange for the development of the Federal Court.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: My understanding is that part of the deal was that the Federal Court got the site where the building is being constructed and we got back the pocket part. Therefore, we have the whole block—King William Street, Wright Street, Gouger Street and Mill Street.

Ms CHAPMAN: Given the minister's answer, would you prefer the site between Gouger Street and Wright Street or the tram barn option that is being considered?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: Certainly, we would prefer to remain where we are for historical reasons. I have discussed this with the Attorney-General. While we cannot rule out the possibility of moving to the tram barn site, one of the problems, if we move, is what we then do with the building. Do we continue to use it, which means an inefficient arrangement of staff, files and books moving back to the building whenever we are sitting there; or do we turn it into some kind of museum, which would be a pity in view of its historical significance and which would be a relatively costly thing to do? For those reasons, we strongly prefer to remain at our present site, but if the only option for a building with satisfactory facilities is on the tram barn site then, I suppose, very reluctantly, we would have to take that option.

We would prefer to try to use the old building for historical reasons. From our experience of going across to the Sir Samuel Way building, although it is perhaps only another hundred yards to the tram barn, I foresee added difficulties with staff moving files and books that further distance and crossing at least two roads in so doing.

Ms CHAPMAN: I invite the minister to provide the costing information as requested. Page 25 of Budget Paper No. 6, the Regional Statement, shows \$3.4 million removed from this year's budget in relation to the Port Augusta court redevelopment. The same references show that this project will now not start until 2006-07 when \$7.985 million has been set aside. The total cost has now been put at \$12.1 million. The capital investment statement for the 2002-03 budget (that is, two budgets ago) refers to this project as having a total cost of \$7.4 million, of which \$1 million was to be spent by the end of June 2003. That statement reads:

Construction of a purpose-built courthouse on the corner of Commercial Road and Jervois Street, Port Augusta—a site made available by the demolition of the former police station, CIB and holding cells.

The capital investment statement (Budget Paper No. 5, page 15 to which I have referred) shows that the completion is not now due until July 2007. Why has there been a cost blow-out and why the delay?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: First, there was concerted local opposition to building on the old police station site, although that site is adjacent to the current inadequate Magistrates Court and adjacent to the courtrooms used by the District Court and the Supreme Court when they visit Port Augusta. Also, the local council and businessmen in Port Augusta were opposed to the new court going on that site. They lobbied the government and we responded to their requests. We asked them to suggest some alternative sites. One site they suggested was old railway land on the outskirts of the city at Flinders Terrace.

That is the site they preferred, so we complied. It turned out that it was going to cost more to build there. Also, there was a desire for other agencies associated with the courts to have rooms in the new single-storey building at Flinders Terrace. Additional funding of \$4.6 million, I think, was provided, and that was for a three courtroom building, including rooms for associated agencies, registry and mediation facilities, point of entry security, open plan for internal waiting spaces and sheltered external waiting areas. The multipurpose courtrooms will be designed to provide a high degree of flexibility in the operating configuration to suit the specific requirements of particular hearings and trials.

The member for Bragg was not in parliament when the Brown Liberal government came to office, but I should remind her that it was the policy of the then attorney-general to remove all resident magistrates from country areas, and, accordingly, the Liberal government removed the magistrate from Port Augusta and the magistrate from Mount Gambier. I said at the time that if Labor came to office we would restore resident magistrates in the country, and that is what we have done. We have not one but two magistrates now at Port Augusta serving the Far North, and we have a resident magistrate, Chas Eardley, at Mount Gambier.

The two magistrates at Port Augusta now are Fred Field and Clive Kitchen, who is a native of Port Augusta. I think that now that we have two magistrates at Port Augusta that has changed the plans for the court. It must accommodate two magistrates sitting simultaneously regularly, and we must also accommodate other courts that visit Port Augusta. There is the Residential Tenancies Tribunal; there will be the federal magistracy service; and, of course, from time to time, there will be Supreme Court and District Court hearings in Port Augusta, and there will therefore be the need for space for a jury and a jury room. The Port Augusta court has become a more ambitious project than it was originally. It is on a new site, owing to community lobbying. The government has been responsive to that, but it carries with it a cost and a delay.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank the minister for that explanation, and that it will be expanded in its use, particularly as some other projects (such as the Sturt Street community school) have a lot fewer students and have had blow-outs. I am pleased to see that that economy is being considered. Budget Paper No. 3, page 2.15 states:

An additional District Court master will help manage the increasing pressure being experienced in our civil courts.

When will the additional District Court master be appointed and has that position been advertised?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The additional District Court master is intended to help manage the increasing pressures experienced by our civil courts. Additional funding has been provided for that. It was the preference of the Chief Judge that a master be provided rather than an extra judge. When I say an 'extra judge', it is worth bearing in mind that, in the government's first budget, as a saving we did not replace one judge—

Ms CHAPMAN: Judge Williams.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, it might have been Judge Noblet in the District Court, although it is true that we did not replace one of the judges in the Supreme Court. Naturally, the Chief Judge would have liked that judge's position restored but, if it was a choice between a judge and a master, he believed that it would be better to have a master. The masters do the bulk of the work in assisting civil litigants prepare their cases for trial. It has the effect, I think, of making civil trials heard by judges much more efficient.

The work of the masters also leads to vast numbers of matters being settled without the need for a trial, thereby reducing pressure on the judges of the District Court. The past two years have indicated that the workload exceeds that which is reasonable for the current two full-time masters, and it is leading to delays. A third auxiliary pool master has been utilised to assist over the past two years—that is, a master from the Supreme Court. However, this has resulted in cost pressures. We think that a more efficient way to proceed is to employ a new master.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I can add that I sent a draft of the advertisement to the Attorney either yesterday or the day before. We are also calling for expressions of interest for two masters in the Supreme Court, because we have some retirements coming up early in the new year. The draft advertisement that I sent to the Attorney invited applications by the closing date of 30 July, so I am hoping that it will appear in the next week or two with that closing date.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As the Chief Justice mentions, we are losing all our Supreme Court masters over the next nine months or so, so there will be four masters to be taken on in our courts. We will be advertising for masters, and that skill will be much in demand owing to the retirements projected and the new position.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, in relation to the two Supreme Court masters, it is widely rumoured that the District Court masters Norman and Rice may be promoted. Is that an option that is being considered by the government or will you advertise these positions?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We will advertise them.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a third question.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that, according to the impartial umpire on my left—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Chairman, I think the member for Bragg would make an outstanding master. I am certainly open to her application: I would not want her to be deterred by rumours!

Ms CICCARELLO: My question to the Attorney regards the Courts Administration Authority, but perhaps the Chief Justice would like to answer, given comments that he has made recently. In 2003-04 the Courts Administration Authority aimed to have 60 per cent of criminal cases disposed of or come to trial within 180 days. Can you explain the discrepancy in the estimated result for 2003-04, which indicates that only 23 per cent of cases will be disposed of within that time frame?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: Yes, I am happy to. Criminal cases come to us once they have been committed for trial from the Magistrates Court, and our task is then to get them to trial, hear the trial and hear any appeal. Getting them to trial involves ensuring that both the prosecution and defence are ready. We have a double-barrelled standard: we aim to start the trial of 80 per cent of cases within 180 days of their arriving and 100 per cent of cases within 365 days of their arriving (or within one year). We are actually performing quite satisfactorily in relation to what I call the 100 per cent or 365 day standard. Although we are not actually getting rid of every case in that time, our performance is satisfactory, from my point of view.

There are always cases where things go wrong and, for one reason or another, you just cannot get it started. However, in relation to our target of 80 per cent of cases within 180 days, we are not meeting it and, in fact, we are going backwards. In the papers that you have, the figure is stated as 60 per cent, and that surprised me, because I am not actually sure why 60 per cent is in there as the target—it is actually 80 per cent. Our performance in reality is even worse than it seems. The short answer is that I am not clear why we are slipping. There are many factors that come into play here: first of all, how quickly can the prosecution get its case ready, and that is affected by its efficiency and resources; how quickly can the defence get its case ready, and that is affected by its efficiency and resources. Sometimes getting legal aid causes delays. Sometimes, because of pressures on the

Forensic Science Centre, expert reports cannot be obtained as quickly as we would like.

Availability of counsel can affect when we can get the trial listed. The number of judges is relevant, but so is the number of courtrooms. It is not simply a matter of adding more judges: you are limited to the number of courtrooms. Our own listing practices—that is, the way in which we list trials—may be a factor. Another factor that we find is estimates of trial. If we are told a case will go for five days but, when it comes on, it actually goes for eight days, for example, we would have listed it on the basis that the judge who heard the five-day case would be ready to start another one in six days' time. If the first one goes for eight days, the judge is not available and, unless we can find another judge, that case does not start then and has to go back into the system, be given a new date and, therefore, does not commence as soon as we hoped it would.

The other thing that can affect it is case length. We have found that case lengths are increasing, not dramatically, but in the District Court I think that over the last two to three years they have gone from an average of about 4½ days to a bit over six days per case. While that 1½ days may not seem very significant, when multiplied by all the cases we hear, it is significant. That is why I am not sure why our performance is going backwards. We really have a choice: we could just adjust the standard to reflect what we are doing. I do not want to do that, because I do not think that what is happening is satisfactory. I do not want to just pick another standard, because that would just be guesswork.

I think we are at the point where we need to make a concerted study, but that will take a lot of resources. It is something that the Chief Judge and I have been discussing on and off for a year. We look at the list and make inquiries of our staff, trying to work out what is happening but, as I said, we cannot pin down any one factor that provides the answer. I think that somewhere in the next 12 months we will probably establish a working group and try to work out what is going wrong. This is something we have looked at several times, so we know there is no easy answer. It is not as if it is a brand-new problem. It is something courts all around the country cope with.

The only other thing I would add is, as it happens on a national basis our performance is still quite good. My own view is that a person, particularly victims of crime and people who are involved as witnesses should not have to wait as long as they are waiting for the cases to be heard. I fully understand it causes them a lot of anxiety and I think we should be getting cases to trial sooner than we are. It is frustrating that we are not. So, I think the time has come where we are going to have to commit some significant resources. Just at the moment we do have a committee, chaired by Justice Duggan, with representatives from the DPP and others, which is looking at trial efficiency: that is, what we can do to make the trial itself more efficient and, because of the limited number of people with expertise in this area, I prefer to let that committee finish its task before I then form another working group to look at the pre-trial process.

So, the short answer is, in terms of national standards, that our performance is satisfactory, but it is slipping and I do not think, personally, it is good enough. There is no simple answer and, because it has been slipping for some time, it is clearly not a temporary trend. I think the time has come at which we are going to have to revisit this issue and try once again to work out how we can do better.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question supplementary to that. Chief Justice, in the judge's report for 2003, in relation to civil trials, it seems that we have gone from a situation, say in 1997, which was as far as your report goes back, to disposing of 45 civil trials in a year, five waiting, to a situation now where in the last year, only 23 trials were disposed of, with another 23 waiting. We have no fewer judges in the sense of operational time in that period. The length of trials in that time has gone down from 6.1 days average to 1.8 days. Is that an alarming statistic to you, in the sense that it seems that if the trial times are significantly reduced, and we are actually disposing of even a lot less, on the face of it there is an amount of judge's time that is not involved in the court room? There may be, for all the reasons you have explained particularly in relation to the criminal jurisdiction, but that is the civil trial report that you have given. I would appreciate your comment in relation to that.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: No, it does not alarm us. Because the numbers of civil trials are relatively small, the statistics do tend to jump around much more, because it is a much more varied pool of cases. We are hearing civil cases more or less as soon as parties are ready. If you went to court today and said you were ready, while we could not give you a listing next month, we can probably give you a listing in two to three months time, unless it is a long case. A high proportion of civil cases continue to settle, which is inefficient from our point of view. When that happens the time is then either used for judgement writing or we move the judge onto other work. So, while the number of civil cases has declined—that, again, is an Australia-wide trend, I think, that the number of civil lodgements is tending to go down and the number of civil cases coming to trial is tending to go down. I suppose the end result of that is if you looked at our allocation of judicial resources over the last five years you would find, perhaps not surprisingly, that the amount of judicial time on crime is going up quite steadily and the amount of judicial time on civil work is going down quite steadily. So, it is really just reflecting, in a way, what is happening in the marketplace. Does that answer the question?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, thank you. Can I just identify then, is there a corresponding decrease in number of applications being lodged in the court in civil matters?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: Yes. The civil lodgements in total are reasonably steady now, but I am just looking at table 8. In fact, in 1997, there were 834 lodgments, last year there were 1 100. There was quite a big drop around 1994, 1995, 1996, partly due to a change of approach by the compulsory CTP insurer to personal injury claims, and partly due to a lot of Housing Trust possession applications being dealt with, I think in another way which just did not come to the court. So, for the last five or six years, our civil lodgements have been in that range, 1 000 to 1 100, and have just been steady, but they are a good deal less than they were 10 years ago.

Ms CICCARELLO: My next question is in regard to the fines payments system. Attorney, what steps have been taken to improve the efficiency of the fines payment system?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I was pleased to go and see the fines payment system operating at the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court recently, and it seemed to be a highly efficient and enthusiastic outfit. May I compliment the previous government on their 'Paying Through the Nose' campaign to improve fines payment. Mr Chairman, you will recall those ads on television and also on billboards. There

was one on the Squatters Arms Hotel at Thebarton on the Port Road.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says they were disgusting, but they were aimed at a particular audience. They depicted a young man strapped down, I think to a dentist's or doctor's chair and a man, presumably representing the Fines Payment Unit, extracting a television and other desirable consumer goods through his nasal passages. That advertising campaign was a success, and I hope that it gets a rerun some time.

Ms CHAPMAN: How much in the budget for it?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I don't think there is anything in the budget for it; but it was a success and it was an initiative taken during the time of the previous government, and I just wanted to acknowledge its success. The Courts Administration Authority is participating with South Australia Police in conducting a traffic campaign to identify drivers with outstanding fines. The first campaign was conducted in April this year with the next being scheduled for the end of May. The Courts Administration Authority is currently data matching with South Australia Police and the Tenancies Branch of Consumer Affairs to gain up-to-date contact details for debtors.

The Courts Administration Authority and Microsoft have developed a prototype system for transferring and matching data with other agencies. Work is now under way to carry out further matching with other government agencies. There are presently more than 13 000 direct debit payment arrangements in place with about \$1 million being received a month. There are on average 1 100 payments received through Australia Post to the value of \$350 000 a month. The average number of payments received at Transport SA customer service centres is 220 per month, representing \$57 000. The introduction of Centrepay in November 2002 has also proved to be successful. The Courts Administration Authority receives 20 000 payments (on average) per month to the value of \$600 000.

Alterations to the court registries to accommodate fines enforcement work have now been completed. Modification of existing court registries is underway to cater for the impact of recent road safety reforms, such as the new speed limits. The Easy Pay Fines Call Centre receives an average of 12 500 calls a month and collects an average of \$246 354 a month in credit card payments. The call centre also makes an average of 3 300 outbound calls per month. During the financial year 2002-03, the Fines Payment Unit issued 1 671 enforcement warrants. Of these, 843 debtors were arrested and brought before the Fines Payment Unit; 496 warrants were returned marked 'defendants' whereabouts unknown'; 20 executed nil effects; 61 were paid; 13 resulted in goods being seized; and in respect of 19 no further action was taken because of debtors entering into payment arrangements. So, the total value of receipts for the full calendar year 2003 was \$35.7 million as opposed to \$32.3 million in 2002. This includes fines, court fees, levy payments, and suitor payments, which are payments to third parties.

I think the changes to fines payment, which were initiated in the time of the previous attorney-general (Hon. K.T. Griffin) have been a success, and I commend the previous government for it. I am pleased that our government has inherited it and carried it out. If fines payment became optional for a class of people, then there would be contempt for our justice system. Enforcing fines payment to the best of our ability is important, and we are doing that.

Ms CICCARELLO: When will the Court Assessment and Referral Drug Scheme be introduced in South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Court Assessment and Referral Drug Scheme is a joint state-commonwealth funded initiative. It enables magistrates to refer defendants into treatment for three months as part of their bail or bond conditions. The Court Assessment and Referral Drug Scheme targets the drug using population moving through the Magistrates Court who would be suitable for bail or bond in contrast with the Drug Court which targets defendants likely to receive a custodial sentence. State funding of up to \$170 000 per annum was approved during the second round of Drugs Summit initiatives. So, let no-one say that no useful initiatives have emerged from the state government's Drugs Summit. Commonwealth funding is expected to be \$418 000 during 2004-05. I commend the Howard Liberal government for its contribution.

Some delays have been experienced in the introduction of a pilot owing to hold-ups with the confirmation of commonwealth funding and the lack of available accommodation space for new Courts Administration Authority positions. A multi-agency steering committee (which includes all relevant government departments) is operating and is chaired by the Chief Magistrate. The Court Assessment and Referral Drug Scheme will be piloted at the Port Adelaide, Adelaide and Murray Bridge magistrates courts over 18 months, and the scheme will then be rolled out to other courts across South Australia. The effectiveness of the pilot Court Assessment and Referral Drug Scheme will be evaluated by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research.

The CHAIRMAN: What mechanisms and processes exist to give you regular feedback from judges and magistrates about what is happening in relation not only to criminal matters but in particular causal factors so that we as a community can try to reduce crime and some of the other social issues that give rise to crime, because I would imagine that judges and magistrates get frustrated with trying to deal with these problems. What happens to ensure that we try to reduce appearances before the courts in the first place? Do you have regular meetings with judges and magistrates?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I do have regular meetings. I meet with the Chief Justice I think once a month at his Supreme Court chambers. I meet with the Chief Judge, Terry Worthington, about once a month at my office. I also meet the Chief Magistrate, Kelvin Prescott, about once a month and from time to time, cases which have achieved prominence in the media are discussed. Sentencing outcomes are raised on radio talkback, not just radio 5AA and radio 5DN, but also radio 891 on the Kevin Naughton program, as was the case yesterday with the Clarke case. More often than not I will read the sentencing remarks on the Courts Administration Authority website and then seek to explain the judge's reasoning on that radio program.

Often the media reports of a criminal case will not cover all the relevant considerations in sentencing and it is my duty as Attorney-General to speak out on behalf of the judges and to explain their reasoning more fully. Sometimes, of course (and the Priestly case was an example in 2002) I will not agree with the judge's reasoning and the DPP will appeal the matter. Recently in the Jarrod Damian Payne case I have been a party to the appeal represented by the Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis QC, in seeking a guideline judgement on cause death by dangerous or reckless driving. But my duty in the first instance is to explain the judge's reasons to the best of my ability, and to defend the integrity of the courts.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept that and I think that is worthwhile. What about the bigger issues like mental health issues, intellectual retardation, foetal alcohol syndrome, drug affected behaviour—those big issues? What is the connection between what we see in the courts and those serious issues in the community which give rise to the work of the courts? What happens in terms of translating the evidence in the court in terms of those people affected by those things and changes in the system?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: There are two programs—one is the Drug Court Program and the other is the Mental Impairment Program. The Drug Court Program commenced under the previous government in May 2000, and the Rann government approved additional funds for the expansion and continuation of the Drug Court Program in December 2002. The Drug Court targets people with drug problems who have committed offences that would otherwise attract terms of imprisonment. The program provides an intensive program of treatment and support with court ordered conditions concentrating on strict supervision by Drug Court case managers. The aim of the court is to minimise or stop illicit drug use to prevent or decrease any further drug related offending.

The Drug Court has gone through a period of consolidation which has resulted in improved outcomes for those who are participating in the program. It is reflected in the increased numbers of participants completing the program. There have been 707 referrals to the program since its inception. Of those accepted, 23 per cent have completed the program—which is an increase from the previous year's figures. The successful participants will have remained with the rigorous program for 12 months; minimised or stopped use of illegal drugs, and that includes cannabis; will have significantly reduced or ceased drug related offending; engaged with treatment and support agencies; attended regular court reviews; and, importantly, undergone regular urinalysis, and I think Mr Chairman you would know that, because you wrote on behalf of one of your constituents who was undergoing urinalysis.

So, the Office of Crime Statistics continues to evaluate the Drug Court Program and is assessing the recidivism rates for those completing the program. The Justice Strategy Unit of my department in the process of developing a memorandum of administrative agreement in which the Court's Administration Authority will be the lead agency for the Drug Court. A Drug Court program management committee with representation from key agencies continues to meet under the chairmanship of the Chief Magistrate. The Drug Court Manual is near completion and will be available in the near future on the Courts Administration Authority website.

We also have a Court Diversion Program for people with a mental impairment, which was the other leg of your question. That diversion program commenced also under the previous government in June 1999, and in June 2001 the Olsen government approved additional funds for continuing it and expanding it. The program is designed to meet the needs of those accused appearing in magistrates courts who have committed certain minor and summary offences and who have impaired intellectual or mental functioning. The program provides an opportunity for eligible individuals to address their mental health and disability issues and their offending behaviour while the legal proceedings against them are suspended. Regular monitoring and reports are provided to the magistrates with comprehensive information about the mental impairment of the offender, the availability of

community services, and the offender's progress while accessing these services.

The Courts Administration Authority employs all staff except for one of the liaison officers who is employed by the eastern mental health service. The program has increased its service to the Adelaide Magistrates Court, Christies Beach, Elizabeth and Port Adelaide. It is also operating at Whyalla and Port Augusta and will be commencing at Berri in June 2004. The waiting time for an assessment by the program is between two and three weeks, and there is a four-week waiting time at the Adelaide Magistrates Court between referral from a general hearing and a hearing date in the Court Diversion Program court.

There are 162 accused currently participating in the program or undergoing assessment, and those who participate will be in the program for six to eight months. The diversion program has assisted a total of 1 127 people since it started. I should also mention that I have a bill before the house to try to get bail for those offenders who, owing to a mental impairment, cannot understand their bail conditions, and a friend would go guarantor for them.

The CHAIRMAN: Another issue that is of concern to me (I saw the figures recently for Victoria and I suspect they are not much different here) is domestic violence. If the figures are correct, they are an appalling indictment on our society, particularly on men, accepting that 30 per cent of domestic violence is committed by women and increasingly by teenage girls. But, it would appear to me that the current court and justice system is unable to deal with this issue, and I wonder whether there are any plans to adopt some new strategies and revise what you are doing to tackle this very serious issue in our community.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The family violence courts established at Elizabeth and Adelaide magistrates courts handle all criminal and non-criminal matters such as applications for domestic violence restraining orders arising out of incidents within the family, and the courts aim to be more understanding of and responsive to the dynamics of domestic violence. The courts also use the violence intervention program, funded jointly by the Department of Human Services and the Attorney-General's Department, which provides an inter-agency approach to working with all relevant family members. Both the northern and central violence intervention programs operate through a collaborative agency model involving the Department of Human Services at Elizabeth, the Salvation Army in Adelaide, the Department of Correctional Services, SAPOL and the Courts Administration Authority.

The northern violence intervention program has provided services to the Family Violence Court at Elizabeth since 1997 and is now a regular part of court business. The program has a coordinator employed by the Northern Community Health Service and two dedicated magistrates. Between July 2003 and April 2004, 92 men have been referred to the program by the court, and 85 women have been assisted by the introduction of in-court support for women attending the Elizabeth Magistrates Court. The central violence intervention program in the Adelaide Magistrates Court has been in operation for almost five years. Program staff continue to ensure that a range of information sheets are available for women applying for domestic violence restraining orders and for those men who are served with the orders. Between July 2003 and March 2004 there have been 186 male court contacts and 68 men referred to the program; and 206 women have been assisted by program staff in relation to domestic violence and

summary protection orders when appearing in court. A Family Violence Court steering committee, chaired by the Chief Magistrate, has been introduced to discuss the further development and operation of the program and advise on policy and procedural issues.

So, in response to the question, we are persisting with that approach and, although more can be done, in recent years we have been making a big effort. That effort was initiated by the previous government and we are persisting with it.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 2.17, administrative savings. According to this item, annual operating costs over the next four years will be reduced by \$770 000 per annum. The item says that this will be achieved by administrative measures. The authority is to be commended for its economy. My question is: exactly what measures will be taken to achieve such significant savings?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I am happy to respond.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In the budget papers it says that it is up to individual agencies how they achieve those savings, so I will refer that to the Chief Justice as head of the Courts Administration Council.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: As I understand it, this is the 3 per cent across-the-board cut. The short answer—and I suppose this is always the case with a body funded by government—is that when that sort of decision is made you swallow and say, ‘Well, we will do our best.’ It is not a satisfactory answer but all I can say is that we are working through that at the moment. Just how and where we make the savings, I am not sure. We believe that, over the years, any fat that there was in the Courts Administration Authority has, by successive governments, been well and truly trimmed away. So it will be very difficult.

Obviously, we do not want to reduce the services that are provided to the public through court registries and other things, and we recognise the right of government to decide where the money will be put. We also recognise that this has been applied by the government to its own departments, not just to the courts. But, as you would sense from what I am saying, we do not think it will be easy for us, and we are still working out just where we will make those savings. I am sorry that I cannot give a specific answer, but it is too early. But I will just add that this has happened a number of times. It comes under different names such as ‘efficiency dividends’ or sometimes just nakedly ‘cuts’, and this is something we experience under all governments.

Ms CHAPMAN: The budget papers identify an annual recurrent funding for court operations of \$200 000 in 2004-05, rising to \$215 000 in 2007-08. The general description is ‘improved service delivery’. Where are the funds to be spent?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I am not sure where you are reading from.

Ms CHAPMAN: Budget Paper No. 3, page 2.16.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I am told this is extra funding for circuit expenses, psychology and psychiatric reports, and interpreting costs.

Ms CHAPMAN: In what manner will those services be delivered? Will there be more of them?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: That is why I am having trouble relating the answer to your question. My understanding is that there will be increased services in these areas; in other words, we will incur increased costs and there will be additional funding for that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Are there any benchmarks against which the improvements will be measured?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I suppose not, because we are talking about the need for more interpreters. We are finding that the Port Augusta circuit is getting longer, so more cases are being heard. As you would appreciate, we are in an unusual position in the sense that if the cases arrive we simply have to hear them. To some extent, while it may not seem a good answer, talking of benchmarks does not make much sense. If there are more crimes being committed and more trials to be heard we just have to hear them. It is not something we can regulate in any way.

Ms CHAPMAN: There is an allocation of \$193 000 for administration of the new Coroner’s Court. This is also at page 2.16. The forward estimates show that this amount will rise to \$669 000 next year and eventually to \$715 000 in 2007-08. On what will the new funding be spent? Why is the funding trebling next year? I would hate to think we have a lot more deaths to be investigated, but I will wait to hear the answer.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In fact, there are more deaths to be investigated because the definition of ‘reportable death’ has been expanded to embrace deaths that previously have not been reportable. There have been changes to the Coroners Act. The member for Bragg will recall the bill going through parliament: it was a bill of the previous Liberal government. We picked it up as it was and got it through parliament. It had lapsed with the calling of the election. There are new reportable deaths, owing to the Coroners Act.

They include those that occur during, as a result of or within 24 hours of carrying out a surgical procedure or an invasive medical or diagnostic procedure, or the administration of anaesthetic for carrying out such a procedure; deaths that occur at a place other than a hospital but within 24 hours of a person having been discharged from a hospital or being an inpatient of a hospital or a person having sought emergency treatment at a hospital; persons who were at the time of death protected under the Aged and Infirm Persons’ Property Act or the Guardianship and Administration Act, or under the custody or guardianship of the minister under the Child Protection Act; and a resident of a licensed supported residential facility.

The Coroner and senior management of the Coroner’s office have concerns about resource issues facing the Coroner’s office in light of the new act. The average elapsed time between a death and its inquest has been increasing and the Coroner is yet to hear inquests from deaths in 2001. This type of delay, owing to a lack of resources to conduct investigations, has a flow-on effect on the public. It is demonstrated by the impact both on grieving families and the public when prolonged investigations and subsequent inquest delay the finalisation of recommendations to alert the public to potential hazardous death circumstances. An increase in forensic science charges has affected the Coroner’s office budget.

There has been an increase of about 200 post-mortems a year, representing an additional cost to the budget of about \$160 000 per annum. Of course, an outstanding pathologist whose life’s work was autopsies has been taken into the parliament (namely, the member for Adelaide Dr Jane Lomax-Smith) and is no longer available to do autopsies.

The Forensic Science Centre has recently instituted a charge of \$400 an hour to provide a pathology opinion on a case. These opinions generally take 15 minutes and the Coroner’s office will seek this type of opinion about four times a week, which represents an increase per annum of \$20 800. Toxicology costs have increased over the past two

calendar years, and this represents an increase of about 186 toxicology cases over the period. The forensic pathologists suggest that this represents an increase in polydrug usage amongst the public and a commensurate need to test for drugs in those deceased who are involved in motor vehicle accidents, drug-related deaths, drownings, homicide, infant deaths and deaths where the cause is undetermined.

The cost of private conveyance of bodies from country regions to Adelaide for post-mortem examination has increased as the rates for cents per kilometre are now increased annually. According to increases in the South Australian transport CPI, the practice of notifying families when deceased persons have had organs retained during the post-mortem examination has affected the budget line. Of course, the member for Playford has been an avid lobbyist on that point. When an organ is retained for further testing, the family may choose to have the body returned for the funeral and the organ repatriated to the body or burial site later.

I know of a case within my own circle of friends where that occurred only last week. The decision by the family member means that the funeral director is required to make two trips to Adelaide: one to collect the body for the funeral service and another to collect the organ after the testing has been completed, and these costs, in combination, have increased private conveying charges. Staff retention is an issue in the Coroner's office. High workload in an office that operates seven days a week has taken its toll. Recruiting suitable staff members who are trained to handle the subject matter and who have the necessary competencies to prepare investigations and inquests is a constant and time-consuming task. I will ask the Chief Justice whether he has anything to add to that.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: We are paying a lot of money through the Coroner's Court for pathology reports, post-mortems, transport of bodies and so forth. It is, in fact, becoming quite an expensive jurisdiction, and we are rather nervous about the impact on us of the broadening of the definition of 'notifiable deaths'. We are working through that with the government trying to estimate what additional costs that would inflict on us, but it is becoming quite a high-cost jurisdiction to service for those reasons. We are paying out a lot of money for services provided by government agencies.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary on this matter, the increased definition and workload which the minister has highlighted and on which the Chief Justice has expanded, obviously, is a matter that needs to be provided for. But for the purposes of these estimates, what will be the increased caseload in 2007-08? What caseload does the Coroner presently deal with per year and what are the figures that are being used for the purposes of this anticipated extra money for 2007-08 because of all the reasons that have been stated?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I have some figures for current caseloads. In 2002-03, 3 673 deaths were reported. By contrast, the figure for the previous year was 3 507. Post-mortems increased in 2001-02 from 1 072 to 1 232 in 2002-03, so there is a steady increase there. I cannot accurately answer the honourable member's question, but I suspect that the difficulty from the broadening of 'notifiable deaths' is predicting how many more post-mortems and inquests will take place. I gather that the Coroner has predicted a 38 per cent increase in notifiable deaths. However, the next step will be to see how many more post-mortems, toxicology reports and so forth we will get when we do that.

As we are entering unknown territory in terms of the types of people whose deaths are being notified, I suppose that the

real answer is that one will have to make a sort of educated guess. As the honourable member would appreciate, we are concerned, first, about the workload (namely, how does the Coroner get through this); and, secondly, we must have the money to pay for all the inquiries, post-mortems and so forth that this produces, and that is something we are trying to work through with the government.

Mr HANNA: I wish to return to a matter that has already been addressed briefly by the Chief Justice in relation to the Supreme Court building. I note that in the most recent report of the judges of the Supreme Court to the Attorney-General it is stated that the current facilities raise significant health issues for staff, the judiciary and members of the public. Will the Chief Justice expand upon those significant health issues?

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I will do my best. First, in a building such as ours there are things like heritage staircases, which are very attractive but which have risers (I think the term is) of not the standard size—simple things like that. To some extent, health issues would be attributable just to wear and tear, and our uncertainty is whether we should be spending money doing things as basic as replacing frayed carpeting—what would be happening with the building, what should we do in terms of carpeting? Another factor is overcrowding. Certainly, three and four staff to the one room concerns us at the occupational health level. That would be one of the main things that occurs to me.

If you go into some of the judges' chambers, you will see cabling taped to walls. Sometimes it is across the floor with gaffer tape over it. Again, there is a huge cost to channel that into the building. Also, we find—and you probably find in Parliament House—that the minute you want to do anything the heritage branch, understandably, wants to know what you are doing and wants to examine it very closely. As I said, there are all sorts of cables taped to walls and running across floors, and there is potential for people to trip on these things. As we move into the electronic age, having those facilities in the court building, surprisingly, produces occupational health problems. I would say that sort of thing: overcrowding and then some aspects of a building built in a different era when safety was not thought of in the way that it is today.

Mr HANNA: Secondly, I would like to ask the Attorney and the Chief Justice, on behalf of the Courts Administration Authority, about the impact of changed police practices in relation to charge bargaining after the Nemer case. It has been reported that there is a greater reluctance to compromise or make arrangements in respect of charges. The logical implication would be that more matters would proceed to trial and, obviously, that will have an impact on court resources. Has that effect been anticipated or, indeed, observed in the Magistrates Court or in the higher courts?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, I will kick off. Police prosecutors are expected to follow the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions' guidelines, and that means that police prosecutors are required to engage in charge negotiations in accordance with the DPP guidelines. So, I actually think it would be contrary to those guidelines that bind the police for the police to have a policy which excludes charge negotiation altogether. I do not believe that the changes to police prosecution practices are, or could be, in violation of the DPP guidelines. As I understand it, for one particular area, all the charge negotiations had to go through one person; I am not sure if that is continuing, but I will ask the Chief Justice if he wishes to comment.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: Our perspective is slightly different because, in this sense, we are at the end of

the line, so we see the results without knowing exactly how the results are arrived at. Clearly, if there was a significant drop in the number of what I call sensible plea bargains that would be a concern because that would imply that trials are going ahead that should not be going ahead, either because the prosecution does not expect to get a conviction or because the defence realises that it has no hope of escaping a conviction but, nevertheless, between them, they have not been able to agree on an appropriate plea. So, it is a cause for concern. However, the short answer is that so far we just do not know whether, as a result of recent events (including the Nemer case), there will be any changed patterns. I understand that, during the last but one Port Augusta circuit there seemed to be fewer pleas of guilty than usual; but, as you would appreciate, these things can go up and down, and one swallow does not make a summer.

The short answer is that, at this stage, we would be concerned if there were a noticeable change in patterns of behaviour because, from my point of view, the general approach to charge (or plea) bargaining has been appropriate. However, at the moment, we cannot tell whether or not any changes are occurring. As you would be well aware, there would be a lot of gossip within the profession about it, but that is entirely anecdotal, too. I think that only time will tell. It will actually be difficult to measure; you would have to be very cautious even on one year's figures to draw any conclusion just from looking at the number of pleas of guilty. I suspect that, in a way, the true answer may not be known for two or three years and, even then, it might be difficult to be sure just what is going on.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I was advised by the Acting Director of Public Prosecutions yesterday that there was not much change in the post-Nemer period. Just for myself, I would say that, if the Nemer case led to defence counsel making fewer ambit claims in charge negotiations, and if it made prosecutors more careful in charge negotiations, that would be a wholly good thing.

Mr HANNA: Am I to understand from the Attorney's response that police prosecutors are not more reluctant to entertain sensible charge negotiations since the Nemer case?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My understanding, from my advisers, is that this occurred in only one area of police prosecutions. I do not have a report on the effect that it had, but I can assert that police prosecutors must follow the DPP guidelines, and that means entering into sensible charge negotiations.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, in relation to charge bargaining, while I appreciate that the DPP guidelines need to be adhered to, has there been any change of instruction? This is what we understand has been the position, but what are they, apart from certain cases going through one person? Are there any changes of instruction under those guidelines or any other requirements that police prosecutors must now act under?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: First of all, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions changed its own guidelines in response to the draft Kourakis report—that is, the second report—to tighten up its approach to charge negotiations. I do not have any information with me on what the change in that particular police prosecutions area was, other than the newspaper reports. Police prosecutors are, of course, responsible to the Commissioner of Police, who in turn reports to the Minister for Police. Police have been reminded of their obligation to comply with the Office of the DPP guidelines.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I just quickly raise the matter of the Murray Bridge magistrates court. I had the privilege of being an observer there recently. I am not sure if it is part of the government's compact with the member for Hammond, but I was appalled at the facility in which the magistrate had to operate. The magistrate did an excellent job. However, there were something like 50 or 60 people waiting to see the magistrate; it was a tiny room, with a swinging door, and how the magistrate could do her job I do not know. I know that you cannot rebuild and build new facilities everywhere at once, but is that on the list anywhere to upgrade it or to do anything at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No. Our priorities are different. We are building new magistrates courts at Victor Harbor, Berri, Port Pirie and Port Lincoln. They will be private/public partnerships. Port Lincoln is a heritage listed court and, while quite attractive in its exterior, it is not really an effective working courtroom. Port Pirie is cramped, as is Berri, and they are our priorities for funding.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the Attorney give any indication whether Murray Bridge is on a list anywhere, or if it just does not appear on the radar screen.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, I cannot give that commitment. I have been to the Murray Bridge Magistrate's Court myself, but Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Berri and Victor Harbor are our priorities.

Mr SNELLING: Can I ask a question about the sentencing remarks web site. Perhaps the Attorney might be able to provide some information about it. I would be interested to know how many hits were made on the sentencing remarks web site.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will ask the Chief Justice to answer that.

The Hon. the CHIEF JUSTICE: I have some statistics. Our web site overall, that is the Courts Administration Authority web site, is currently getting what I think is a surprisingly high number (27 789 hits per day), which is a 41 per cent increase at this year, compared with last year. For sentencing remarks I am told there has been a 50 to 60 per cent increase in the number of hits. In May of this year, on sentencing remarks, we had 857 hits per day.

I think we have a search engine if you wanted more detailed information. If you contact me or Sylvia Kriven, our media officer, it may be able to track it a bit further and tell you what sort of inquiries are being made, or what sort of hits. However, they are the raw figures, so from our point of view that is quite pleasing.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of payments relating to the Courts Administration Authority, \$63 679 000, and administered items for the Courts Administration Authority, \$30 000, complete.

State Electoral Office, \$2 076 000

Departmental Advisers:

Mr S. Tully, Electoral Commissioner.

Mr D. Gully, Deputy Electoral Commissioner.

Mr K. Penniford, Director, Strategic and Financial Services, Justice Department.

Ms CHAPMAN: The budget papers show that an additional \$750 000 is allocated for 2005-06 for the conduct of the 2006 election. We support that, and we would welcome an earlier election if it were constitutionally possible. The Commissioner's excellent report on the 2006 election shows a cost of \$6.724 million compared with \$5.093 million for 1997. In his report, the Commissioner made financial recommendations including the following:

Determination of office budget

Consideration to be given to allow the State Electoral Office to negotiate its budget directly with the Department of Treasury and Finance. The current whole-of-government arrangements are for financial disbursement arrangements to be overseen by portfolio management group teams. At this election, the Justice Portfolio made available \$0.5 million to the office.

I am firmly of the opinion, however, that:

the Electoral Commissioner should not take part in these leadership forums, as their agenda may include matters of government policy on which it is not appropriate for the Commissioner to comment and this therefore makes it difficult to debate an issue with that forum;

the allocation of funding for the office should not be in the hands of those who have competing outlets for funding at the portfolio level and who may wish to impose expenditure limitations which could jeopardise the conduct of free, independent and fair elections.

Have the Commissioner's recommendations been accepted by the government?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: After that letter was written, the State Electoral Commissioner had an opportunity to meet with the Treasurer and Treasury about the State Electoral Office's budget, and his requests were successful.

Ms CHAPMAN: Are they working to the satisfaction of the Commissioner?

Mr TULLY: The arrangements for our funding are still primarily through the portfolio of justice. My position remains that I would like all of our funding arrangements to be discussed directly with Treasury. In terms of outcome, I am satisfied with the outcomes that have been achieved for the following budget years, and particularly the year 2006 for the state election.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just before the budget, the government announced that it supported Bob Collins' recommendations that elections for the APY Executive be held in July this year, and \$35 000 was allocated for the conduct of the elections. I am referring to Budget Paper No. 3, page 2.42, which states that the State Electoral Commissioner will have the oversight of that election, subject to the legislation. Polling will take place on one day in seven designated communities on the lands. Are you satisfied that you can adequately supervise an election on the lands for \$35 000?

Mr TULLY: The actual costs of the election will be dependent on the final rules that the parliament determines. My understanding is that they are yet to be fully considered in the lower house but, on the basis of previous activities on the lands and what I thought the rules might come out to be, I suggested that \$35 000 be allocated. That would cover chartering two aircraft, providing around 20 staff on election day, and also having translated material (firstly translated and then distributed) both in print form and in a radio format. It may well be that the honourable member is right and that it is not adequate, but at the time I was asked to make a prediction that was the best that I could offer on the rules that I thought may exist.

Now those rules have changed a little, in my own defence. The current rules, which have yet to be considered by the lower house, provide for a nomination period of a couple of weeks, whereas previous arrangements had been that

nomination and election took place on the same day. So, I will still aim to work within that but, as always, not compromise any process for the sake of a few thousand dollars.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary on this question of process, given that there is no separate role for this election, what measures will be in place to ensure that there will be no irregularities in the election?

Mr TULLY: The major issue of people having the opportunity to vote more than once is one that (once the rules are settled by the parliament) I would like to discuss with the community, through Mr Collins or through the Municipal Services Officers, whatever is determined to be the best consultation mechanism. For example, some countries use a dye or an ink that, when electors have completed their vote, leaves a dye stain on their fingernail that stays for a couple of days. That is a way of ensuring that people do not vote more than once. But I want to be culturally sensitive to that and not introduce it if it is going to cause more problems than it is worth.

As far as secrecy of the vote is concerned, we would maintain procedures that we have had in the past whereby we would allow only one voter at a time in the polling station, so that nobody could see how they voted and they could vote without any fear of discovery of how they voted. The proposals currently before the lower house, as I understand it, are that photographs will be taken of each of the candidates for election and they will be behind a receptacle, and that voters will have the opportunity of placing a marble in that receptacle. That would all be done on a one at a time basis which, of course, is very slow, but that would overcome a lot of the problems of people maybe not feeling comfortable in a show of hands election or one that was not a secret ballot.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question on the issue of the APY election. Assuming that the lower house of this parliament deals with that issue promptly in the next week or so, are you ready to go for a July/August election?

Mr TULLY: I certainly have a translator engaged for translating the rules. Whilst being respectful of the parliament, I need to move on that, so we have an accredited translator working on it. I have spoken to charter companies as far as aeroplane services go, and we have looked at the times that are being proposed and believe that we can fly electoral officials in on polling day from Cadney Park and fly them back so that there is no question of their being on the lands outside of polling hours. So, we have progressed as far as practical at this stage. I have also written to Mr Collins with a suggestion of which officials I might be able to use in the lands and asked for his views and nominations. My proposal is to use the Municipal Services Officers as electoral officials in those communities, but I am seeking his views.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr TULLY: Well, that is the other question. I have approached the Deputy Commissioner for Police and he is not happy—sorry, the police department on the ground are not that happy about being electoral officials. That is one issue that I have to resolve very quickly. I overheard the member for Mitchell casting some concerns about Municipal Services Officers not being impartial. If that is in fact the general view, I will be back to the drawing board and maybe need to approach the Commissioner of Police again.

Ms CHAPMAN: What would be the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of conducting a single by-election in a state electorate, and I appreciate the difference between the electorate of Spence or Mount Gambier or somewhere else—

Mr HANNA: Who have you got in mind, Vickie? I am certainly not going yet.

Ms CHAPMAN: Certainly not. Mitchell would not cross my mind. I appreciate that there will be some geographical factors that would affect seats, but what would the average cost be in a typical electorate for a by-election?

Mr TULLY: There have not been many by-elections in recent times, but it is something that we look at from time to time when there are indications that the possibilities are higher than otherwise. For metropolitan seats we would estimate the cost to be somewhere around \$170 000 for a by-election; and for country seats, particularly Stuart and Giles, it could be as high as \$230 000.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, in the 2004-05 budget is there any provision for a by-election?

Mr TULLY: There is no provision for a by-election. We have not been advised that there is such a likelihood, and I would expect, if there was a variation, I would immediately approach Treasury for supplementary funding.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any plan to have a comprehensive review of the Electoral Act? I am aware that there are some inconsistencies or variations between what is allowed in a federal election and a state election in terms of advertising. There is the perennial issue of stobie pole ads and the ongoing issues with councils, but I wonder whether there are any plans to have a comprehensive look at the act and its provisions to try to address some of the shortcomings.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes. You will recall, Mr Chairman, that an electoral bill was brought to parliament during the term of the last government. It passed the Legislative Council with amendments that I thought were meritorious. It was to be dealt with in the last sitting week of the house, but you may recall that in that last week the member for Mount Gambier informed the government that, if it persisted with the amendment, candidates would be prohibited from running as independent Labor, independent Liberal or independent Democrat (that was the amendment that would prohibit the use of another party's name or part of the party's name without its consent).

That being so, the member for Mount Gambier would withdraw his support from the then government. So, the then government did not proceed with the bill, even though an overhaul of the Electoral Act was required. Only yesterday I gave my stamp of approval to a 98 page cabinet submission to amend the Electoral Act. That will be a comprehensive bill and will owe much to the previously lapsed bill, and I hope it will be before parliament in the next session.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you assure us that your photograph, which I think is a traditional icon of the western suburbs, will be permitted under the new legislation?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It certainly will be permitted. My photograph on my corflute posters dates from 1988 when I was aged 30 years. It is a perfectly good photograph and I shall persist with it.

Mr HANNA: You are sticking with the black and white!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is right, I am sticking with the black and white. I do not want my rheumy complexion to appear in the corflute posters. So, after every election—as I am sure you do, Mr Chairman—I take down my posters within 24 hours of the close of the polls, dust them, wash them, dry them on the trampoline or on the Hills Hoist and wrap them in black plastic ready for use four years hence. And, yes, I will continue to use my 1989 general election posters—of course, with the amendment of Spence to Croydon—and I hope it will remain lawful for everyone else

to do so. I have no plans to change the law to forbid that. Of course, as the member for Goyder interjects, one must remain on good terms with the person who authorised one's posters.

Mr HANNA: Who is that? Terry Cameron?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Terry and I are like that.

The CHAIRMAN: I guess there is a serious aspect to this, and that is misleading the public. In the commercial world people have to present a true representation. In your case, Attorney, you have not changed much, but there could be a situation where someone has aged significantly and looks different from how they looked in 1988. But, putting that aside, I accept your reassurance.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I think the Electoral Act should continue to accommodate the vanity of members of parliament. I think it would be undesirable to print new corflute posters unnecessarily just because the likeness of the candidate may have changed slightly over two years. There is a provision in the Local Government Act that the photo submitted for the candidate's statements that are circulated by the electoral office must be a recent likeness—I think within 12 months. I can see the point of that, but I do not think corflute posters should be unnecessarily trashed.

Mr HANNA: Following on from the questions about the APY lands election, should parliament decide there will be one soon, I have a question about the \$35 000 budget. Can the Electoral Commissioner advise when he was first alerted to the possibility of an imminent election and when that \$35 000 would have to be set aside?

Mr TULLY: There have been discussions for some time with various groups about possible elections on the AP lands. Of course, in the normal cycle they were due late last year. I met late last year with Mr Gary Lewis, chair of the committee, and some other officials, and I was advised about some constitutional matters about which there was some confusion (they are my words, not his) and the need for an election. Some months passed and other issues came into play on the lands, and my discussion shifted from being with the Department for Aboriginal Affairs to senior staff of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

While my memory is not exact, my belief is that probably two months ago I gave an indication on the rules at the time that \$35 000 was the best I could come up with at that time for around 3 000 electors, not all of whom will vote.

Mr HANNA: Will you specify in what manner you are intending to engage the municipal services officers in respect of the elections?

Mr TULLY: For a very straightforward function of receiving nominations and forwarding those nomination forms to me. As I explained in answer to a question from the member for Bragg, it was my initial understanding that there would not be a nomination period and that we would go up there to hold nominations and elections straight afterwards. Given that there is a nomination period, it seems to be a ridiculous expense to have 10 people sitting up there for two weeks in the hope they might receive a nomination or two. I was hoping to use the municipal services officers to receive the nominations (with a photograph) and fax them to my office so that we could start proceedings and prepare ballot papers—sorry, not ballot papers but, rather, prepare for the election

Mr HANNA: Not ballot papers?

Mr TULLY: No. Originally, there was a sense that there would be ballot papers and photographs on the ballot papers, but those rules changed in discussions that were held with various parties, not all of whom I know. The next thing I

knew was that the proposal had returned back to marbles, which is a situation we have administered satisfactorily in the past.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have seven omnibus questions about which I have advised the Minister for Justice. We have a session this afternoon and I am happy to ask them in that session.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I hope I am able to recite the answers to the omnibus questions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I would be pleased if you could, thank you.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am not sure you will be.

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

Department of Human Services and Department for Families and Communities, \$1 833 372 000
Administered items for the Department of Human Services and Administered items for the Department for Families and Communities, \$166 349 000

Membership:

Mrs Redmond substituted for Ms Chapman.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms K. Lennon, Chief Executive Officer, Department for Families and Communities.

Mr S. Blight, Director, Office for Youth.

Mr F. McGuinness, Financial Adviser, Office for Youth.

Ms J. Ryan, Policy Officer, Department of Human Services.

Mr A. Story, Chief of Staff, Minister for Youth.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the examination open, and point out that the examination will be in stages because some aspects relate subsequently to the Minister for the Status of Women. Minister, do you wish to make a brief opening statement?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: First, I acknowledge that we are on Kurna land and acknowledge the traditional owners. It gives me great pleasure to address the estimates committee for the Office for Youth. It was only 15 months old when I last appeared before the committee, when I was pleased to report a number of significant achievements in this office. Now, 12 months later, I am delighted to report on the new milestones accomplished by the office.

A number of the traditional programs within the office have established high levels of participation. For example, this year's youth parliament had a record number of 120 participants, involving a diverse range of young people not previously encountered within the program. Similarly, the HomeStart Finance Youth Media Awards received a record number of entries in 2003, and it was my pleasure to present William Rayner, Editor of *The Stock Journal*, as the South Australian Young Journalist of the Year.

Other programs have undergone some transformation. The Active8 Premier's Youth Challenge is about to complete its pilot phase and has been finetuned to ensure that program funds are targeted at the initiatives which promote youth development outcomes. The Office for Youth is about to present me with its recommendations of successful program applicants for programs to begin in 2004-05. Another

program which has undergone a transformation is the Duke of Edinburgh's Award. Late in 2003 it was my pleasure to appoint a new State Award Committee to oversee the program.

Mr Robert Gerard, the current and ongoing chairperson, I am pleased to say, has been joined by respected high profile South Australians, such as the Hon. Diana Laidlaw (a minister in the former government), Ms Frances Magill (Chief Executive Officer of Statewide Superannuation Trust) and Mr Peter Karidis, a prominent Adelaide business person. They are also joined by Ms Shivani Reiter, the Telstra Businesswoman of the Year 2002. I am pleased to advise that this program, too, is now setting records of youth engagement with the figures for March and April setting new heights.

My enthusiasm and pleasure at the significant achievements of these and other programs is tempered, however, by some of the delays in the development of the Youth Action Plan. At the 2003 Estimates Committee I indicated that I anticipated that I would be able to launch the Youth Action Plan in early 2004. Unfortunately, this has not occurred. The delay has been partly due to staffing changes within the Office for Youth and, as members would be aware, it is a fairly small office. More importantly, I think that it has been delayed to ensure that this program fits in with the State Strategic Plan.

When the complete plan is available I believe that it will offer a challenge to all government agencies to address youth issues within the context of the six objectives of the State Strategic Plan. A cross-government task force, representing 15 agencies, has prepared a draft (which is nearly ready for my consideration) to go to cabinet and then to a final public consultation. I expect that the Youth Action Plan will be completed this year. However, we are a little behind the anticipated completion date. I look forward to the 2004-05 Office for Youth activities with much optimism and excitement, which is contagious from the office itself and from the people who are involved with our Office for Youth programs.

In particular, I believe that this office has given statewide leadership in a number of social inclusion initiatives contained within the School Retention Action Plan's 'Making Connections', and will assist with the latest social inclusion reference on youth unemployment. The office will lead the development of a Premier's Memorandum on Youth Participation. It will conduct a range of youth participation workshops. It will conduct research into best practice in student governance in schools. It will establish a series of youth and business round tables, and it will report on the world's best practice in youth development.

The Office for Youth is supporting the development of a proposal for an international youth conference in Adelaide 2005. In particular, the Office for Youth has allocated staff time to assist the Social Inclusion Unit in the Department of Premier and Cabinet in research and development of a conference program. The office will continue to work with other agencies, such as the Department for Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology, the Department for Education and Children's Services and the Social Inclusion Unit in making sure that we collaboratively pursue better outcomes for young people. Finally, I would like to congratulate Mr Joe Scalzi on his appointment as the parliamentary secretary responsible for youth.

I look forward to the continuance of strong bipartisan support for youth issues that I have enjoyed with Mr Mark Brindal (who was a previous minister for youth and more recently the shadow minister) and your good self, Mr

Chairman. I thank you for your ongoing interest, not only as a former minister for youth but also as someone who is an advocate for youth in our community. I would like to say that this is a very positive program in South Australia and I look forward to its continuing.

Mr SCALZI: I would like to thank the minister for her kind words and congratulations. I am privileged to be in this area. As a former teacher for 18 years, a father of three and a step-father of two, I feel that I can make a contribution in this area. I agree with the minister that we must work together in this very important area. I acknowledge the good work that has been done in the area of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, and I commend those members who have been appointed to the board, as well as the Active8 plan, because recognition is very important.

I believe that recognition is a prerequisite to participation and contribution. We must encourage young people to participate and contribute. It is no use talking about young people being the future if we do not recognise the present and the contribution that they are making. If one looks at volunteering in South Australia and, indeed, Australia, a lot of good work is being done by youth. There are still many concerns within the area of youth. Youth employment is an important issue, with only .75 per cent employment growth forecast for South Australia for the coming year. The youth unemployment rate in South Australia is 29.2 per cent.

Increases in charges such as car registration up 3.8 per cent and third party insurance up 5.5 per cent, along with increases in driver's licence fees and bus tickets, will certainly impact on youth, who are often working part-time on low incomes and actively seeking work. Only recently comments have been made in the media in regard to the difficulties of young people trying to continue to study full-time while working long hours. So, young people are certainly not having it easy.

There is to be no replacement for the Magill Training Centre, as reported in the *Messenger* on 9 June, where it was stated that it would be patched up, with \$1.5 million being spent on maintenance rather than on the relocation to Cavan as pledged by the former government and reconfirmed by the minister in June 2002. Minister Weatherill has set aside \$2.1 million in the 2004-05 budget as an interim measure until the future is decided. The maintenance money will be wasted when the Magill Training Centre is eventually sold and bulldozed, and the outcome for the residents of the centre will still not be satisfactory compared to the purpose-built centre at Cavan. Once again, capital works have been delayed. How much longer will young offenders have to wait on adequate accommodation?

Likewise, in the budget there is no mention of dedicated youth facilities for detox and rehabilitation. This was item 27 in the South Australian Labor Party's 'Platform for Government', where, under the heading 'Youth Affairs: Valuing our Future' the following appears:

Labor will review treatment and support services for young people dealing with [drug and alcohol] issues and examine the feasibility of establishing an adolescent treatment facility.

There are no specific services for housing for young people. As I said, youth employment is now up 3.9 per cent to 29.2 per cent. Obviously, this is unacceptable, and I agree with the shadow minister for employment that the time for discussion papers and committees is over; we must now see implementation of targeted initiatives to deal with youth unemployment.

In relation to retention rates, ABS figures reveal that we have the lowest retention rate in the nation for year 10 to 12 boys at 64.7 per cent. A lot of problems that arise relate to those issues, which that have to be dealt with.

My first question is about the Youth Action Plan. I note that the minister has acknowledged that it has not been released, even though it was mentioned in last year's estimates—and I commend the minister for updating us on that. I would like to ask a further question on that. I refer to Budget Paper 4, page 7.21, under 'Program K2: Office for Youth—Subprogram: K2.2 Operational Policy and Resource Management'. The performance commentary states that statewide consultation for the development of the Youth Action Plan is nearing completion. The performance indicators show that fewer than 100 people were consulted in 2003-04 and that fewer than 100 will be consulted in 2004-05. My questions to the minister are: who is being consulted in this statewide consultation process? How are they identified? Are the fewer than 100 people for 2003-04 the same people as for 2004-05? Are they separate from the government agencies involved?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I thank the honourable member for his comments, which cover a number of areas, not merely those under my responsibility. Of course, the member would be aware that we see the Office of Youth as a bit like the Office for Women in having the challenge of trying to work across all portfolios. I share the honourable member's concern about youth unemployment, but I do remind the honourable member that, under his government, the youth unemployment rate was 34 per cent and, under our government, it is now 29 per cent. That is still unacceptable, but I do not think we should rewrite history about youth unemployment. This is an ongoing concern and I do not think that the honourable member would be very proud of the 34 per cent that applied when his government was in office.

The Youth Action Plan, as I said in my opening address, is behind schedule. This is mainly because we wanted to ensure that it was in line with the State Strategic Plan; that was the major reason. However, there are some other reasons that I will outline now. I should just correct the record on the reference that the honourable member gave from page 7.21. It actually says that more than 100 people have been consulted, not fewer than 100 people. The Youth Action Plan comes from the ALP platform, where we were very clear about our youth policy and, indeed, about policy that went further than the Office for Youth. As I said, the Office for Youth, in my view, has more of a facilitating role across government and the community. It works very closely with organisations such as the Youth Affairs Council (YACSA) and the numerous youth organisations that we have in the community. We are hoping to look at identifying goals for young people through the plan; that we are a government that is responsive to the needs of young people by having a youth action plan; and (I think the honourable member has touched on this) that we have a better coordinated approach in regard to service delivery to make sure that there is not a duplication of effort.

I am particularly keen to make sure that it is not the same 20 young people who receive services, that it is spread across the state and that there is a better access and equity component to what we do. The Office for Youth is the second smallest portfolio in government, as members would be aware. I think that in its co-ordination role it certainly does much better for its size than other larger departments. I

probably sound a bit parochial, but I think they do a brilliant job.

One of the areas that we have looked at is how we actually consult with young people. Although figures do tell a story, it is interesting to note that we have received over 100 submissions from young people about the youth action plan, and some enthusiasm has been demonstrated about the fact that we are looking at a plan of action. In this consultation have been all the government sectors (the three levels of government) and the community sector which, as people in this chamber would know, is quite a considerable sector. The youth sector alone is large, but other communities have been involved. A youth action plan workshop was held in April this year to look at the targets and priorities. As I said, we have made sure that the youth action plan not only looks at the recently released State Strategic Plan but also responds to the six strategic objectives of the State Strategic Plan.

As members would know, the State Strategic Plan has targets and priorities for action, and there are 16 key goals. We have looked at that with respect to young people in our community to make sure, again, that we are on the agenda in all of those areas. The task force charged with this duty considered all this on 6 May, so it is fairly recent. The draft is currently under consideration by me and also the office, to then go to cabinet. There have also been regular updates put on the Office for Youth web site. So, those who are into computer technology as a way of accessing information have been kept up to date with what we have been doing in that area.

When I took the draft of the South Australian youth action plan to cabinet it was followed by an eight-week period of extensive public consultations. The intention is that, once it goes through cabinet and gets the tick off there, it will be published and distributed statewide. There will be some collaboration on the plan with all the departments and levels of government that I talked about earlier. We also intend to make sure that the youth action plan supports particularly the State Strategic Plan's goals and targets, particularly target 5.7. That is the background to it. I am sure that if there are any supplementary questions or more detail, Stephen Blight would be able to answer those questions.

Mr SCALZI: I have a supplementary question. What is the cost of the youth plan and has the cost of the plan blown out at all as a result of the delay?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I am sorry, I may have by mistake said that the youth action plan has gone to cabinet. It has not. I was trying to say that the approval to go through this process went to cabinet, so I had better just clear that up so that I am not misleading the honourable member. Could you repeat the question?

Mr SCALZI: I accept that, and thank you for that. What is the cost of the youth action plan and has the cost blown out as a result of the delay?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The allocated budget for the plan under the 2003-04 budget was \$16 500. The actual year to date is \$7 400.

Mr SCALZI: My next question is a general one. Since the government is refusing to conduct a royal commission into allegations of child abuse of state wards in institutional care, what abuse prevention programs or initiatives is the government going to put in place to empower young people to protect themselves against child abuse? I understand that is over all government, not just your portfolio.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I do not accept what the honourable member said. It is not now my area of responsibility, but

I not only disagree with what he said but know that the work that is being done, particularly for children under the guardianship of the minister and wards of the state, is considerable. Having been in charge of that area, I know what work has been done and I am sure that Minister Weatherill will be able to amplify that next week, as will Chief Executive Kate Lennon. That question needs to be put to the appropriate minister, but it does give me the opportunity to talk about some of the programs that we have running through the Office for Youth, and the main emphasis, in my view, is to look at empowerment and at participation.

Mr SCALZI: That is specifically what I was referring to.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The Office for Youth, as I said, is a very small portfolio, as far as money is concerned. The resources that the Office for Youth have are the staff, with a very small budget. I am very proud of the fact that we have managed to run a number of programs over the past couple of years and will continue to do so, and I will just list some of them. There is the Active8 Premier's Youth Challenge; the Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund for Children and Young People—and that is particularly directed at young people who have been under the guardianship of the minister. This is a new and very exciting initiative. I am proud of this group which is made up of former attorney-general Hon. K.T. Griffin; the Hon. Ann Levy, former Labor member and the first woman President of the Legislative Council; representatives of CREATE, a group for young people; and a number of other important members of the community who are dedicated to making sure that we continue to support young people who have been under the guardianship of the minister. I can add more detail, but I will provide a briefing on that program.

The Duke of Edinburgh Award, which I mentioned in my opening statement, has been revamped. I am grateful to Bob Gerard for his leadership and the way in which he has managed to make sure that not only the community sector but also the business sector is right behind this award. There is also the Rural and Regional Youth Program, which we are looking at, and the School Retention Action Plan, *Making the Connections*, Workers with Youth, network grants, the Young Achiever Award and, as I said, the Youth Action Plan on which we are working. We have youth advisory committees now I think in all local government areas. This is a very important initiative. We are doing considerable work in a whole lot of areas including some of the issues raised by the honourable member with the Youth Affairs Council. We have the Youth Empowerment Grants, to which young people and organisations can apply directly. I could go through some of the details of that if the honourable member wishes.

We have the Youth in Community Grants to try to make sure that we support different initiatives that come from the community sector. We have Youth Parliament, which has had a record number of participants from a diverse range of backgrounds rather than what tended to happen in the past where a particular group of young people were served under that program. We also have a lot of programs that look at the fact that, like all of us, young people come from a diverse range of backgrounds. Those are just some of the things that I can tell you about. As you can tell, I would be more than happy to amplify any of those in more detail.

Mrs REDMOND: I ask a supplementary question in relation to the Active8 program, given the minister's offer to expand. I refer to page 7.20—Performance Indicators. Under the targets for 2003-04, it states that 1 500 is the number of young people approved to participate in Active8, but the

actual outcome was 1 220, which is somewhat lower, and the target for this year is lower again. A footnote at the bottom of those performance indicators states that both the estimated result for this year and the target for the coming year are determined in relation to available resources. That reads to me as though the government set a target which it did not provide the resources to meet. I would like the minister to explain whether I am reading that correctly or whether there is some other explanation.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I will ask Stephen Blight to explain the detail of the plans for the Active8 program.

Mr BLIGHT: The Active8 program was originally funded as a pilot program over four years with a budget of \$4.4 million. Each program which is funded runs for two years. In the pilot, some of those programs were funded for one year. So, there has always been the issue of the programs which are starting up and those which are continuing and those which have been funded. There is, therefore, not a complete match between the figure for the programs funded and those actually running at the moment, because a program can be funded in one year but it will run for two years.

In those four years, there was an initial allocation of \$1 million and then it went up to \$1.2 million, then \$1.5 million, and then to a base figure of \$700 000. At the time the prediction was made for the programs for 2003-04, there was some consideration given to trying to get top up funding for the program for that year, but it has been established at the base of the final year of the pilot. The team that considered the targets for 2003-04 were working within that context. The program has now been established at \$700 000 ongoing funding. Your observation of the lower figure is correct because the programs which are concluding at the moment were initially funded in the year in which there was \$1.5 million out of that \$4.4 million.

Mrs REDMOND: So, essentially, it has been halved.

Mr BLIGHT: Statistically it has been halved, but it was approved by a previous cabinet at \$1.2 million, \$1.5 million and \$700 000. So a decision was not made to halve it; it was actually part of the planned allocations for those four years. There was no variation in the allocations over that four-year period.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The other point that needs to be made is that we have tried to diversify the sort of programs that we are running through the Office for Youth. When we make a decision about forward funding for that program, we will look at it again to see where we go from here. There is certainly the \$700 000 that Stephen Blight mentioned that will be ongoing, so we have made that decision. The Duke of Edinburgh Award in addition to the Office for Youth has been quite a positive thing. It has enabled us to diversify and, as I said, try to involve young people whom we could not have involved if we did not have that program.

The same applies to the Youth Conservation Corps, which comes under another part of my responsibility, under Employment Training and Further Education. But, again, it gives us another program that we can access for young people. So, that is the sense behind it. I make no bones about the fact that I think that the Office for Youth should get more resources. I make this point, I know that my predecessors have made this point and that there is a similar problem with the Office for Women. I guess the problem is that because people do such a brilliant job, we expect that to continue. I also have for members, if they would like it, an information kit on the actual programs that are being run. So, it will give

you the opportunity to look at the detail of some of the ones that I mentioned to the honourable member.

Ms CICCARELLO: Perhaps a suggestion to the minister could be that, if we lower the voting age to 10 or 11, we might see treasurers increase budgets because we would have younger people able to vote, and therefore it might be taken more seriously. You may have already touched on this in answer to some of the previous questions, but with reference to Volume 4.2, page 7.2, K21, what have been some of the practical benefits of the Office for Youth Funding of the Youth Advisory Council?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I should just say that it is my personal view that the voting age should be lowered, and I am very keen on supporting moves in that area. You may be interested to know that at the YACfest that we held, I think it was last year, which is the Youth Advisory Council's festival, one of the matters that was considered by that forum was the voting age issue. I cannot remember the exact figures but there was, I think, 99 per cent support by the young people who were at the YACfest for the voting age being lowered to 16 years. So, I take very seriously the advice that I get from my various advisory committees, and it does accord with my own personal view. This is something that I am very keen to talk about. I am not saying that necessarily anybody else is keen on that issue, but I am pleased to see that the member for Norwood can see the sense in that area.

As I said in my opening statement, the youth advisory committees have been a real success story for the Youth portfolio. I refer also to their partnerships with local government: the basic fact is that we are such a small portfolio that we are actually compelled to partner with other groups, and I think that is a good thing in itself. In this case, we have used the infrastructure of local government to make sure that young people have representation at a local level on local youth issues. So, I think this is a very important initiative. They also provide advice (I am not sure how it is taken) to the elected members of council, and there has been some very positive feedback through the local government forum that minister McEwen chairs about the youth advisory committees. I would not say that the elected members are always in accord with the advice that they get, but I think it is good that it is available.

One of the duties of the youth advisory committees is to consult with young people in their area, to lobby community decision makers in their area, and also to promote a positive image of young people in local communities instead of what we tend to see in the media, which is always the negative side of young people's existence.

These outcomes have come at a fairly modest budget allocation of \$250 000. There are 70 YACs, as they are called, including five indigenous-specific committees, funded in the 2003-04 budget. This means that more than 700 young people have been involved in South Australia—and I am advised that the Parliamentary Secretary in this area has been meeting with a number of these YAC groups, so I know that he will support what I am saying about how important they are on a local level. On 61 local councils the Outback Areas Trust is represented, and there are two Aboriginal Land Trust areas—Yalata Aboriginal Corporation and Neppabunna Community Incorporated—and they have been involved in this whole process of having youth advisory councils.

To their shame, there are only seven councils in South Australia that do not have a youth advisory committee. I will not name them. Each YAC is eligible to receive annual funding of \$3 000, and in many cases their value has been

recognised by the local government, which has topped up by giving extra funding and other resources. Again, in this budget, we have allocated \$250 000, and this will be used to support the existing 70 youth advisory committees.

One of the exciting initiatives (and I hope that members here will come to this event) is YACfest 2004. This is a one-day forum for YACs and their coordinators and is planned for September 2004. This will be another opportunity for young people to get together and share common experiences and concerns. The Speaker managed to come to the last YACfest that we held, and I think that he found it (like I did) most enlightening to hear the views of that group. The focus on the youth advisory committees is certainly in line with the State Strategic Plan commitment to building communities.

Ms CICCARELLO: I refer to Budget Paper No. 4, Volume 2, page 7.19. What have been the outcomes of the Dame Roma Mitchell trust fund for children and young people?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: As I said, I am very impressed by this initiative, and this gives me an opportunity to talk about it in more detail. Under the Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund for Children and Young People, children and young people up to the age of 30 years who are or have been subject to a guardianship order or who are in a long-term family placement financially supported by Family and Youth Services are eligible to receive funding from the trust. This grant program provides funding to eligible children and young people to assist them to achieve personal goals, contribute to their health and well-being and provide development opportunities. The trust fund is administered by the Public Trustee, with administrative support from the Office for Youth and a board that oversees the funds management, grant assessment and allocation process.

As I said previously, I am very impressed with this board. I particularly acknowledge its administrator, Bill Cossey; I mentioned retired politicians Anne Levy and Trevor Griffin who volunteer their time to assist with the work of the fund; and, as I said, there are a number of community representatives, particularly young people who have been under the guardianship of the minister. For obvious reasons, I will not identify them.

Mrs REDMOND: Can I ask for clarification of where this matter appears on page 7.19?

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has taken the view not to be too prescriptive about the pages because it takes up a lot of time.

Mrs REDMOND: I appreciate that, but the page number was quoted in the question.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: There is a grants and subsidies line on that page, but I have just been advised there is a technical issue that the member may have raised. The Public Trustee is charged with responsibility for that area, but it does come under my portfolio area of responsibility. That would be the technical answer to the question. I am advised that we also provide the salaries to run that program. I do not know if that is a good enough reference for the honourable member. It is very interesting that the opposition, not the government, would ask where the reference is.

The current capital value of the trust fund is \$1.8 million and it is estimated by the Public Trustee that the life span of this grant will be 10 years. I know, having met with the chair (Bill Cossey) recently, that the fund is looking at a number of other initiatives, which may mean that it lasts longer than 10 years, and I will be happy to talk about some of those initiatives at another stage.

Grants have been offered to 65 applicants from the first two rounds of funding in October 2003 and January 2004. They have received a total of \$147 040 since October 2003, and I expect that \$180 000 will be available for distribution in 2004-05. To give members an idea of the sorts of things that have been funded to date, they include: computer systems, TAFE fees, trade tools, whitegoods, basic household furniture items, driving lessons, clothes for job interviews, a hearing aid, a special purpose wheelchair, text books and specialised dental work. By definition, young people eligible for these grants come from disadvantaged backgrounds. The provision of grants to purchase these goods and services makes a real difference to the quality of life of applicants in this program.

Mr SNELLING: What has the government done to support youth peak bodies?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: We have looked at a number of initiatives. We particularly work with the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, and I commend that organisation because it provides excellent advice (not always advice that I take, I might add) and it has worked very closely with the Ministerial Youth Council. There is a lot of debate because not everybody in the youth community has the same views. YACSA has 54 youth members under the age of 25, 12 individual members, 25 network members and 45 organisational members, which casts the net pretty well across not only young people but also the different organisations in South Australia. I was very pleased that we were able to increase the funding to the Youth Affairs Council in the state budget by \$55 000, and it now has an allocation of \$250 700. As I said, the level of work that is done by the equivalent of five full-time staff and 136 different types of representatives is exceptional, and it is a model for some of the other peak organisations in South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: As you pointed out, I have been Minister for Youth, and I am still passionate about young people. I am the person who created the Youth Parliament and Youth Media Awards as well as starting the Youth Advisory Council process and Activ8, which was hijacked (it was created by me but, subsequently, other people took it up). Is the youth action plan based on an audit of youth facilities and services? One of my concerns is that young people are discriminated against in our community in terms of lack of facilities and services. While my own office has done a bit of work, if we are to have an effective action plan we need to look at what is and is not provided throughout the state by way of youth centres, youth worker services and out-of-hours counselling, and so on. Is that part of the youth action plan? Has that formed a basis of it?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Not explicitly. Obviously, those issues have been raised during numerous consultations and workshops that have been held. I know from my previous portfolios that this is one of the areas for which the Department for Families and Communities has some responsibility, particularly through its family and community grants and a number of other grants from the family safety aspect, through to young people's shelters and the homelessness strategy. We have looked at that area. I imagine that it could be better answered next week under the Department for Families and Communities examination. Kate Lennon might like to comment.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very keen that someone looks at it, even if a consultant has to be engaged to look at what is and is not provided for young people. Some councils provide

youth centres, some do not. It is a mishmash of discrimination against young people throughout the state.

Ms LENNON: I think that the new department is certainly looking at youth issues. As you are aware, there has been a large advertising campaign for new staff, particularly for Family and Youth Services; and there are a number of youth workers there. We will be looking at how youth workers are placed in the community and their role and relationship with schools and parents. Also, we will be looking at what I term centres of excellence, that is, working with local communities, local councils and local businesses to deal with youth issues. That will be unfolding in the next 12 months, but I take your comments on board.

The CHAIRMAN: I encourage the government to do an audit.

Mr SCALZI: The minister might want to take this question on notice. In relation to mentoring, the Labor Party made a commitment in its 2002 election policy to commit an extra \$2 million over four years to youth at risk, including funding for community mentors and role models. Has this been achieved? It is becoming clear that mentoring is a growing phenomenon in Australia because of its ability to prevent at-risk behaviour and intervene in problematic behaviour. Is the government interested in expanding this community service opportunity? If so, does the government have a clear strategy on implementation of volunteer youth mentoring in South Australia?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I think most of what the honourable member has asked comes under the Department for Families and Communities and, to a certain extent, the health and education portfolios. As I was explaining, the Office for Youth has a different role. I know the Office for Youth is interested and involved in these areas, more as a consultant to government, but those particular programs and the funding for them come under those portfolios.

One of the areas at which we are looking is the number of volunteers who are involved with the different programs in government, whether it be the Office for Youth or the employment portfolios, SA Works, and the particular programs that we have there. That is something I am considering at present. I know that our Chief Executive is looking at ways to ensure that we have the best possible outcomes from not only our mentors but also our volunteers in the different programs. Some work is being done by the Chief Executive to look at that area and, on a general level, the benefits derived from those programs. I think in the previous budget a number of mentoring type programs were announced, not only under the Department of Human Services but also under education and employment, training and further education.

Mr SCALZI: In Budget Paper 5, Capital Investment Statement, there is no mention of dedicated youth facilities for detox and rehabilitation. As I mentioned earlier, item 27 in the Labor Party's platform for government youth affairs states:

... Labor will review treatment and support services for young people dealing with [drug and alcohol] issues and examine the feasibility of establishing an adolescent treatment facility.

I am aware that YACSA has been advocating the establishment of dedicated services for youth in this and other areas (recommendation 10 of the YACSA state budget submission, October 2003). I understand that residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation facilities for youth are available in Queensland, Victoria and in Western Australia in conjunction with Mission Australia. In Queensland, in particular, ADAWS

(Adolescent Drug and Alcohol Withdrawal Service) provides a 10 to 14 day live-in program with full support (health and medical support, counselling etc.) for young people aged 13 to 18 with drug and alcohol issues. The service has been based in Brisbane since 2000 and it has recently become available to referrals statewide. Will the minister advise whether any funding is allocated for the development of such facilities in South Australia? Has any progress been made towards establishing such facilities? I know that funding should come from other areas, but I am talking about the general policy towards this and the fact that YACSA, a great peak body for youth, is advocating such a facility.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I think that, as with some of the other questions the honourable member has asked me, this question is out of order for the Office for Youth area. In understanding the reason for the question, can I say that there is probably an opportunity under families and communities, health and social inclusion initiatives for the honourable member to get a more comprehensive reply on those areas. The Social Inclusion Unit, as I mentioned earlier, has been working very closely with the Office for Youth on a number of issues, particularly relating to young people. It has also been working very closely with YACSA.

Members will recall that very early on in our time in government the Drugs Summit really did set up the outline for the way in which we would try to deal with the fact that a number of young people are at risk by virtue of alcohol, drugs and other sorts of unfortunate lifestyle choices. This program has been followed not only through the areas of education and health but also through what was social justice but is now families and communities. Certainly, the Office for Youth has been involved in all those programs, and particularly the social inclusion programs. However, the detailed answer about resources and the future would really come under the portfolios of other ministers.

Mr SCALZI: I understand that it must be a whole of government approach.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's time has expired. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed. We will now move to consideration of the lines relating to the status of women.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Mr Chairman, I seek a clarification. I understand that the member for Hartley opted not to ask me the omnibus question on youth. That has not been dealt with. I am not sure of the present arrangements. How long are we sitting? Has there been any change in the times that we may or may not sit?

The CHAIRMAN: I am not aware of any changes other than that with which the committee concurred, that is, that we would go into the lunch break by five minutes. That is the only change of which I am aware. In relation to the omnibus questions, I guess that the honourable member can have them raised at other times, because we are still under the same general portfolio area. One point which I raised previously but on which members obviously choose to follow their own course of action is that members making introductory statements means that not a lot of time is left for questions. However, that is the prerogative of members.

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Ms C. O'Loughlin, Director, Office of the Status of Women.

Ms L. McAdam, Manager, Office of the Status of Women.

Ms M. Russell, Policy Officer, Department of Human Services.

Membership:

Mrs Hall substituted for Mr Scalzi.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz substituted for Mr Meier.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The South Australian government has maintained its commitment to the women of this state over the last year. Funds allocated to this portfolio for the 2004-05 financial year have been maintained at \$1.78 million. This includes \$520 000 to support the continuing work of the Women's Information Service and the \$230 000 for the Premier's Women's Council. I would just like to spend a few moments highlighting some of the successful activities undertaken in this portfolio over the last 12 months, as well as some of the important initiatives that are planned for the coming year, particularly those that relate to the targets of the State Strategic Plan.

The Premier's Council for Women was allocated its operating budget of \$205 000 over the past year, and this was supplemented by a carry-over of \$25 000 from funds not expended from the previous financial year (2002-03). Some of the important projects undertaken by the Premier's Women's Council was the publication, *Statistical Profile of Women in South Australia*. This snapshot of the status of women in the state provides important baseline data that is now informing the council in its ongoing work and also the Office for Women. I would like to distribute that publication. In fact, the information that emerged from that profile now underpins a continuing project to identify available gender desegregated data on key measures on the status of women, and the development of indicators that will enable regular monitoring of changes in the status of women across the state.

The Premier's Women's Council has also conducted consultations with women through forums held in Adelaide and Whyalla. They were very successful events that gathered valuable information through community input on the concerns of women in the important issues exposed by the statistical analysis, particularly focusing on women's working life and experiences of poverty. Further consultation forums are planned for the coming year including focus groups with girls in the Years 10 to 12 across the northern suburbs. The northern suburbs will be the hub of broader consultation for women during August.

The issue of women's leadership has also been a major area of work for the Premier's Women's Council. Of course, this target within the State Strategic Plan leaves us with much work to do in pursuing the objective of an average of 50 per cent female membership by 2006 and 50 per cent female chairs of all boards and committees by 2008. The council has been working with the Women's Policy Office to bring to the forefront the issue of women's participation on state government boards and committees. This project has involved a complete overhaul of the Women's Register, the publication of the Premier's Women's Directory, and the establishment of an online resource to assist ministers and government to identify women with skills and experience relevant to the wide diversity of boards and committees across government. This directory will be launched on 3 August at a function that will bring together women in the directory and key decision-makers across government. I would assume that everyone in this chamber would get an invitation to such a program, and obviously other members. In addition, the government is developing options to encourage external organisations to ensure that they do not overlook qualified women when nominating panels of candidates for appointments to boards and committees.

I would like to talk briefly about policy. The policy office has focused on five key areas over this year: indigenous women's initiatives, women's safety, women's leadership, legislative reviews, and support and advice to agencies on the ways to integrate gender considerations to their day-to-day activities. I would like to highlight briefly the work of these areas. In relation to the indigenous women's initiatives, the Office for Women's supported an indigenous women's gathering at Spear Creek in collaboration with the Aboriginal Services Division of the Department of Human Services and DAARE to ensure that Aboriginal women influence high level decision-making. The gathering incorporated a workshop on governance and the involvement in advisory structures of government facilitated by Ms Virginia Hickey from Luma Corporate Governance Consulting.

Following the state gathering of a delegation of four Aboriginal women attended the national gathering of Aboriginal women as part of MINCO—the ministerial council for women ministers, or ministers with responsibility for women's affairs, which is probably a better description. The Office for Women has also worked hard to facilitate the establishment of the supported accommodation pilot project for Aboriginal girls from Gepps Cross High School to improve school retention rates and the completion of the South Australian Certificate of Education. This project is an excellent example of collaboration across many parts of state government, federal government and the community sector which, on completion, will provide a model that we hope will emulate other parts of the state where there is an identified need—places like Gepps Cross.

In addition, the supported accommodation project work continues on the establishment of an on-site child care facility for all the young mothers who attend the Gepps Cross High School to help them complete their schooling consistent with the State Strategic Plan of increasing the percentage of students completing Year 12 or its equivalent to 90 per cent within 10 years. An Aboriginal women's policy position has been advertised in the Office for Women. The skills and knowledge of this person will bring the organisation in line for us to be able to consult appropriately with Aboriginal women, organise further gatherings, and also provide direct advice on policy initiatives to address particular issues that are identified.

I would also like to hand out the Women's Safety Strategy. I think that members may have already received this but, with your indulgence, I would like to hand those out now. The Office for Women has collaborated with other government agencies and women's services to work on a whole-of-government strategy on women's safety. A discussion paper was released for public consultation on International Women's Day this year and submissions have been received from a diverse range of community organisations. The Office for Women has also participated with the Department of Human Services in the National Partnerships Against Domestic Violence *Women's Leadership*. The Office for Women continues as a successful partnership with Multicultural SA to conduct women's leadership programs for women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Options are currently being explored to expand this initiative next year to offer more advanced training for women whose needs are not met by the current program.

As mentioned earlier, the Office for Women has worked with the Premier's Women's Council in overhauling the Women's Register and developing the Premier's Women's Directory to be launched in August. This work is an ongoing

component of the Office for Women's activities and, as an integral part of government, works towards meeting the State Strategic Plan targets of 50 per cent female membership on boards and committees by 2006, and chairs by 2010. The Office for Women also updated and reprinted its popular publication 'On Board', which provides tips and advice for women about their obligations as board and committee members. I am just reminded that the figure is different: we want to have 50 per cent women chairs of committees by 2008, not 2010.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I understand the member for Heysen's consistent point on this matter. The Office for Women has also collaborated with business and professional women to reprint a guide to mentoring which has proved very popular with women seeking guidance about how to work with mentors and advance their professional lives. There has also been a number of legislative reviews that the Office for Women has played an active role in, particularly the review of the Equal Opportunity Act and the review of legislation that discriminates against same-sex couples.

The office has worked closely with Workplace Services and those sections of Premier and Cabinet on population strategy to develop options to improve how we manage work/life balance issues. Taking up the member for Heysen's point of view, certainly that work/life balance issue affects all of us who do have a life as well as our work. Some of these issues have been picked up in the development of the Fair Work Bill and in the South Australian government contributions to the ACTU work and family case hearings.

There have also been support and advice to government agencies on ways to integrate gender considerations in their day-to-day activities and this work continues with the integration of gender analysis as a normal part of government business. The Office for Women in South Australia and the Office of Women's Policy in Western Australia have joined with the University of Adelaide and the University of Western Australia to apply for an Australian Research Council linkage grant to support a detailed project to develop models of gender analysis suitable for Australian government contexts. The outcome of this application will be known shortly.

I would just like to mention in closing the Women's Information Service, which I think most of us agree is a particularly important service. This continues to provide women in South Australia with free and confidential information support and referral service, and access to support in becoming familiar with information technology. I am pleased to note that there has been a significant growth in the number of telephone contacts to the Women's Information Service.

I would also highlight that the budget papers last year only provided figures for the non-metropolitan contacts. The figures presented in this year's paper have been revised to include all contacts whether metropolitan or non-metropolitan. Unfortunately, the major issues women contact the service for assistance with remain familiar: legal issues, health advice, assault and abuse, financial advice, and work/career issues.

Women from country areas have received more regular visits from the Women's Information Service staff over this past year and the outreach service has been maintained. The service also plans to extend its information technology program to meet an identified need for women who do not have word processing skills or the IT skills that they might like. The Women's Information Service also continues its

volunteer program and another six women are currently undertaking accredited training programs that the Women's Information Service offers to its volunteers.

I would like to make those comments, and the reason why I have persisted with probably longer than usual opening statements is that I do not think that this portfolio area gets enough light shone on it, considering the fantastic work they do, and continuing to be the smallest department in government.

Mrs HALL: I would just like to make a few remarks before we get into questioning on the budget lines. Firstly, I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the opposition for the work of Carmel O'Loughlin, the Chief Executive, and the staff members of the Office of Women. As we are all aware, they do produce a range of impressive work across government and no-one doubts their commitment to work for the cause which is of course raising the status of women within our community.

As the minister has already mentioned, the 2004-05 budget is still the smallest line in government and I would have to say from my perspective that, having regard to a government that has buckets of money and which has had huge increases in tax receipts, I can sympathise with the minister that thus far some issues, particularly those affecting women, do not seem to be among the priorities of the Treasurer.

I would like to congratulate Dr Ingrid Day, as chair of the Premier's Council for Women and the members of her council for a most impressive publication, the *Statistical Profile of Women of South Australia*. It certainly provides fascinating reading, highlighting many serious areas and issues of concern. I would strongly suggest it should be recommended reading for all of our colleagues. I am quite sure the minister would be very happy to provide additional copies to ensure that some of our male colleagues get to read and understand the content of what is contained in that particular profile. With those remarks I would like to go straight into questions.

Obviously, we are dealing with the budget line and I will start with the reference to page 7.23, Women's Policy Office. The State Strategic Plan contains targets that have already been mentioned by the minister of increasing the number of women on all state boards and committees to 50 per cent on average by 2006; having 50 per cent, on average, of state government boards and committees chaired by women by 2008; and increasing the number of female members of parliament to 50 per cent within 10 years. What action does the government intend to take to achieve these targets and is the government intending to legislate to achieve any of these targets?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you for the question and also for the comments. I think it has been a good tradition in this house that the women in parliament do acknowledge the great work that is being done by the Office for Women. Within the State Strategic Plan, as already mentioned by me and now by the honourable member, we plan to increase the number of women on all state boards and committees to 50 per cent. I know that this was a target that the previous government set, but we want to do this by 2006, so I think we have set ourselves a fairly hard task. However, I relish the opportunity to try and make this happen, particularly with the support of the Premier who, interestingly, has made it very clear to cabinet that he expects us to reach this target. He questions almost all of us, not so much me, because I am almost virtuous in this area, but certainly some of my

colleagues, but by 2008 we will be looking at state government boards and committees being chaired by women.

The member for Morialta would know from her term as a minister (as would the member for Newland) that part of the problem of getting people to serve on boards and committees is that, when you ask representative organisations (particularly peak bodies) to supply the names of people whom they think would adequately represent or reflect the views of the organisation, quite often, the people whom you are given to consider are men. One thing that we need to look at is a process (which I understand has been adopted in the UK, particularly in England) of talking to the private sector and some of the community organisations about the people whom they put forward for consideration. With some industries, the problem is that women do not have a high profile in those areas. So, that is part of the challenge that we are facing.

We have needed to do an analysis of this because, although the previous government had the same target and former minister Laidlaw was very supportive of this process, we need continually to keep that profile up-to-date. That is another part of the work that is being done. I acknowledge that this has been an ongoing target for the previous government as well. We are tired of hearing from different people (including members of parliament) that there are no suitable women out there to be nominated. So, another challenge is to identify women whom we believe on merit should be considered for the different appointments that are available. A lot of women would understand that, if you are going to survive in a non-traditional area, you have to be not only as good as but quite often twice as good as your male counterparts. Unfortunately, in the area of boards and committees this seems to be the philosophy. My argument—I am sure the member for Morialta would support me—is there are those women in the community, and we need to identify them. So, that is the other part of the process that we are looking at.

Ms CICCARELLO: I move:

That the sitting of the committee be extended beyond 1 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: So, we are looking at a number of processes in our efforts to deliver on that promise. I am advised that I inadvertently said that the target for 2008 is to have a woman chair of all boards and committees. That might be a good initiative, and I am sure some people would like to hurry up that process, but I meant to say 50 per cent of all boards and committees. I think I must have been thinking aloud.

Mrs HALL: I also referred to the target of increasing the number of female members of parliament to 50 per cent within 10 years. My specific question was: is the government intending to legislate to achieve any of these targets?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I apologise for not addressing that point. That is something that we are actively considering. I am not sure how it will play out in parliament, though. Obviously, it will be a prerogative of the different parties and the Independents to nominate and be considered and go through preselection—all the things that, if you are a member of a party, you have to do, let alone if you are an Independent. There is precedent for looking at legislation, so that is being actively considered at the moment.

Mrs HALL: I refer again to page 7.23 under the heading of Office for Women. Last year, there was reference to the participation of women at the Constitutional Convention. This

followed a forum and a think tank conducted in collaboration with the Hawke Institute of the University of South Australia. What recommendations arose from this process, and what action has been taken as a result of the recommendations of that forum and think tank on women's constitutional issues?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: We do not have that information in front of us. We can take that question on notice and give the honourable member a briefing. The director could make some general responses, if that would be helpful.

Mrs HALL: I am happy for that question to be taken on notice. My next question again relates to the Women's Policy Office. What were the findings of the office's review of the South Australian Women's Register for Appointments to Boards and Committees; has the office made any further recommendations following this review and, if so, what were they?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I will hand this over to Carmel O'Loughlin.

Ms O'LOUGHLIN: We are searching much more widely and certainly looking at women who are already on category 1 boards to see whether they are interested in other boards because they already have experience in board work and have been considered for other government boards. What was the second part of the question?

Mrs HALL: What further action has been taken as a result of the recommendations—and from the forum on the constitutional issues?

Ms O'LOUGHLIN: That was the first one.

Mrs HALL: Just the further recommendations; that is fine.

Ms O'LOUGHLIN: The other thing that is really important is highlighting those women's success. I really wanted to say that some of the issues that were highlighted in the *Cabinet Handbook* are now being looked at legislatively, so that when other organisations are asked to nominate people for boards and committees they must have three—one of whom is a man and one of whom is a woman. So, there is a choice of a woman on those boards.

Mrs HALL: I guess the first section of that was what were the specific recommendations. Are they available? Is the minister able to share them with the committee, or do you want to take that on notice and provide the information later?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: With your indulgence, I would prefer to take that on notice. I do not have those recommendations here, but again, I would be more than happy to brief any interested members on that work.

[Sitting suspended from 1.04 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: We will continue considering the payments for the area of the status of women.

Mrs HALL: My next question also relates to page 7.23, specifically, the Women's Policy Office. Has the office provided any advice to the Department of Correctional Services regarding the conditions in the women's prison? I ask that question because in minutes of the Correctional Services Advisory Council, including monthly overview reports of visiting inspectors (and this material was obtained under FOI), it is stated that prisoners in the women's prison are being subjected to overcrowding and a lack of general activity. Prisoners have raised concerns with visiting inspectors that they are provided with no activity—a lack of work and exercise—and the reports clearly indicate that this is leading to a deterioration in the mental health of the prisoners. Prisoners have also expressed concern that they are

gaining weight and suffering from obesity—they have experienced significant weight gains in a short period. They attribute this to the fact that they have nothing to do, and their quotes include: a lack of work, a lack of exercise and a lack of activity in a general sense. There is much focus in this day and age on obesity, and I wonder whether advice has been given to the minister about this.

I understand that it is accepted within the general industry of corrections that one of the best management tools when dealing with prisoners, male or female, is the provision of sporting and recreational facilities and work activities. My understanding is that there are recreational facilities at Yatala and Mobilong and that they are very important in terms of management. Again, I understand that land is available in the Northfield precinct which is owned by corrections. I wonder whether the minister would consider supporting a recommendation that some of that additional land in the precinct and on the border of the women's prison could be utilised for recreational and sporting activities or at least some sort of exercise activity.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I thank the honourable member for her question. My understanding is that the Premier's women's council has raised that issue in one of its meetings and they will be doing some work in that area. I am a little out of date in regard to the most recent research that the member refers to, but I know from my personal research about those very poor lifestyle outcomes. The issues about gaining weight, high depression rates and people feeling worse than they might for just having been in gaol have been supported a number of times by the work that has been done in this area.

I think it might be more appropriate for me to take that question on notice and provide to the member the policy work and the work that the women's council is doing in that area in the form of a briefing, if that is acceptable. I think it is an important area and I agree with most of the comments that have been made. Corrections is not under my direct area of responsibility, but I am sure that minister Roberts would be happy to provide information and details in regard to that. It is something that I will generally take on notice and ensure that we provide a briefing and an update on what action could be taken and what is happening at the moment.

Mrs HALL: As a follow-up, given the response of the minister to that question, I again refer to the Women's Policy Office and ask whether advice has been provided to the appropriate minister regarding the appalling conditions, as I understand them, suffered by women detainees in the City Watch-house. My understanding is that, as a result of—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mrs HALL: I have asked whether the policy office of the office of women has provided any advice. My understanding is that overcrowding generally in the women's prison is one issue and the minister will take that question on notice. However, there has been a report that a female offender who had been convicted and sentenced was placed in the City Watch-house for 13 days. As we know, the watch-house is a police facility but it is not equipped to hold prisoners, as I understand it, for more than 48 hours. In this particular instance there were 11 prisoners, two of whom had hepatitis C, and they were forced to share toothbrushes. No showers were provided for three to four days, and the only toilet was blocked for a very long time with playing cards. A woman who had her period was not provided with sanitary products. There were no clean clothes, and access to water was refused other than at meal times. When asked about the ongoing

circumstances and conditions at the watch-house, the Minister for Correctional Services would not, and said he could not, give a guarantee that such a set of circumstances would not happen again. I ask whether the policy office has provided any information on this.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you for that information. I will have to take that matter on notice. I am not aware of those circumstances. I will need to get back to the honourable member with the details of that particular instance; I have not heard about the incident. I am not sure of the time frame in relation to when those questions were asked? Could I get that as a matter of clarification, as well?

Mrs HALL: It is provided in FOI documents.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: What time frame are we talking about?

Mrs HALL: In the past six months.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I will check and get back to the member.

Mr SNELLING: Minister, how is the Office for Women contributing to the social inclusion initiative?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: There has been a very close relationship between the Office for Youth and the Office for Women to ensure that we look at the various social inclusion references that the Premier has set, and also that the Social Inclusion Board and unit are following through.

I mentioned in my introductory comments that the Office for Women has a responsibility to coordinate issues across government departments, particularly those that are important for women and girls. One of the references under the headline 'Homelessness and school retention' has been acted out at Gepps Cross Girls High School. This is a very impressive school, which has a focus on keeping girls at school. I have met a number of young women and girls at that school, and they see the high school as not only their school but also their home; they feel very comfortable about its being their main base. A number of those young women and girls experience domestic violence and have abusive home environments. I spoke to a couple of the young women and asked them what they thought was so special about the school; they said, 'Well, it's the only school I've ever heard of that has actually explained, because I live by myself in a flat, what the implications would be of me renting a TV and how I would go about that.' So they were getting very practical advice from the school.

Part of the program at Gepps Cross Girls High School is looking at the needs of young Aboriginal women and girls, and the Office for Women has been working very closely with these young women to encourage them to stay at school as long as possible.

One of the significant issues for some of the girls at this high school is homelessness. The Office for Women, with the Social Inclusion Unit, is looking at ways of providing appropriate accommodation. The young girls and women to whom I have spoken have been very keen to be independent, so that has its own raft of issues and problems. Importantly, it provides child care so that the young mothers can study but be confident at the same time that their children are being cared for. It is often said in this house that one of the interesting things about being a parent is that we seem to have the least amount of training for that job compared with that which we receive for everything else in life.

The Office for Women has brought together the Aboriginal unit in the Department of Education and Children's Services, the Aboriginal Housing Authority, the Housing Trust, the Social Inclusion Unit, the Aboriginal Hostels

Limited and Gepps Cross Girls High School to look at ways in which to support these young women and girls, as well as ensuring that Aboriginal students, in particular, remain at school to complete their certificate of education. As a result of this group of services getting together, there is the provision of a 16-cottage flat development in Elizabeth Grove, and there has been work on supported accommodation in order to ensure that the students are housed safely. The emphasis is on their completing their education. The Office for Women has also been involved in having interdepartmental negotiations to look at establishing an on-site child-care centre. We are hoping this will be operational in 2005.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, I am particularly concerned at the level of domestic violence in our society. I have noted the local statistics, which I am sure are correct, and I have also looked at the Victorian situation. Quite frankly, it is appalling. I raised this matter earlier today with the Attorney-General and the Chief Justice. Have you any thoughts on whether we need new strategies to deal with this serious issue? It is not a criticism of you or the present government because it has been an ongoing problem. In my view—and I may be wrong and I stand to be corrected—we do not seem to be getting rid of this evil in our community.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I would like to respond to that question in a couple of ways. As the social justice minister, I have had the opportunity to meet with the workers who provide the services in that area, whether it be children's shelters, women's shelters or shelters for homeless people, and I was educated about the level of violence and abuse in our community. As I had responsibility for the portfolio on the ageing—and the member for Heysen and I have had a couple of discussions about this—I was quite concerned about the numbers of older people in the community who also suffer abuse and violence. It is quite worrying. Unfortunately, there are all types of variations on the theme of violence and abuse in our community.

However, I was heartened by the fact that the community sector and the government services do work very closely together, although that does not mean that we have enough resources. Unfortunately, the demand far exceeds the supply of services and support available, so the challenge is to do a couple of things: one, I believe, is to expose the issues that we have in the community. I consider that I am fairly well-informed, but I have to say that I had not really thought about the amount of abuse, violence and problems that older people in our community have reported, and they are just those that are reported. I have more idea of some of the issues that women face, and I also have some experience of the issues facing families and men in this area. What we really did not have was a strategy to deal with these issues.

I think that everyone has been doing a job way above the call of service, but it certainly seemed to me and to the workers in the area that we needed to have a strategy. While the strategy that I have handed out today is the women's safety strategy, there needs to be a cultural aspect to the fact that people need to understand that violence and abuse are not acceptable. There needs to be a sort of cultural shift in that particular behaviour. Starting with small steps first, our discussion paper, which is entitled 'Valuing South Australia's Women', is one step in what I think needs to be a comprehensive campaign to talk about the fact that violence (whether it be domestic or family violence) is just not acceptable and that, as a community, we believe that that change needs to happen.

Your comments, Mr Chairman, hit right at the heart of the problem; that is, that we do need to have a comprehensive approach. However, the fact that this examination relates to the Office for Women and that the reported violence in our community is mainly perpetuated by men on women, it is perfectly reasonable for us to look at one step in a whole plan aimed at a women's safety strategy. That is why I am very pleased that we have managed to get this discussion paper out, and I am hoping that it will have spin-off effects. The Council for the Ageing has set up an advocacy service. Aged services organisations—particularly the Helping Hand Centre at North Adelaide—have bonded together to come up with a booklet for older people in the community that covers some of the things they could do if they feel they are being pushed around or that violence or abuse is being perpetuated against them.

I think that I have distributed that booklet to members. Certainly, I made it known that it was available. Those sorts of initiatives all form part of what needs to be a comprehensive approach to changing our attitudes.

Mrs HALL: Just to follow up on the issue of domestic violence, could the minister provide the committee with any updated information that may have come through the policy office or which she may have received separately concerning the occupancy levels in women's shelters? The minister would have seen a recent article in *The Advertiser* in the last few days in which the manager of the Domestic Violence Crisis Service, Gillian Cordell, stated that South Australia's 22 women's shelters are always at capacity. Given that we are approaching winter and all that that will entail, is there any update on the figures or is there any additional capacity, particularly over the next few months?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: This is not directly within my area of responsibility. I think that this would now come under the responsibility of the families and communities minister and the health minister. However, I would be happy to provide the honourable member with that information. In coping with the numbers of women and children who have had to go into alternative accommodation, we have had to look at a range of issues, including the acquisition of motel rooms as an interim measure, an initiative that I think happened under the previous government.

I am sad to report that that is one of the options and, unfortunately, it has been increasing as time goes on. I have attended a number of meetings with the workers in that area and we really do need to look at what sort of options are available. Unfortunately, this is becoming a growing problem, and I think that, in most states and territories (certainly from the reports I have received from the respective ministers) this is an ongoing issue.

So, I am very pleased that the Office for Women has been involved in these programs, particularly with the service delivery people, but also with the federal government on the campaign that it has had, and most recently the TV campaign has been most useful—looking at men's attitudes as well as looking at women's attitudes about abuse and violence. I am advised that we are also looking at some of the other options of actually keeping women at home. Rather than the people being abused or violated having to move from home—particularly the women and children, which is what usually happens—we are looking at the perpetrators having to move out rather than the rest of the family.

Ms CICCARELLO: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 7.23, sub-program K3.1—Women's Policy Office. Can you highlight what the Office for Women is doing to

progress issues for women in South Australia who are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you for that question. The Office for Women has, as would be expected, and very importantly, linked up with other parts of government and the community sector, and particularly the South Australian Cultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, and also through their Women's Advisory Committee, with TAFE, with also the different multicultural communities, to sponsor an Adelaide TAFE Certificate IV course in community work for culturally and linguistically diverse women. They have completed the leadership course for community women. This course just started as an initiative that was enthusiastically received in the community and has now had an outcome of Adelaide TAFE being able to provide a certificate.

I think that the really important point here is that women who may not have normally sought further education have now had access to a TAFE course that gives them a qualification in leadership in particular. It is probably sad that a number of other women and men in the community have not had the opportunity to do leadership courses. Who knows what would happen, member for Norwood, if a few more people were trained in the leadership area? Without fantasising too much about that, of the 20 women who started this certificate course, I am advised that 19 of them completed the course and gained certificates; now, 14 of these women are taking part in the mentoring program. I am also pleased to say that, despite our modest budget, the Office for Women contributed \$5 000 towards these particular courses.

I make special mention of the women who are in the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission's Women's Advisory Committee. They are a bunch of dynamos, and they are determined to make sure that this particular course is accessible to multicultural women in our community. I think we will be negotiating fairly heavily with the TAFE sector about making sure that we can expand these programs.

Mrs HALL: At this stage, I would like to very quickly read six omnibus questions, which I am very happy for the minister to take on notice. Did the Office for Women need all required budget savings targets for 2003-04 set for it in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 budgets? If not, what specific proposed project and program cuts were not implemented? Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants in 2003-04 for the Office for Women—

The CHAIRMAN: For consistency, the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that \$5 000 be the cut-off, so we are not looking for consultancies of \$10.

Mrs HALL:—listing the name of the consultant, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment—

The Hon. S.W. KEY: With the first one, I can say that there were no budget savings. With the second one, we will need to take it on notice considering the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition's qualifications on that.

Mrs HALL: How many surplus employees are there for each surplus? For each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost of the employee within the Office for Women? In the financial year 2002-03, what underspending of projects and programs were not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2003-04? What is the estimated level of under expenditure for 2003-04? Has cabinet approved any carryover expenditure for 2004-05? What was the total number of employees with the total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee, and also as a subcategory of the total

number of employees with the total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee for the Office for Women as at 30 June 2003? What is the estimate for 30 June 2004? Between 30 June 2003 and 30 June 2004, will the minister list title, job and total employment cost of each position with the total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more? Which has been abolished and which has been created? What is the difference between the consultants and contractors, and how many people or services that were previously classed as consultants and now shown as contractors? What is the value of their contracts and what are the services that they provide?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Regarding the question about surplus employees, it will not be of surprise to anyone here that there were no surplus employees within the Office for Women. Regarding the financial year 2003-04 and the carryover expenditure question, in 2002-03 there was a carryover of \$26 000, which was sought by the Office for Women. This small amount did not require cabinet approval for carryover and was approved within the overall Department of Human Services budget. These funds were for the Premier's Council for Women. In relation to the question about all departments and agencies reporting to the minister and the level of under-expenditure, again, it will not be a surprise to be told that there was no under-expenditure estimated for the year 2003-04.

As to the question about the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee, and then subcategories and the total number of employees, the Office for the Status of Women has one employee with a total employment cost greater than \$100 000, that is the director. The total cost for this position is \$105 100 plus a motor vehicle. There has been no change in this arrangement between 30 June 2003 and the end of June 2004. I will take on notice the question concerning the breakdown of expenditure on consultants.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: We understand and we have heard that both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have agreed that consultancy expenditure over \$5 000 will be the benchmark. Considering that the Office for the Status of Women is probably one of lowest budgets that we see before the committees, could I suggest that a request go to the minister to deal with this quite differently, because I can imagine that \$5 000 would be quite an expenditure with regard to the Office for the Status of Women? It would be handy to get the actual amounts.

The CHAIRMAN: Any consultants working for two and sixpence we want to know about.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I am more than happy to brief honourable members about our budget. It is probably easier for you to understand exactly what we do with the miserable amount of money we get in this portfolio.

The CHAIRMAN: Well done, minister. I cannot give you an early minute, because we are out of time. That concludes the part of the examination relating to the Minister for the Status of Women. I now adjourn the remainder of the examination of the Estimate of Payments under the Human Services portfolio until Tuesday 22 June.

Witness:

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

Membership:

Ms Chapman substituted for Mrs Hall.
Mr Scalzi substituted for Mrs Redmond.
Mr Matthew substituted for Ms Kotz.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr B. Pryor, Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.
Ms K. Matthews, Equal Opportunity Commissioner.
Mr R. Mathews, Fund Manager, Justice.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments re-open for examination and refer members to appendix C, page C2 in the Budget Statement.

Before we proceed further, I acknowledge the presence of members from the government of Kenya and welcome them to our chamber.

Attorney, do you wish to make an opening statement?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No.

Ms CICCARELLO: What educational programs has the Office of Liquor and Gambling been running to promote the responsible consumption of alcohol by young people?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: A youth alcohol information wallet card was developed in 2003 in conjunction with the City of Marion Youth Advisory Committee. The wallet card contains information relevant to young people about the legal and health aspects of alcohol consumption. It was distributed to all public and private secondary schools on request before Schoolies Week 2003. The government intends to make these wallet cards available to secondary schools in August each year so that young people will have up-to-date and reliable information available to them before beginning end-of-year or end-of-school celebrations.

The Office of Liquor and Gambling together with South Australia Police in the Sturt local service area conducted a fake identification awareness campaign. Some of the alterations to the cards issued by Transport SA are ingenious for getting people under the age of 18 into venues when they should not be there. The campaign has two aims: first, to provide information to young people about proper forms of identification; and, secondly, to promote licensee awareness of the use of fake IDs. The campaign was launched at the New York Bar and Grill at Westfield Marion in August last year. It involved circulating information brochures to all secondary school students within the Sturt local service area, giving training to licensees and their staff about identifying fake IDs, and increasing task force activity by police and the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

The campaign is being evaluated in conjunction with the Office of Crime Statistics. We have anecdotal evidence that both licensees and the police report a lessening of attempts by minors to gain access to licensed premises within that local service area using fake IDs. After the successful '1+1=3' responsible alcohol consumption campaign at Christmas last year, in conjunction with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, South Australia Police and industry groups, the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner intends to collaborate with industry, enforcement and health agencies again this year to develop a designated 'drive safe' campaign for Christmas 2004.

In addition, after the incident involving under-age drug consumption at the Heaven nightclub, the Hotels Association, the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, the police, Human Services, my department and the Premier got together to work on changes to the law to discourage the presence of under-age teenagers in licensed premises, but we are still working on that matter. I am acutely aware of the difficulties of parents, because I have a 17½-year-old son who wants to do what his older mates do. So, we will have a careful look at that law. The Commissioner is concerned about parents who have parties for teenagers at their own home and supply alcohol gratis to teenagers under 18 or allow teenagers under 18 to bring alcohol and to consume it on their premises. This misconduct might need to be brought out of the public realm and handled by the law, but I will ask the Commissioner whether he would like to add anything.

Mr PRYOR: In the context of what the minister was just speaking about, I believe that the youth of South Australia are being exposed to drinking in the most unsafe environments. A minor cannot drink under any circumstances in licensed premises irrespective of whether they are with a parent. We expect that licensed premises are well managed. A minor can drink in a public place only in the company of a parent or an adult spouse or guardian, but they can drink themselves into oblivion in a private place. A minor cannot drink in a park, but if they jump over the barbed wire fence and drink in the back paddock there are no restrictions. I get more complaints from the South Australian community about unsafe drinking by minors at end-of-school parties and 16th and 18th birthday parties than I get about any drinking by minors on licensed premises. In saying that, I am not condoning minors drinking on licensed premises, but it seems to me that we have a law that actually allows minors to drink in the most unsafe environments.

In addition to that we also have a whole range of other education initiatives. My office as part of the various accords and local liquor management initiatives around the state runs training programs for licensees in conjunction with the police and the local council. I think we conducted about 20 training programs throughout the state last year. We also train all people coming into the industry on liquor licensing laws as part of the mandatory training in responsible service of alcohol and liquor licensing laws. We really have quite an extensive training program, so much so that I have recognised it and diverted funds to establish an education and training unit within the office. We now have three people committed to that. We send out monthly bulletins, and we send out information bulletins on a range of issues. I see that the resources that we are putting into education are better spent than the resources that we put into some of the reactive work we do of going out and investigating complaints after they have happened.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, on the issue of licensing being reactive, which you say is not as advantageous as looking at the education option, which I appreciate, how many licences have you withdrawn or had removed in the last 12 months when you have been able to identify that under-age drinkers, fourteen year olds etc., are on premises in those circumstances?

Mr PRYOR: No licence has been withdrawn. I have taken disciplinary action on 14 occasions—two relating to minors on licensed premises. Those disciplinary matters are still to be determined. As I said, I am not condoning minors being on licensed premises and we will continue to investigate every complaint. I have actually taken the disciplinary

action against the Heaven nightclub even though it was the Commissioner of Police and police officers who identified the issues down there and attended on the night. It is not easy: within my office we simply do not have the resources to inspect licensed premises 24 hours a day.

It is really an issue for SAPOL—police officers are the people who we rely on to enforce liquor licensing laws. They are out in the community 24 hours a day. My inspectors work from nine to five but we cooperate with the police. We run joint taskforce operations and any complaint from a member of the public will be investigated by my office. If it appears as though it is a matter that could constitute a breach of the act, we will immediately refer that to SAPOL as the appropriate authority to investigate it.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a further supplementary question, when was the last time you caused a licence to be withdrawn or removed because of under-age drinking?

Mr PRYOR: We have currently got one before the court. There has never been a licence that has been revoked. To revoke a liquor licence, you are most probably talking about an action with around a \$5 million, \$10 million or \$15 million penalty to the licensee. The Liquor Licensing Act is quite clear and provides that the Licensing Court must look at suspension or revocation if a licensee appears on a second or third offence of serving a minor. We have never had the situation in South Australia where a person has appeared before the Licensing Court on a second occasion.

Ms CICCARELLO: Following from some of the comments with regard to the review of the code of practice, what work is being done to review the code of practice for the responsible service of alcohol under the Liquor Licensing Act?

Mr PRYOR: We established a joint working group to look at the code, and I think the simplest way to answer this is to say that so far the code has been a statement of principle, which is there to guide the industry on good practice. The code is also a document that becomes a condition on every licence. Much of the code, as it is currently written, is very difficult to enforce. So, we have been working with legal practitioners, the industry, DASC and a whole range of other people to retain the principle of this being a directions document but to make it a document that is enforceable, so that, when either the police or my officers go out and we witness a breach, it is actually easier to prosecute.

We want to take away words like 'unduly', etc. There are quite a few subjective words in the current code, and if we had five lawyers they would all end up with a different interpretation of exactly what it means. So, we are trying to tighten it and trying to give the industry clear guidelines as to what we expect, to make quite clear that certain promotions and activities simply are a breach of licence, rather than to simply say, for example, the following might be deemed to be an inappropriate practice.

The CHAIRMAN: Do we want to move to the area of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity is here so, if there are questions about equal opportunity, this would be a good time to ask them.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no questions on that topic, we will move on to the Attorney-General's line.

Ms CHAPMAN: In parliament on 2 June 2004 the Leader of the Opposition asked a question about the government's refusal to establish an inquiry into sexual abuse of children in government care, and the minister responded, 'I am considering an inquiry or options short of a royal commis-

sion.' The Attorney-General has frequently said on radio that the cost of a royal commission would be \$30 million. My question is: has any allowance been made in this budget for the inquiry which the Attorney-General claims he is considering setting up?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My recollection is that my openness to an inquiry about state wards and children in foster care, and possibly children in the care of state authorities such as the education department, occurred after the budget was well settled, so special provision would have to be made for it, probably from existing resources. But I have taken advice on establishing an inquiry short of a royal commission and am continuing to receive advice about that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question. From whom have you taken advice? What is the estimated cost of the inquiry on the advice you have been given to date? Will you be prepared to provide a copy of that advice to the committee?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have taken advice from the Crown Solicitor's office and I have taken advice orally.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there an estimated cost?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Not yet.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a further supplementary question. What is the basis upon which you claim that \$30 million is the cost of a royal commission?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have discussed that matter with Queen's Counsel and it is a ballpark average cost of royal commissions over the years. Certainly, the legal profession in South Australia and Her Majesty's counsel have said they would regard a royal commission on this topic as a feast.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question on that. How many Queen's Counsel have given you advice that a royal commission would cost \$30 million or thereabouts?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I cannot recall how many, but it has been a common subject of discussion. Indeed, it was a subject of discussion at the most recent silks' dinner.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can you name any of them?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am not going to name them, no. I think it would be invidious to do so.

Ms CICCARELLO: Has the Attorney-General improved services for victims of crime in South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In the first year of this government the Premier and I made an agreement with the people of South Australia to strengthen victims' rights, and the Rann Labor government has met that agreement. We have a bill before parliament that will radically overhaul our parole system, including giving victims representation on the Parole Board and the right to make submissions to the Parole Board in person. The government is well aware that victims' rights must be more than paper rights. We want to make real practical improvements in the administration of criminal justice that will benefit victims. Most importantly, we accept that victims need better services to help them deal with the harm that has been unexpectedly inflicted on them.

About three years ago, the then Attorney-General entered into an agreement with the Victim Support Service to open five regional victims' services. These services have all since opened, and I commend the previous Liberal government for that initiative. An evaluation of the services is under way. Preliminary findings suggest that victims of crime in the five regions are being given useful information, counselling and practical advice to help them recover from the crimes visited upon them.

The findings also suggest that the services cost more than was expected. I have consequently agreed not only to maintain these services but also to increase their annual grant. I gave the Victim Support Service \$363 000 for these services, an increase of more than \$50 000. The Rann Labor government has also invited the Victim Support Service to open two new services. One of these services will be in Whyalla and the other in Murray Bridge, and I have given the Victim Support Service an extra \$132 500 for this purpose. I should add that these increases are in addition to the annual grant that the Victim Support Service has received since the mid 1980s. This year that grant will be \$690 133, a far cry from the few hundred dollars given to the service in the early 1980s or the few thousand dollars allocated in the mid 1980s when annual funding was first introduced.

I am also pleased to report that the Victim Support Service employed a specialist homicide worker earlier this year. The service was able to do this because the government not only gave it an extra \$60 000 grant last year for this purpose but also has agreed to the funding being continuous. In March this year Her Excellency the Governor appointed Mr Michael O'Connell as the Victims of Crime Coordinator under the Victims of Crime Act.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As the member for Torrens interjects, he is a splendid fellow. He is charged with the responsibility of advising me about how best to use government resources to help victims of crime. This is a task that Mr O'Connell has done well under the previous government, as well as now with the Labor government. The Rann Labor government is committed to giving victims the practical help, information, counselling and compensation they need to put them on the road to recovery. Our contributions, though, will always be modest in proportion to the needs.

Ms CICCARELLO: What funding has the government provided to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am very glad the member for Norwood has asked this question. The contrast between this government and the previous government could not be starker.

Ms CHAPMAN: At least we had a Director of Public Prosecutions.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, that is an awful interjection from the member for Bragg, on a par with her interjection that Bevan Spencer von Einem did not need to be DNA tested. We do have a Director of Public Prosecutions, namely, Wendy Abraham as Acting Director of Public Prosecutions. Wendy Abraham was responsible for the bodies in the barrels trials. She is an outstanding advocate, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law. For the past month and a half she has been, and for some time to come she will continue to be, the Director of Public Prosecutions in this state. For the member for Bragg to interject that we do not have a DPP is bad form: we do.

We advertised in Saturday's *Australian* in the *Insight* section and also in *The Advertiser* for a DPP. It is very hard to work out what the Liberal's position was on the previous DPP. They have many positions on the previous DPP. They have one which they tell Graham Archer at *Today Tonight* and they have another which the Hon. Robert Lawson tells his legal colleagues in the profession. The Liberal Party condemned me for not expressing my confidence explicitly in Mr Rofe in the aftermath of the second Kourakis report. Then, when asked by the media to express confidence in Mr Rofe, the shadow attorney-general Mr Lawson declined.

So I do not quite understand what the Liberal Party's position was—maximum mayhem, I presume.

In 1997, the Costello report, a review of the operations of the Office of the DPP, recommended an immediate \$1.5 million recurrent funding increase. That money was never allocated to the office by the previous Liberal government, which must have been aware, as a result of the Costello report, of the need for an urgent injection of funds. In July 2002, only months after coming to office, the Rann Labor government announced an extra \$1.168 million for the DPP over four years; that is a \$275 000 recurrent increase in the office's budget. In May 2003, the Rann Labor government announced an additional \$1.142 million for the DPP over four years, a further \$275 000 recurrent increase in the office's budget.

In addition to that money, in June 2003 I announced an annual grant of around \$250 000 from the Victims of Crime Fund to meet the cost of dedicated witness assistance for young victims. This more than doubled the support for South Australian children who witness crime, allowing for the appointment of another 2.5 full-time equivalent social workers, as well as funding to secure the future of the 1.5 full-time equivalent existing workers who had been employed temporarily. This extra \$4 million in extra funding over four years makes up for many years of financial neglect by the previous administration. I hope the opposition members on the committee will not begrudge those remarks because, where the previous Liberal government has done the right thing, I have gone out of my way today to praise it, but its record on the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions was a bad one and that also ought to be noted.

The Rann Labor government recognises that additional funds will be necessary to deal with our commitment to crack down on organised crime, biker gangs and pederasts in order to make South Australia a safer place in which to live. The extra funding acknowledges the increased demand on prosecution services of the government's law and order program, and the flow-on that the increased police numbers announced in March by the Deputy Premier will have on prosecution. Of course, it is no good increasing resources to one part of the criminal justice system without having a commensurate or corresponding increase in other sectors of the criminal justice system. So it is no good having 200 extra police if one does not have extra police prosecutors and extra prosecutors in the Office of the DPP.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg interjects: how many walls of biker fortification have we taken down since our anti-fortification law came into force? Well, it came into force only recently, but I can tell the member for Bragg that the Rebels motor cycle gang's proposed headquarters at Brompton, on the corner of Chief Street and Second Street, which in the initial application involved eight-foot high concrete tilt-up walls, was an application that the then Liberal government was happy to have go ahead. It did nothing. The Olsen Liberal government, with Trevor Griffin as Attorney-General and Robert Brokenshire as police minister, did nothing to stop that monstrosity being constructed in the Brompton area.

I recall, of course, that in 1999, soon after the Rebels motor cycle gang bought those headquarters from the Federated Gas Employees Industrial Union, those headquarters were bombed, blowing out the glass of houses along much of Chief Street, causing Chief Street residents to congregate in the Gaslight Tavern in the early hours of the

morning in fear of what further explosions may occur. The explosion was of such magnitude that it rattled the windows of my house in Kilkenny. What the Labor government has done is call up that proposal as a major project, and an announcement will be made in due course.

It seems to me that what we are doing is preventing the fortifications being erected in the first place, and, as we know, prevention is better than cure. As to whether outlaw motor cycle gang fortifications, such as those of the Gypsy Jokers at Wingfield or the Hell's Angels at Mansfield Park or the Finks at West Thebarton, need to be bulldozed, that will be an operational decision for the Police Commissioner. We do not tell the Police Commissioner how to enforce the law. One way in which we do differ from the previous Liberal government is that we brought in an anti-fortification law, which would not have been brought in but for the change of government, and we are in the process of preventing the erection of bikie gang headquarters in the midst of residents. Prevention is better than cure.

Now, to return to the matter in hand. The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions has done a great job dealing with the large increase in work over the last two years. Let us not forget that the special offence of home invasion, introduced in 1999 in response to Ivy Skowronski's monster petition, was resisted to the very last by the Hon. K.T. Griffin, of blessed memory. He did everything he could to prevent there being a dedicated offence of home invasion, but—

Ms CHAPMAN: In two years how many have you prosecuted?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Snelling): Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Dozens, possibly hundreds. We will get the figures on that for the member for Bragg, because the relevance of this part of the answer I am giving is that the burden on the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions—what causes its officers to struggle with their caseload and for its budget to be strained—is the enormous caseload that has been brought about by the creation of the offence of home invasion, known on the statute book as aggravated serious criminal trespass or serious criminal trespass. Indeed, the case that has caused so much controversy in the last 24 hours, namely, the Darren Luke Clarke case, is a case of home invasion. The office is dealing with about 1 500 cases each financial year, and this funding means more prosecutors for our state to deal with the increased workload.

Having rolled Trevor Griffin in cabinet on the question of whether there should be a dedicated home invasion offence separate from house break, the Liberal government then did not provide the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions with any more resources to deal with these cases which, as I understand it, had previously been dealt with by police prosecutions. However, making them major indictable meant that these cases had to be dealt with by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, yet the Liberal government of John Olsen provided no extra resources for the DPP to deal with these cases.

So, it adds insult to injury for the member for Bragg to ask, 'How many serious criminal trespass cases are there?' when she should know that there are many, many cases that are stretching the resources of the office of the DPP. Again, it is an inopportune interjection by the member for Bragg who is just not across this portfolio.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Attorney is straying into debate.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The government will continue to redirect money from less important services to the core services of health, education and law and order. This extra funding will ensure that South Australians will continue to be served by an effective criminal prosecution service that is timely, efficient and justice. Labor is delivering on law and order.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, given that the contribution—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: This is supplementary.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In view of the previous practice of the Chairman, I will allow it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Chairman. I appreciate your indulgence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question must relate to the answer that the Attorney has given.

Ms CHAPMAN: As it will do. Given the increased funding to deal with the increased workload, why is it that \$11.435 million is being paid out in compensation to victims who, of course, have also increased in the last year, but for this forthcoming year the government has budgeted only \$10.468 million? We have more offences and less money available for the victims.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The amount of payouts under the Victims of Crime scheme depends on the nature of the crimes and the magnitude of the harm caused. It also depends to what degree recovery is made from the perpetrators. In some years, better recoveries are made by others. Certainly, the incident that would have abnormally increased the payment of victims of crime money during this financial year is the Bali bombings. We are the only jurisdiction in Australia to make payments to victims of the Bali bombings; the commonwealth has not come to the party on that. So, that is one reason why the victims of crime payouts this financial year may be a little high. In the Nemer case, I note that the opposition's position is that it is undesirable that the Nemer family make payments to Mr Geoffrey Williams. There was a storm of criticism when I suggested during question time that this would be morally right.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, you suggested that they had an obligation.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Presumably, the member for Bragg thinks that the taxpayer, through the Victims of Crime Fund, ought to stump up the money for Mr Williams given that he has lost his eye. Really, if I were the member for Bragg, I would not be raising victims of crime payments.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is that the only reason? The Bali bombings are the difference why, in this case, over \$1 million less is budgeted in the forthcoming year?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will consult with Michael O'Connell and the victims of crime section of the Crown Solicitor's Office and get a more detailed reply for the member.

Ms CICCARELLO: What action is the Attorney-General's Department taking to address Aboriginal justice matters at a local level?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Aboriginal Justice and Community Development team established by the Justice Strategy Division of the Attorney-General's Department includes a director, central policy and project staff, and four justice community development officers in partnership with ATSIC. The Attorney-General's Department has produced the Aboriginal Justice Strategic Directions document, which looks at providing ways of dealing with the over-representa-

tion of Aboriginal people in both the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems. Four justice community development officers have now been recruited and are located in Ceduna, Adelaide, Port Augusta and the Riverland. I am told that the community development officers' focus is the criminal justice setting to deal with issues for the Aboriginal community through local level planning and problem solving. We hope that this will ensure that Aboriginal community perspectives are taken into account in justice portfolio planning, policy advice, and service and program development.

I am hoping that, building on the success of this program, there may be scope to transfer some of the central policy and project staff of the Justice Strategy Division to regional areas. The community development officers will be in a position to craft locally based justice plans for the Aboriginal community such as diversion camps for Aboriginal youth, community education sessions, and police and Aboriginal community liaison groups. As an addendum to that, I intervened some months ago to ensure the continuation under the crime prevention program of the Bush Breakaway program at Ceduna, which is designed to help local Aboriginal youth undertake socially useful tasks.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: My first question continues with the line of questioning of my colleague the member for Bragg in relation to the Attorney's investigation into the merits of a royal commission into allegations about the treatment of children in government care. As part of my question, I must say that we have had an extraordinary admission to the committee this afternoon from the Attorney; that is, that the source of the information that he has provided to the parliament—that a royal commission would cost \$30 million—has been obtained through informal opinion from a silks' dinner. In my 15 years as a member of parliament, I have never before been confronted with opinion from an attorney about informal opinion from a silks' dinner.

Be that as it may, as it is clearly the source of the Attorney's learned opinion, I ask the Attorney that in canvassing opinion from learned silks at the dinner where this information was sought did he ask those in attendance what their view would be as to the cost of a royal commission with tight parameters, namely, a royal commission which considered only those who had been in state care—for example, in places such as McNally, Lochiel Park and similar institutions—and which also had a defined time period? Did the Attorney ask for costings of a royal commission of that nature from the learned counsel?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My advice on the costing of the royal commission was principally from the head of the Justice portfolio, Ms Kate Lennon. Her estimate happened to be corroborated by Queen's Counsel when I discussed it with them. The Liberal Party's proposal for a royal commission into sexual abuse was not as confined as the member for Bright now makes it. It was an open-ended commitment at the beginning, and only now is he seeking to circumscribe it; so, of course, I did not ask anyone what the cost of such a circumscribed royal commission would be, because the Liberal Party was not canvassing such a royal commission. There are reasons other than cost for not holding a royal commission. On principle, I object to people being able, under the cover of privilege and in front of television cameras, to have the opportunity to make false allegations about others with no accountability.

I think it would be appropriate for evidence of criminality to be taken in camera by the person conducting such an

inquiry, if we have one. Some of the allegations that have been made, for instance by the member for Unley's informant, are plainly false and I am not going to provide taxpayers' money for a public, unaccountable witch hunt while much of the evidence given at the royal commission will be evidence of truth. Some of it will not be, and I do not think it is appropriate to conduct a witch hunt in public, although that is the prospect that the opposition relishes.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In view of the Attorney's now changed answer to the committee, the changed version of events in relation to the costing of \$30 million given for a royal commission, can the Attorney advise if the information that was provided to him by his department head, Ms Kate Lennon, was provided in writing, and is he prepared to make such written advice available to the committee?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That information was provided orally at one of our regular meetings.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: How convenient, I must observe.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I would just ask the member for Bright to withdraw the implication that I was misleading the committee.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Chair, the Attorney has changed his version of events under close scrutiny. One can but wonder but, if it is your direction, Mr Chair, in order to keep the proceedings going, I will do so and let others observe in *Hansard* what happened.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is the Attorney seeking that the member for Bright withdraw his comment, 'How convenient'?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If the member for Bright is willing to withdraw it for the good order of the committee, I would ask him to.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Under those circumstances, Mr Chair, I am happy to oblige. My second question relates to the same topic and the Attorney, in his answer to my colleague, the member for Bragg, indicated that he is taking advice in relation to an investigation by a committee other than a royal commission. While the Attorney has indicated that the committee he is considering would not be held in front of TV cameras, would it afford the protections of a royal commission, so that victims who may wish to come forward to give evidence will do so with the knowledge that they have the protections afforded to them that would normally be available through a royal commission?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to the possible inquiry that you are considering—and I appreciate that you have indicated what you are prepared to look at in that regard—how many cases do you need to come forward to be sufficient for you to be prepared to make the decision to proceed with this inquiry and even ask the Treasurer for some of the \$200 million unallocated funding in this budget to fund such an inquiry?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I think the question is rhetorical.

Ms CHAPMAN: How many questions? How many cases?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The question is rhetorical.

Ms CHAPMAN: How many cases need to come forward? How many people need to come forward to the government in this state, as some have done in the Anglican and the Catholic church to cause them to have their inquiry? In your document, published in this budget, you seek to have fair and

just access for the people of South Australia in relation to the hearing of their complaints, but how many people need to come forward before you will actually announce and proceed with this inquiry, which there is clearly plenty of funding in the budget to meet?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have already said that I am considering an inquiry into state wards, children in foster care and perhaps other areas for which the state government had responsibility. When I have an announcement to make, I will make it. I do not have an announcement to make today. It remains to be seen whether an inquiry is necessary but, if the government believes one is necessary, I will make an announcement and I will be clear on the terms of reference and the methods of operation of that inquiry. It is interesting that the member for Bragg can be so indignant about this topic, but her own party, which governs at federal level, has ruled out such an inquiry.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question. As the Attorney knows, this is a state jurisdiction. It is his jurisdiction and that is why this issue is being addressed to him, the Attorney, to deal with this matter. My supplementary question is: how many cases of people have come forward to the government already and laid their complaint of concerns in relation to abuse of which they have been victims in foster or institutional care in this state?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I think I have answered the question fully. The member for Bragg continues as an interrogator, but I think it is clear to the committee what the answer is. I am considering an inquiry. The member for Bragg seems to want a number of some kind. I am not going to indicate a number, because that part of the question is clearly rhetorical. It is the member for Bragg making a statement; it is not the member for Bragg genuinely asking for a number. Remember this: the previous attorney-general (Hon. R.D. Lawson), when he was the attorney-general, was opposed to lifting the statute of limitations on sexual offences. He was written a briefing on the matter by a member of the policy and legislation section advising against lifting the immunity.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order, Mr Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Snelling): The member for Bragg asks a different question: how many people have presented a case to the government until now?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am making the point—

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Answer the question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The point I am making is that those who complained to the government and other authorities about sexual abuse before 1 December 1982 would not have had an opportunity for their case to be investigated by the police or prosecuted by the DPP but for the change of government.

Ms CHAPMAN: How many?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I would like to ask a supplementary question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A supplementary question cannot be a restatement of the same question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is not a restatement. The Attorney seems to be having some difficulty in relation to numbers, so I will make the question a little more straightforward. To assist the Attorney and his government in their consideration of whether a royal commission or another form of judicial inquiry is necessary, how many statements signed by a justice of the peace or statutory declarations would he

like to have delivered to him from victims and their families before he will decide that a royal commission is necessary? Would he like 60, 100, 200—set a number?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow that question, because it is not a question of fact; it is hypothetical.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: With respect, it is not. Statements are being collected. How many would the Attorney like?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am happy to provide an answer to that question. The most appropriate response to allegations of sexual abuse against children is a police investigation followed by a prosecution, and that is why the police have been funded by the government to set up the Paedophile Task Force, which is investigating hundreds of allegations and having some success. The important point to make is that, if there is not sufficient evidence or quality of evidence to have a reasonable prospect of a conviction, a prosecution will therefore not go ahead, but the alleged victim will be invited to have counselling at the expense of the government. That is what we are doing.

The Anglican Church has had an inquiry, as has the Roman Catholic Church into the St Anne's case, and the government is presently considering an inquiry on the matter of state wards and children in foster care. We will consider the question of whether an inquiry is necessary but, for the reasons I have given of costs and matters of principle, we will not be having a royal commission. I think that answer is plain. I know that the people who listen to me on radio understand that it is a plain answer.

Ms CHAPMAN: I ask a supplementary question. As the Attorney knows, the Anglican Church inquiry and the Catholic Church inquiry identified issues relating to procedure and protocol. I think he would appreciate in his current position that, clearly, sexual child abuse occurs more than just within church confines. There is clear evidence at a national level and there is data on children who have been victims of abuse.

The Attorney is personally aware, as is the opposition, of people coming forward with complaints. All of these people (whether members of churches or state institutions) have not had access to the 1982 to 1992 period that has been unveiled by this government. They are prepared to do this; they see a need for it. Whilst the government is considering this matter, it is leaving those people who are coming forward saying that they have been abused whilst in institutional care without any remedy or redress, or closure, or the confidence that it will not happen in the future, particularly in foster care. Will the Attorney accept that there is clearly a body of people out there who have already come forward? He knows this. They need the redress that has been offered in church situations.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I missed the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Will the Attorney accept that this body of people also needs some redress as do those whose cases have been exposed through the Anglican and Catholic inquiries?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, I understand the need of some of them for closure and redress. That is why we lifted the immunity on pre-1 December 1982 prosecutions, when the previous attorney-general (when in government) would not support lifting the immunity. That is why we have established the Paedophile Task Force and counselling for victims and their families. That is why we set up the Layton

inquiry and why we have invested vast amounts of taxpayers' money in improving child protection as a consequence of that inquiry. This is one of the foremost priorities of the government. We are doing sensible, practical things; we just do not happen to agree with the Liberal Party's proposal for a royal commission because of both the cost and matters of principle.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do members on the government side have any questions?

Ms CHAPMAN: I have another question, Mr Acting Chairman. I have asked a supplementary question and I have asked a question. I have a third question to ask.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think the Opposition has had a fair crack of the whip.

Ms CICCARELLO: Will the Howard federal Liberal government's proposed changes to indigenous legal aid services have a financial impact on the Legal Services Commission?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Is the argy-bargy over? Can we resume?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, we are back on to the dorothy dixers.

Ms CICCARELLO: I would hardly call this a dorothy dixer.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Attorney-General has the call.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am sorry that the member for Bragg and the Liberal Party do not think that the question about legal aid for indigenous people is anywhere near as important as the questions that they have been asking.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order Mr Acting Chairman. That is an outrageous allegation and I ask the Attorney to withdraw it immediately.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It may be an outrageous allegation—

Ms CHAPMAN: I do make a point of order in relation to that statement. It is disparaging to a member of the committee and I ask that it be withdrawn. To suggest that there is a lower level of importance in relation to legal aid in this state—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Attorney-General has the call. That is not a point of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My point was correct. Indeed, members of the opposition were disparaging the asking of this question by the member for Norwood.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is not right. On a further point of order Mr Acting Chairman, that is not the case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I am sorry.

Ms CHAPMAN: With respect, Mr Acting Chairman, you have obviously not yet heard my point of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! You do not speak over the chair. A point of order is not an opportunity for any member to get up and refute any comment that has just been made. There is no point of order. I would however ask, for the good conduct of the committee, that the Attorney turns to his answer to the question from the member for Norwood.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Your rulings are so wise, sir. I feel sure that one day you will be Speaker of the house. Indigenous people face a future in which access to legal services will be even further restricted under a proposal by the Howard federal Liberal government to tender out Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander legal services within the next six months. This proposal could result in even higher levels of imprisonment, affecting the Department of Correctional Services, and increased risks of deaths in custody. The

proposed arrangements are also contrary to the key recommendation of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, aimed at keeping indigenous people out of jail.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The total funding allocation for the proposed contract period from 1 January 2005 to 31 December 2007 will be \$122 580 000. This represents a yearly cut of \$2.4 million a year. The distribution of funds is not guaranteed but is likely to be somewhat different from that applying in the current financial year. If the tender is to be provided on a commercial basis, a provider would have no alternative but to reduce the services provided to match any diminished funding provided. The proposed arrangements would also affect the Legal Services Commission of South Australia by increasing demand and shifting costs to the South Australian government. If ATSILS shifts its focus from criminal law matters, currently about 90 per cent of the work, the gap left for legal aid commissions to fill will be even greater.

Despite clear evidence about why legal representation in less serious matters is necessary, the Howard federal Liberal government's proposal says that help for Aboriginal defendants for minor traffic offenders or public drunkenness 'should be an exception rather than the rule'. This could leave indigenous defendants without legal representation. Under Legal Services Commission guidelines, the commission would not be able to fill the gap. Under these short-sighted arrangements, service providers will be able to refuse legal help to second-time offenders charged with violence and refer them to counselling and support services.

This does nothing to assist the person's legal needs. It is not guaranteed to assist their social needs, and it involves the service instead of the court in prejudging the applicant's guilt or innocence. It also fails to acknowledge or deal with the systemic causes of criminal behaviour such as poverty, unemployment and racism. It would be a completely unacceptable rule if applied to non-Aboriginal persons.

The restrictions on criminal law assistance, the resulting higher levels of unmet need and the increase in self-represented litigants, will result in increased remands and increased adjournments in court, and even greater numbers of indigenous people being imprisoned. There will also be an increasing demand for representation assistance from legal aid commissions, especially in state criminal matters that are funded by state governments. I have written to the commonwealth government noting my concerns about the commonwealth proposal and its failure to consult with the states and territories about how best to deliver legal services to Aboriginal people.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Attorney would be aware that in the recent budget the Minister for the Southern Suburbs was allocated \$750 000 over three years for anti-graffiti programs. Are you willing to consider a clean-off program similar to Bob Carr's New South Wales model to operate in the southern suburbs on a pilot basis in conjunction with the Minister for the Southern Suburbs?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The question is a pertinent one. I know that minister Hill has received money for this purpose but I am not sure how his department will spend it. What I can say is that, in response to the importuning of the member for Fisher and suggestions made on Leon Byner's program on radio FiveAA, I have been looking at whether funds can be gathered from my department to fund a pilot program for graffiti removal by offenders. It is true that back

in about 1991 the parliament passed graffiti laws whereby offenders could be ordered to scrub off their own graffiti, but in recent years only one hapless offender at Millicent has been ordered to scrub off his own graffiti. The Office of Crime Statistics was able to tell me that when I asked, I think on behalf of the member for Fisher.

Grffiti is often promptly removed well before the case comes to trial, so the offender cannot rub off his own graffiti. The order that needs to be made is that the offender rub off the graffiti created by other graffiti vandals. I think this is best done as part of a work gang under the supervision, I hope, of a fairly stern community service orders officer.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I thank the member for Florey for her suggestion of a Hell's Angel supervisor, but that will not be necessary.

Ms CHAPMAN: Give it to a woman!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Give it to a woman, says the member for Bragg—presumably a woman like her good self.

Ms CHAPMAN: We do not have a problem any more in Burnside.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says there is no graffiti program—

Ms CHAPMAN: We do not have a problem in Burnside because we have our own squad.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Burnside does not have a graffiti problem because it has its own squad.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The eastern councils still have a good crime prevention program, and the member for Hartley and the member for Bragg attended when I launched it at the Norwood Town Hall recently.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, he who taketh can also give, and that is what occurred in the eastern suburbs. I think the idea of the member for Fisher of work gangs, supervised by a stern type (I think he would prefer a retired military type), and the offenders dressed in bright fluorescent jackets so they can be seen by passing motorists is a good idea. I think shame has a role in the criminal justice system and I am currently looking for funds within my department to fulfil his wishes, because I respect the views of the member for Fisher on criminal justice a great deal. I sometimes wish he were a member of the parliamentary Labor Party so it could be exposed to his views intimately.

Ms CHAPMAN: In light of the time, I indicate to the committee that I have the omnibus questions to read in. Unfortunately, they cannot be tabled under our rules so I will read them as quickly as possible.

1. Did all departments and agencies reporting to the Minister for Justice meet all required budget savings targets for 2003-04 set for them in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 budgets and, if not, what specific proposed project and programs cut were not implemented?

2. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of consultants in 2003-04 above \$5 000 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, I would love to answer that.

Ms CHAPMAN:—listing the name of the consultant, cost, work undertaken and the method of employment?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Chairman, could I answer that question?

The CHAIRMAN: If the minister wants to answer, he is welcome to do so.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, there is no need for me to take the question on notice. I have the answer for the member for Bragg and I can see that she is pleased that that is so. The Attorney-General's Department has authorised 17 consultancies for the period 1 July 2003 to 30 April 2004. Consultancies are divided between administered funds and controlled funds. Administered funds are those managed by the Attorney-General's Department on behalf of a third party such as the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund. Controlled funds are moneys allocated by appropriation to the Attorney-General's Department. The amounts are taken directly from the general ledger and do not include Public Trustee. I will read them. From administered funds:

- McCallum Consultancy—prepare a best practice model to prevent re-abuse of children, to complete whole-of-government response to the Child Protection Review Report prepared by Robyn Layton QC, \$9 600.

From the controlled funds:

- Andrew Rogers Industrial Design—preparation of plans for Standards Laboratory upgrade, including gantry crane, \$6 000.
- BDO Consulting—appointed to undertake a review of the Metropolitan Fire Service workshop at Deeds Road to determine if, and then how, the SA Metropolitan Fire Service appliance fleet should be maintained, \$9 600.
- KPMG—provide assistance and design templates for the Review of Justice to report on the justice portfolio performance as recommended by the Economic Development Board, \$5 532.
- Police Security Services—conduct a security risk review for the Attorney-General's Department at 45 Pirie Street, \$7 600.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I think I am more at risk on the 253 bus or on my bicycle than I am at the department. It continues:

- Danton Services (oddly enough, this is not consultancy for a revolutionary war or a guillotine)—review of training facilities, and so on, across the emergency services sector, \$25 000.
- deMasi Jones—development of the SAFECOM (the fire and emergency services combination) logo, \$10 800.09.
- Lizard Drinking—development of an appropriate organisational response to leverage information and communication technology investment value in the delivery of sustainable outcomes that are aligned with government policy objectives and community outcomes, \$43 725.
- Toucan Consulting SA Pty Ltd—develop a strategic plan for eight community legal centres in South Australia, \$13 636.

There were no consultancies above \$50 000. The total value of Attorney-General's Department's consultancies was \$150 316.16.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you for that response. I will continue the omnibus questions:

3. For each department or agency reporting to the minister, how many surplus employees are there, and for each surplus employee what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost of the employee?

4. In the financial year 2002-03 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2003-04?

5. For all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what is the level of under-expenditure for 2003-04, and has cabinet approved any carryover expenditure into 2004-05?

6. (i) What was the total of employees with total employment costs of \$100 000 or more per employee, and also as a subcategory the total number of employees within a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister as at 30 June 2003?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Some 106 employees of the Attorney-General's Department receive total remuneration in excess of \$100 000. This should be noted.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Morphett says, 'ssh', or such like, as if he is astonished; and he says, 'They're well paid.' Many of these people are the solicitors and prosecutors who put Bunting and Wagner behind bars. These are the people who put the major criminals in this state behind bars for a long time. I value these employees and they would be earning much more in the private sector.

Ms CHAPMAN: No: you have to get a job in the private sector.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: These people are not fat cats, as the Liberal opposition would categorise them. These are on-the-ground workers giving great service to the people of South Australia. The remuneration relates only to employees within the reporting entity of the Attorney-General's Department and does not include employees from other agencies for whom a payroll service is provided. Remuneration includes salaries, superannuation, reportable fringe benefits received, expense payments, vehicles and car parking, and fringe benefits tax payable. Remuneration is not limited to executive positions (as the opposition implies) but any employees who are remunerated at \$100 000 or more within the financial year as follows. Now 35 were executive positions, but 26 were just plain legal officers and 45 were managing solicitors. That is what you have to pay: the very minimum you have to pay to get good people working in the Crown Solicitor's Office and in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. I have great faith in those two institutions. They give great service to the public of South Australia. I do not think that the opposition should be quibbling with their wages or categorising them as fat cats. The labourer is worthy of his hire.

Ms CHAPMAN: I shall await the balance of the answer to the rest of that part of the question I asked. I continue the omnibus questions:

6. (ii) What is the estimate for 30 June 2004?

(iii) Between 30 June 2003 and 30 June 2004, will the minister list job title and total employment cost of each position (with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more) (a) which has been abolished and (b) which has been created?

7. What is the difference between consultants and contractors and how many people or services that have previously been classed as consultants are now shown as contractors; and what is the value of their contracts? What are the services they provide?

Consistent with some agreement between officers, I am happy to provide a copy of those questions to the committee for distribution.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee is now considering lines still under the portfolio area of Minister for Consumer Affairs and Office of Consumer and Business Affairs.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr M. Bodycoat, Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

Membership:

Dr McFetridge substituted for Ms Chapman.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, do you wish to make any statement?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I never do, sir. I always give the maximum time possible for opposition questions.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The Attorney is as cooperative as ever. I would like to put on the record that Mr Mark Bodycoat, Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, has also been very helpful in allowing me to get on top of this new shadow portfolio I have been given. I look forward to working with both the Attorney and the Commissioner in a cooperative way. As I have said, with many of the portfolios I have been given it is not so much about confrontation as clarification and explanation. There may be some areas where we differ in terms of the way in which we think things should be handled but, so far, I have not found many of those. I do not think that my questions today will be too difficult for the Attorney to answer. I just hope that we are able to get some points of clarification with respect to what I have described in the past, and again this year, as a very convoluted document called the State Budget.

I refer to Budget Paper No. 4, Volume 1 and Budget Paper No. 3, page 4.18, under 'Revenue from ordinary activities—fees and charges'. Revenues from fees and charges will increase of the order of \$1.462 million. Can we expect further or other fee increases? Will these increases be in line with inflation, and what fees and charges are they? How many fees and charges will be affected?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We will have to take that question on notice. We will get the detail to the opposition spokesman as quickly as possible. Indeed, the honourable member will be pleased to know that last night I signed a number of replies to questions on notice that he has in the House of Assembly. The fees will increase in line with the fee increases that are gazetted each year for government charges, and that takes into account the CPI for South Australia. I think that a couple of other matters are taken into account. It is mostly CPI, but we will get back to the opposition spokesman on what the considerations are on the annual increase in fees. It is uniform for fees across government, and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs' fees are in that basket and treated the same way.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I do not expect the Attorney to give me a complete answer to this next question because it involves federal legislation, but is the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs allocating any of the education and information budget to alert incorporated small businesses to their obligations under the Trade Practices Act? I will briefly explain. Many owners and employees of incorporated businesses may be personally liable for compensation claims under the Trade Practices Act (a federal act), and they may be under the belief that they are protected by state legislation in their business dealings.

I raise this matter because a precedent has been set recently with the City of Holdfast Bay in terms of individual councillors and council employees being potentially liable for punitive damages in a legal matter at Holdfast Bay. This belief could be held by other small business operators who are incorporated, and I feel that they need to be alerted to the current situation.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will ask the Commissioner to answer that question.

Mr BODYCOAT: There is no specific allocation in OCBA's budget to deal with that issue. OCBA has an ongoing program of liaising with the ACCC, which raises and examines a number of issues that will affect both consumers and small business. That is a matter that will appear on that agenda.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The next question is one that I raised with the Office for Volunteers. They were unable to answer it and referred this question to the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs. Why are committees, which are usually made up of volunteers, drawing up codes of conduct for their volunteer and sporting organisations and being charged \$1 200 to lodge or register the code of conduct with the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs and a further \$250 to register as a provider with no net tangible benefit in insurance premium reductions?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The net tangible benefit is that, if the code of conduct is registered, the provider is not liable to a large part of the law of negligence, so the provider's insurance premiums can be reduced accordingly. This was part of the government's response to the blowout in insurance premiums for voluntary organisations. Certainly, in the community cabinets that were held in the country not long after the Rann Labor Party was elected to office, we were told by officials of voluntary organisations that their insurance premiums had risen to the point where they had to impose this extra cost burden on their members or they had to abandon certain activities, or the organisation just folded. They said to us, 'You are the government. Do something about it.' So, we did.

I think that the first item of legislation we had to deal with in relation to the insurance crisis was about limiting the liability of providers of recreational services. One of the things we did was to say that if a provider of recreational services subscribed to a code of conduct for providing that service, that would exempt them from a large part of the law of negligence and reduce their liability accordingly. At that price, what is proposed is cheap. The provider is not required to pay or sign up—the provider can remain governed by the law of negligence. I think that most of them will want to pay, but I will ask the Commissioner if he has anything to add.

Mr BODYCOAT: There are some. The \$1 200 referred to is a once-off fee, and a good part of that is actually intended to offset the cost of handling the examination of the code to see whether it meets relevant objectives. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, in conjunction with the Office for Recreation and Sport (whose members are significantly affected by this), and the volunteers' administration has looked at a range of ways of providing assistance for organisations of the nature you mention, particularly to try to get them over the line in determining whether or not they need to register a code in the first place.

That work continues, we hope, with the development of a pilot with the Local Government Association to develop a code which may be adaptable to a range of situations. The proposal was that, in fact, the pilot would focus on the use of public jetties such as that at Glenelg, which would allow us to develop better guidance on how those kinds of codes might be developed. Also, it is not necessary for every organisation to register its own code. It is appropriate for an organisation to agree to give an undertaking to abide by a code that somebody else has registered, if it is appropriate to the enterprise that they operate.

Ms CICCARELLO: Will the government introduce an application fee for land agents who apply for an exemption from section 23 of the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act? If not, why not?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs administers licensing under the provision of more than one act, including the Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994. Section 23 of the act bans agents and employees from having an interest in land or business that the agent is commissioned to sell. The minister may, however, after receiving an application from an officer or employee of an agent, exempt the person from the purchase of the specified land or business. Currently, applications for exemption from section 23 of the act are processed without incurring a fee.

A review of occupational licensing business processes has identified the need to introduce a fee for a land agent applying for an exemption under the act to allow him to have a direct or indirect interest in the purchase of property that the agent is commissioned to sell. The fee is expected to generate about \$10 000 a year and is, I add, wholly in line with the Labor government's bid to reform the conflicts of interest and shady practices of some real estate agents.

Ms CICCARELLO: Can the Attorney give an account of the success or otherwise of the desktop auditing program in detecting unlicensed activities?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I can. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has a desktop auditing program that is used to detect unlicensed activity as well as people who may no longer be suitable to be licensed. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs regularly reviews public notices to detect licensed companies facing liquidation and conducts financial audits of land agents and conveyancers' trust accounts.

OCBA has predicted that the desktop auditing program would perform 9 000 checks during this financial year. This figure has now been revised down to 8 500 checks. This is because OCBA issued 900 official warnings to traders as a consequence of such checks, which was triple the figure predicted of 300. The increase in warnings is the result of better targeting with the desktop auditing program, for example. The desktop auditing program focused recently on checking that subcontractors to some of South Australia's major builders are appropriately licensed. A disappointingly high number of up to 30 per cent have not been appropriately licensed, and this has led to the large number of warnings.

The breaches of the licensing legislation fell into three categories: a company trading without its own licence, where a director who was formerly a sole trader is licensed; one partner in a partnership not holding an appropriate licence; and a licensee working beyond the limits of his licence. These breaches do not necessarily point to poor workmanship on the part of the licensee. Different licences, however, require different skills and qualifications, and the government is reluctant to expose consumers to the risk that the work that is being performed on what is most people's most valuable asset, the family home, is not being done by fully licensed tradesmen. I am pleased to say that the Electrical Trades Union of South Australia has been in the vanguard of those organisations asking for strict compliance with licensing. I only wish we could do more for that august institution.

An honourable member: I'm sure we could think of something!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am advised that when the breach is of the nature mentioned above, and it is a first

offence and there is no evidence that the consumer has suffered as a result of the breach, the licensee will be sent a warning and encouraged to obtain the proper licence or licence upgrade. OCBA monitors the person's response to the warning to ensure that the unlicensed activity does not continue. If the unlicensed activity continues or there is a previous breach on the licensee's record, or a consumer has suffered from negligent work at the hands of the licensee, the matter is referred for investigation with a view to laying disciplinary or criminal charges in court against the licensee.

I would also add that from time to time, we have had to make public warnings about unqualified tradesmen. In particular, I think there are a couple of shonky house painters going around the metropolitan area, exploiting elderly people, and I gave a warning over Jeremy Cordeaux' 5DN talkback show on that matter.

Ms CICCARELLO: What kind of information and educational material is available to the public on the web site of the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I encourage members to look at OCBA's web site. It uses radio presentations, newspaper and journal articles as well as television news coverage to present its messages to consumers and licence holders. All forms of communication invite consumers and traders to visit the OCBA corporate web site, that is www.ocba.sa.gov.au, for further information. The volume of information given to the public electronically has increased this financial year. Since the redesign of the corporate web site in late 2002, the time that visitors spend on the site and the hits to the site have increased. The figures for 2003-04 far exceeded predictions for the reporting period. In March 2004, 43 per cent of visitors spent more than 10 minutes getting information from the site.

The OCBA web site contains more than 1 000 pages of information, 118 forms and 145 publications. It offers basic consumer information in 11 languages about matters such as buying a car, renting a house and registering a birth. The site also meets protocols necessary for improved access for people with disabilities. Recent enhancements to the web site include a latest news section. Campaigns for 2004 have so far included banned and dangerous goods, such as cap rifles and novelty flashing dummies—in fact, I seem to recall doing a dummy spit for television to promote that particular warning—warning about bathing aids for babies, and the promotion of free residential tenancy information sessions.

Several new sections have been added to the site including consumer credit records, identity theft, keeping your birth certificate in a safe place, safety codes for recreational service providers and product safety for consumers. I commend the web site to members and their constituents.

The CHAIRMAN: Attorney, recently I received a letter that invited me to be listed in a publication and on a web site. The publication was entitled, *Brilliant Minds of the 21st Century*. I was rather overcome when I received this letter and felt very humble and had to sit down. But a fee was required. I have sent some of this information to you. I am hoping it is not a scam, because I could not imagine someone being so cruel, but can you indicate whether or not that particular invitation is suspect?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will ask the Commissioner to respond, but we have come across these quite a lot. One of the highest (if not the highest) officials of the state has been approached by an American organisation to pay something like \$450 to insert her name in a compendium entitled *Great Women of the 21st Century*, and I think a JP

at Port Lincoln was approached by a New Zealand firm to put his name in a similar compendium. I am not sure what it was: it might have been *Jurists of the 21st Century*. After paying his money he heard nothing from them for a very long, long time, as Rex Hunt might say. This is a recurring scam. I will ask the Commissioner to respond. I should add that the particular offer to which the Chairman refers has now been referred by my office to OCBA.

Mr BODYCOAT: While there are some elements of the scheme which are reprehensible and which suggest that it is a scam, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has treated this as a species of what it calls vanity publishing, which is currently quite commonly promoted as inviting people to subscribe to a publication, but it is to be published only on payment of a fee, which they have to pay upfront. There is no certainty that the publication will, in fact, be published and, in many instances, it appears that most people have never heard of the supposed publisher of this publication. As a consequence, the warning that I would give to consumers, which appears on the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs web site, is to treat these kinds of purchases with the utmost suspicion and do not expect to have your name published. Save your money for something on which you can better justify spending it.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1. Why is no licence required to sell secondhand caravans or trailers; what protection is there for South Australian consumers who buy these products; and is information available for people from diverse backgrounds as well as indigenous South Australians?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will refer that question to the Commissioner.

Mr BODYCOAT: The situation really revolves around the definition of 'motor vehicle'. Only secondhand motor vehicle dealers are required to be licensed under the Secondhand Vehicle Dealers Act. The issue of caravans arises only occasionally. I am happy to undertake to provide details of the number and nature of complaints, but it is not a common area of complaint, and, at this stage, it does not appear to justify a recommendation for legislation to control it. As far as general consumer information is concerned, initial information is available from the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs web site (and in some publications) in 11 languages, and that information can be translated by interpreters for other language groups that are not represented in that group.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 4.124—Sub-program 2.6—Education and Information Services. Within the Education and Information Services budget has any money been allocated to educate consumers wishing to sell their vehicle on consignment about the pitfalls that may occur?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This is a good question. I am giving thought—as is the government—to banning sales of motor vehicles on consignment. Many of the claims on the Secondhand Vehicle Dealers Fund, to which those dealers contribute, involve losses that sellers of cars have made when giving their cars on consignment to dealers. Well, they are not always dealers—sometimes they are; sometimes they are not—but they agree to sell the car for them. It is there that big hits on the fund have been made. Consumers are at risk in selling their cars on consignment, and we propose to ban the practice. This matter will be submitted to the parliament, because it is for the parliament to say. The government will

put that proposal before the parliament because we think little good is coming of this sort of transaction.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Is that why in the annual report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs in the Statement of Financial Performance the Secondhand Vehicles Compensation Fund blew out from \$69 000 in \$2002 to \$225 000 in 2003?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will ask the Commissioner to answer that question.

Mr BODYCOAT: That relates to claims originating from, I think, only two or three dealers' activities during the year. I do not have the specific information with me, but I am happy to provide it to the honourable member. This issue is under discussion with the Motor Trade Association arising out of its concern about the drain on the Secondhand Vehicle Dealers Fund because of exactly that kind of activity.

Mr SCALZI: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 4.124. Within the Education and Information Services budget of the Office of Consumer Affairs is there any allocation for informing indigenous car buyers (and other Australians from diverse backgrounds) to protect them from unscrupulous motor vehicle dealers?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We acknowledge that there has been a problem with dealers taking secondhand cars for sale up to the Pitjantjatjara lands and selling them at prices which I think are unfairly high. Sometimes the car is then used for just one trip and abandoned. Visitors to the Pit lands tell me that the area is littered with car bodies, but I will ask the Commissioner to give a more detailed answer.

Mr BODYCOAT: The sale of marginally roadworthy or unroadworthy vehicles to indigenous consumers is one that has concerned OCBA for a short time. It is also a concern to our equivalents in Western Australia, the Northern Territory, Queensland and New South Wales, who have borders which touch on the same general geographic area, and where similar conduct is evident. There is a national project currently being managed under the auspices of the standing committee of officials of consumer affairs, intended to identify exactly those areas of competence as consumers that indigenous consumers are lacking in, and to provide some assistance to them, by way of a coordinated national program of education.

That has involved OCBA and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission in visits to two targeted areas to date—those being Ceduna and related areas on the West Coast, and then to Coober Pedy and related areas where there is a high percentage of Aboriginal consumers. As a result of those, OCBA has been able to gain significantly improved intelligence about the way in which these programs—because they are orchestrated programs, it is conscious conduct by licensed and unlicensed vehicle dealers—to see how these programs actually work and to get a better understanding of how, by cooperation with other agencies such as South Australia Police and Transport SA, we might be able to put a stop to these.

Some of the things that will be examined will be whether or not there should be special rules for selling vehicles to Aboriginal consumers in defined geographic areas, and whether or not it might be appropriate—if it is possible—to require that any vehicle which is sold to a person in those areas may have to have a roadworthiness certificate or some other indicator of its roadworthiness, at least at the time of sale.

Mr SCALZI: How does this problem compare in South Australia with the other states? You said that the problem is not limited to us.

Mr BODYCOAT: I cannot be specific but sufficiently for those other jurisdictions to be as concerned as we are. I think if you look at the state and territory borders, they are artificial creations of geographers, rather than representing cultural boundaries of the people affected. So, if the cultural boundaries of the affected groups cross those state borders there is a reasonable prospect that the same kind of conduct affects them, regardless of which side of the border they are on.

The CHAIRMAN: Attorney, has any thought been given to requiring, in the sale of second-hand vehicles on a private basis, a statement declaring that it is the true distance travelled by the vehicle? We have something, I think, in relation to sale of businesses, and I guess in some way in relation to the sale of houses. People have to make an honest statement in terms of, I think, white ants and things like that. Is there any reason why we couldn't have in a private second-hand sale, a statement, or even a certificate of roadworthiness or something, to indicate that the vehicle is being sold honestly and in an accurate way according to the description?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am advised that there has not been demand for such a change to the law. If a person wants the reassurance of those kind of things, he had better deal with a licensed motor vehicle dealer.

The CHAIRMAN: I am mindful of that, but the reality is that a lot of people, particularly on low incomes and young people, buy vehicles, and they would not have the money to pursue a legal remedy of any kind. I just put it forward for consideration as an issue.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: If the private seller made false representations, there are no guarantees that he would have the assets to meet a judgement if the purchaser sued on the violation of the promises in the documentation.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs examine the cost structure in place for the fees applied to trade measures for—and I quote the Attorney's words out of *Hansard*—'small petrol wholesalers and retailers who already operate on infinitesimal profit margins'.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Changing the trade measurement costs?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Yes.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We have not contemplated that. I assume our costs for trade measurement are consistent with other jurisdictions and designed to attain cost-recovery of the service. The member for Morphett quotes me accurately about the margins that petrol retailers make, the independent petrol retailers. They make their money not on the petrol but on the sale of grocery and snack lines in the shop near the petrol pumps, or they make their money, as my Uncle George used to at the Parkside service station, off the garage doing mechanical repairs. It was dinged into me from a very early age when I was at Uncle George's that the margins on the sale of the petrol were infinitesimal and the petrol was there merely to attract a flow of people whom he hoped would use his mechanical services—which were honed on D-Day, amongst other occasions.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I have one last question. Does the Attorney consider there is a problem with loan sharks who charge exorbitant interest rates operating in South Australia? I have been informed by a constituent that some lenders are charging up to 19 per cent for small, short-term cash loans.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, I am concerned about that, and not so long ago I was reading a booklet produced by the Community Legal Service in Melbourne about payday lending. But I will ask the Commissioner to answer the question.

Mr BODYCOAT: This is an issue that is commonly quite well hidden in the community and involves a range of measures that are designed to keep it hidden. However, as a result of some very useful information made available to us recently by one of the welfare agencies operating in the northern suburbs, we have reason to believe that there is an increasingly widespread practice of loan sharking, which has been hidden from us until now. The matter is currently the subject of further investigation to see whether, in fact, the conduct involves breaches of the credit legislation. If there is sufficient evidence, it is our intention to do something about it by way of prosecution.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any effort been made to try to define the terms 'hand made', 'homemade', 'fresh daily', 'fresh', 'natural' and 'country killed'? Every day, shoppers purchase on the basis of this information. I am not aware of any meat that is killed in the city, for example: I guess that would be illegal. Have the ministers or commissioners of consumer affairs throughout Australia tried to define what these things mean?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The short answer is no, there is not a technical definition of these terms, nor is there a working party working on defining them. However, if it could be established that in particular instances they were false and misleading, we would come down on the perpetrator like a ton of bricks.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now move to an examination of the Office of Multicultural Affairs under the Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Lean, Manager, Community and Government Relations, Multicultural SA.

Mr S. Forrest, Acting Director, Multicultural SA.

Membership:

Mrs Hall substituted for Dr McFetridge.

The CHAIRMAN: Minister, I will not ask you whether you want to make an opening statement because I know your answer.

Mrs HALL: I shall follow the lead of the Attorney and not make an opening statement. I refer to Budget Paper No. 4, Volume 1, page 4.130, relating to government boards. What initiatives have been put in place and what progress has been made in increasing the multicultural composition of government boards?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We do not have a specific paper on that matter but the government has, just in my portfolio, made a significantly improved attempt to appoint people who have their background in non-English speaking communities. I have appointed John Sulan to the Supreme Court: he was born in Prague in Czechoslovakia. I have appointed Chris Kourakis, who is from a Greek-Australian background, as the Solicitor-General. Indeed, his people are from the island of Ikaria in Greece. Such appointments have not been characteristic of the previous administration but, if one were to go through the whole of government, one would see some improvement in the appointment of people from a non-English speaking background to government positions. I mention those two because they are in my portfolio of Attorney-General. I have certainly written twice to all ministers and chief executive officers about our policy, and several ministers have responded to say that they are now

actively seeking advice on nominations from the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

Mrs HALL: Given that the Attorney-General said several ministers have responded and expressed their interest in pursuing it, I wonder whether he would provide information to the house about the ministers who have not responded and who are not doing anything about it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will obtain that information for the house.

Mrs HALL: My question specifically refers to government departments and agencies. How many chief executive officers of government bodies are multilingual? Is the minister able to provide a breakdown of the linguistic capabilities of members of middle management of government bodies?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: So far as the parliamentary Labor Party is concerned, I was pleased to visit Calabria, Campania and Rome recently with the member for Norwood where she displayed her ability to speak fluent Italian.

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is right: they thought the member for Norwood was not a member of the delegation but, rather, the interpreter. I also travelled with the Hon. Carmel Zollo from another place, who is fluent in the dialect of Campania, whereas the member for Norwood speaks the president's Italian. I have much to do with the member for West Torrens, who is fluent in the Greek language. The Office of the Commissioner for Public Employment has examined the diversity of the state public sector through work force profiling over the last several years. It is acknowledged that linguistic and cultural skills of government employees can assist to provide health care, law enforcement, employment search and many other service delivery agencies.

Limited recognition of the value of cultural and linguistic skills already occurs in the form of the linguistic allowance that recognises employees' linguistic skills. This allowance is payable to state public servants who possess bilingual skills at the national accreditation level and who use these skills to overcome the language barrier between South Australians seeking services and the agencies where those people are employed.

I am also pleased to tell the member for Morialta that constituents approaching my electorate office on Port Road wishing to converse in Greek, Maltese or Macedonian can be accommodated.

Mrs HALL: I thank the Attorney-General for that response.

Mr LEAN: The work force profiling that was undertaken by OCPE found that, of those people who responded to the profiling—and that was almost 7 000 public servants—11 per cent of the respondents said they spoke a language other than English at home. That compares with 12 per cent for the total population. Some 21 per cent of the public servants were born overseas, and that compares with 20 per cent for the total South Australian population, so there is a close correlation there.

Mrs HALL: I very genuinely ask the Attorney-General whether it is a priority and whether, as a general rule, all things being equal, the government would give priority to someone who did speak a language other than English?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As a chief executive?

Mrs HALL: Yes, all things being equal.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The PSM Act would say that merit has to be the first consideration. I think it might be awkward to try to incorporate second or third languages into

the consideration of CEOs. It may be different where service delivery is an issue.

Mrs HALL: The government made a commitment before the election to ensure that all government departments and agencies include in their annual reports an outline of their multicultural programs. Have all government departments and agencies included in their annual report an outline of these programs as promised?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: During 2003 Multicultural SA began preparing the guide to implementing access and equity for culturally and linguistically diverse South Australians in the South Australian public sector. During 2004-05 this practical tool will be finalised and distributed to all government agencies. The access and equity implementation framework will be outlined in the guide. Multicultural SA will provide advice across the government sector. The framework requires public sector agencies to carry out and report on outcomes such as consultation carried out with culturally diverse communities, culturally appropriate services and programs, collection of client data and statistics, cultural awareness training for staff and use of ethnic press and other media.

For instance, just yesterday I asked whether the advertisements that the government is running for the new law on carrying knives and other offensive weapons in licensed premises between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. can be translated into the languages broadcast on Radio 5EBI FM, and whether we can purchase advertising time on those programs to make the announcement.

I return to the list: working with interpreters and translated materials. The framework will also provide the basis for the whole of government and equity report to be prepared in 2004-05. Multicultural SA has previously distributed the guide *Working with Interpreters* across agencies. During 2004-05 this useful publication will be distributed to non-government organisations and to local government. An important step in improving the delivery of services in our culturally and linguistically diverse society is the development of cross-cultural communication skills.

Government agencies will be invited to participate in a whole of government forum on cultural awareness training. Although it will be no comfort whatever to the member for Morialta, she may be interested to know that my new citizen letters, new constituent letters and election propaganda are provided in 22 languages other than English to cohorts as small as five.

Ms CICCARELLO: What is being done to improve the recognition of skills and qualifications gained overseas?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This is a complicated matter, but the government's progress has included these points:

- introducing legislation on the recognition of overseas skills and qualifications in June 2003 in the Training and Skills Development Act 2003;
- staging a forum in November 2002 for officers working on policy and operations in assessment for migration and assessment of skills and qualifications. That was held at the Adelaide Oval, as I recall, and I attended it;
- South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission's Building on Cultural Diversity for Population Growth Forum to address population matters raised by the Economic Development Board and the National Population Summit. Overseas qualifications recognition was the focus of one of seven working groups arising from the forum.

- chairing a national working party on overseas qualifications recognition to improve the quality of information provided about overseas qualifications recognition;
- preparing the report 'Overseas Qualification Recognition for Women Migrants and Refugees—Teachers and Nurses' to be launched this year.

Overseas qualifications recognition is complicated and important, particularly when crafting a population policy for South Australia. Alas, little can be done in response to anecdotes. I have asked groups and organisations, such as the Multicultural Communities Council, to give the government any information about specific cases that show the problems migrants to South Australia have with the recognition of their qualifications so that this can inform our programs. Overseas qualification recognition remains a key priority, particularly in the context of the State Population Policy that aims to increase the attraction of our state as a migrant destination.

Integral to successful settlement is the ability of new arrivals to use their skills and qualifications gained overseas in the course of employment which, in turn, benefits the state's economy. The passing of the Training and Skills Development Act 2003 has established the Training and Skills Commission, which has responsibility for advising the government on matters of the recognition of overseas skills and qualification. I might point out, of course, that this body is not responsible to report to me as the Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

In accordance with the State Population Policy, a reference group is being established under the auspices of the commission. The reference group will identify barriers to effective recognition of overseas qualification and skills and proposed solutions. The commonwealth report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants released in 2003, stated:

Public consultations in submissions to the review have indicated that skills recognition remains a major issue for new arrivals.

The report made three recommendations to address these concerns. These recommendations were welcomed by South Australia and other states and territories. The commonwealth government reported that it accepted all the recommendations of that review. It therefore came as a surprise and disappointment to all the states and territories when the ministerial council in May this year was told that the funds for the carrying out of these recommendations were not to be included in the 2004-05 commonwealth budget. The ministerial council was told by the commonwealth minister that priorities had to be set and that funding was not available for this work.

South Australia then took the initiative to get this important matter back on the agenda, and the ministerial council agreed to reinstate the Recognition of Overseas Qualifications Working Group. Despite the lack of support from the commonwealth, the state government continues to recognise that skills recognition remains a major issue for new arrivals.

Ms CICCARELLO: Following the National Population Summit in November, I understand that SAMEAC held a forum on population growth in South Australia which included recommendations for the South Australian population policy. Can the minister tell the committee what the government is doing to make South Australia a preferred settlement destination for migrants, especially humanitarian arrivals?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is a good question from the member for Norwood. I can confirm that, after the

National Population Summit in November 2003, SAMEAC did hold a forum in December on building cultural diversity for population growth in South Australia. During the forum seven workshop groups were focusing on themes involving family and community and strategies to attract migrants; services required at all levels of government to support migrants; attracting overseas students; attracting and retaining talent in South Australia; building on business and trade links to generate growth; facilitating the recognition of overseas qualifications; and, finally, fostering population growth in regional areas.

The report from that forum was sent to the Premier for consideration in the population policy. I acknowledge the work not only of the commission but also of the many other agencies involved in writing the policy. Part of the state population policy seeks to make South Australia a more attractive destination for humanitarian migrants, achieve a higher long-term retention of humanitarian migrants in South Australia, and improve humanitarian migrants' capacity as productive members of the public and the labour force. The Migrant Resource Centre of South Australia is taking up a four-year lease at a prominent heritage building in Adelaide, namely Edmund Wright House. Members may recall that Edmund Wright House was completed as headquarters for the Bank of Adelaide in 1878 and was saved from demolition by premier Dunstan in 1971.

It is probably best known to the public as the old Births, Deaths and Marriages office. The Migrant Resource Centre also has an option to extend the lease for up to 12 more years. It will begin relocating to Edmund Wright House later this week and will take up residence officially on 1 July. It will be joined there by the African Communities Council and the Middle Eastern Communities Council. That will put the Migrant Resource Centre right in the middle of the city and give it much prominence. The lease agreement was made possible by a four-year rental subsidy funded as part of the state population policy. I acknowledge that the majority of the MRC's funding continues to come from the commonwealth through the Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

I commend the Howard Liberal government for its support of the MRC and know that it will welcome the opportunity that this relocation presents. From the MRC's perspective, Edmund Wright House provides its humanitarian migrant and refugee clientele with a central, accessible and symbolic first port of call. Coincidentally, the general timing of the MRC's move to Edmund Wright House overlaps with World Refugee Day this Sunday, the theme of which is 'A place to call home'.

Ms CICCARELLO: What is being done to improve the training and support of ethnic community volunteer networks, especially in regional areas?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: South Australians of a migrant or non-English-speaking background are sometimes not able to access government and non-government programs and services because of cultural and linguistic barriers. Through Multicultural SA, the state government has provided training and support for members of the volunteer migrant information officer network for more than a decade. This training and support enables volunteers to give information and referral services about government and other services and programs to members of their communities. Through the regular training, volunteers are able to keep up to date with policies, programs and services such as health, education,

welfare, law and order, immigration, domestic violence and housing.

Alas, volunteers in regional South Australia have not been able to participate in this training as it is often not possible to travel long distances to attend the regular training sessions. I am thinking, in particular, of the Greek and Serbian people in Coober Pedy, the Sikh people in the Riverland around Glossop, the Turkish and also the asylum seekers of Afghan and Hazara origin around Murray Bridge. In our discussions with the regional multicultural communities network, we have found that volunteers in regional areas would benefit from training and information sessions so they too can better serve the ethnic communities.

I am pleased to inform the committee that Multicultural SA will work with the regional multicultural communities network, the Office for Volunteers, local government and other relevant agencies to hold training and information sessions in regional centres. Volunteer network members will continue to be responsible to the organisations in which they conduct their volunteer work, but I am sure that you would agree that this is a good initiative.

Mr SCALZI: In estimates last year, the minister stated that he would monitor whether there had been compliance with his request to portfolio chief executives to use the ethnic media and to set aside funds in their budget for this purpose. Did the minister undertake this action? What were the results of his investigation? Are strict guidelines in place to ensure that ethnic media is all used to its fullest potential? If so, what do these guidelines consist of?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I cracked the whip after that and reissued an instruction to chief executives. My office also had discussions with the strategic communications unit about advertising in the ethnic press and on ethnic radio. I will try to get the honourable member a detailed response to his question. It certainly deserves that. I have asked that the knives legislation advertisements be extended to ethnic radio.

Mr LEAN: We are aware through Starcom, the master media agency, that South Australian government agencies are indeed using ethnic media. To the end of May in this financial year, they spent \$123 105 on ethnic media advertising through Starcom. Agencies that were involved include ArtsSA, the Department of Health, Government Enterprises, the Department of Human Services, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, South Australia Police, Education and Children's Services, the Metropolitan Fire Service, Transport and Urban Planning, Multicultural SA (of course), the Lotteries Commission, Office of Public Transport, Australian Major Events, Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, Parliament House, Adelaide Institute of TAFE, and the Regency Institute of TAFE.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Chairman, I am sure you will agree that that detailed reply obviates the need to take the member for Hartley's question on notice.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we can have one last quick question. We have two minutes.

Mrs HALL: In that case, I just want to put some omnibus questions on record.

1. Did Multicultural SA meet all required budget savings targets for 2003-04 set for them in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 budgets and, if not, what specific proposed project and program cuts were not implemented?
2. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants in 2003-04 for Multicultural SA, listing the name of the consultant, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

3. How many surplus employees are there? For each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of the employee and the total employment cost of the employee within Multicultural SA?
 - (ii) What is the estimate for 30 June 2004?
 - (iii) Between 30 June 2003 and 30 June 2004 will the minister list job title and total employment cost of each position (with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more)—(a) which has been abolished; and (b) which has been created?
 4. In the financial year 2002-03, what underspending on projects and programs was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure for 2003-04 within Multicultural SA?
 5. What is the estimated level of underexpenditure for 2003-04 and has cabinet approved any carryover expenditure into 2004-5?
 6. (i) What was the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more per employee, and also, as a subcategory, the total number of employees with a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more per employee as at 30 June 2003?
 - (i) What is the difference between consultants and contractors, and how many people or services that were previously classed as consultants are now shown as contractors?
 - (ii) What is the value of their contracts and what are the services they provide?
- The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the examination of the vote completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.25 p.m. the committee adjourned until Monday 21 June at 11 a.m.