

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 October 1999

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### HOME INVASIONS

A petition signed by 102 501 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to increase prison sentences for persons convicted of robbery with violence of residential property was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

### WATER WEEK 1999

The **Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.C. KOTZ**: The theme for this year's National Water Week is 'Water for Life'. This is a theme that should strike a chord with all of us. It has been my observation that Australians, and particularly South Australians, have increasingly recognised the importance of water in our life. We live in a country with so few major rivers and waterways that we have come to appreciate what limited water resources we do have.

Over 100 events are planned throughout the state this week, with participation from some 70 organisations, 68 schools and 10 local councils. This morning I had the pleasure of announcing that Adelaide is to host the International Kids Congress in the year 2000, at the Kids Congress 'Festival of Water' held in Elder Park. The four day conference will be held from 3 to 6 October next year and will provide a forum for concerned children from all over the world to meet and to share ideas to protect and improve the environment. I take this opportunity to thank and congratulate all those involved both with the organisation of this event and with the organisation of all National Water Week events being held throughout the state.

National Water Week is particularly important in South Australia where we are so dependent on others for the quality of our water. Almost all our major water resources are shared with other jurisdictions—the Murray River, the Great Artesian Basin, ground water in the South-East and the Lake Eyre Basin. Being as we are, the downstream users in the catchment, it is vital that we make the most of those resources we are able to access, including those non-traditional resources such as waste water.

I was pleased to launch the draft state water plan on Sunday at the beginning of national water week. The state water plan examines the condition of the state's various water resources and sets out the government's strategic policy directions on water. It is a well worn line, but we should all remember that South Australia is indeed the driest state in the driest settled continent on the planet. Yet, despite that, we presently have ample water resources for our needs, should we choose to use those water resources wisely.

Currently, South Australians use about 1 400 gigalitres of water each year, of which 930 gigalitres are used for irrigation. As identified in the state water plan, a possible further 1 300 gigalitres of water could sustainably be used in this state. About 900 gigalitres of this extra water can be found

in the ground water of the South-East, with the extra 400 gigalitres found in urban stormwater and reusable waste water.

The use of these non-traditional water resources encourages us to think beyond the parameters about the water that is available to us. Add to this the potential for more efficient use of the resources that we are already using, and it can be clearly seen that limitations on our water use are more to do with efficient use of those resources than the lack of resources in the first place. Even a modest 10 per cent improvement in irrigation efficiency could release up to 95 gigalitres of water for a new development.

If the theme is water for life, the clear message to come from water week must be to protect, conserve and get involved. I encourage all members to take this message to their constituents and assist in promoting the important awareness programs initiated to highlight national water week. Conserving water today will ensure that we have a clean and sustainable supply of water for life.

### ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Mr VENNING (Schubert)**: I bring up the thirty-fifth report of the committee on rail links with the eastern states and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

**Mr VENNING**: I bring up the thirty-sixth report of the committee, being the annual report 1998-99, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN**: I move:

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton)**: I bring up the second report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

**Mr CONDOUS**: I bring up the third report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley)**: I bring up the twelfth report of the committee, on the Voluntary Euthanasia Bill 1996, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

## QUESTION TIME

### POLICE FORCE

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Given the Minister's persistence and repeated denials that the lack of police numbers is a problem in this state, why has the government chosen today to backflip on that position? In estimates hearings earlier this year the Minister was grilled on police numbers and persistently refused to identify a problem. We understand today, as we understood yesterday, that the task force announced by the Premier will in fact look at the issue of police numbers.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police):** It is pleasant to have a question from the shadow spokesperson for police because rarely does the shadow spokesperson ever ask a genuine or specific question in this House about policing or rarely does he ever talk about facts. What I have simply done in the past and will continue to do as police minister is talk about the facts. The facts are that we have been introducing for some time now, as the honourable member should recall, a range of initiatives through the Parliament and other processes that will further work—

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Here we go! A few facts are about to be put on the table and the shadow spokesperson cannot even sit there and patiently listen to the answer. It is an important answer, so I would like to spend some time giving a comprehensive and factual answer to the honourable member. This goes back a long time where clearly we had to bring in a new Police Act because you were not able to actually work on modern policing methods and opportunities for community safety and crime prevention unless you got rid of the old 1954 act. We had to start to build the foundations again, and that is where it started. From there, through the very good management of the executive of the Police Department and through initiatives and policies from our government we now have Focus 21 and the local service area where police officers in this state on a day-to-day basis are directly involved.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** All they want to do is ramp things up and not listen to what we are doing. This is an opportunity for you to listen. Through Focus 21; through local service areas; because of the fact that, over a number of years, our government has stopped highly trained police officers from carting prisoners and from sitting behind speed cameras; and, following a range of other initiatives, we have been able to free up police officers to get on with the job. Now with the new local service area some very good policing initiatives are taking place right throughout South Australia. On top of that our government (and we would have been able to do a lot more a lot more quickly had we had support from the opposition and not been hamstrung by the 'ginormous' debt) has got on with the job of fixing that with little help from anyone else. We are now in a position of looking forward to what will happen with additional police resources in future holistically, as has been announced today: it is a good initiative.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Premier inform the House of the latest initiatives being undertaken by the state government in regard to police?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I am delighted to

respond to the question. There is no doubt that the primary goal of all South Australians is to live in a safe community. The ABS statistics indicate that Adelaide is one of the safest cities in Australia. These figures show that our crime prevention strategies are having an effect. Tackling crime is not just about pouring money into an issue hoping that it will go away, because we know that it will not. It is about having a package of measures and a sensible balance; a balance that takes into account law enforcement and prevention in key areas, youth issues and drug matters—drugs within our society. Having said that, though, when there are emerging difficulties and problems with crime, we as a government will deal with them. That is exactly—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That is what is happening, and we have been working on this for some time.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Spence.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** For the benefit of the member for Spence, I first had a meeting with the police association in May this year. Out of that meeting, the minister has been undertaking a raft of work and policy options in the justice portfolio area. Out of that emerged (and the meeting today was set some time ago, as I understand it) my second meeting with the police association to put in place the next step, and this has been a position negotiated and agreed to with the police association.

This measure announced today needs to be taken into account with a number of measures that we have announced over the course of the last few months. For example, we have put in place a City Safer Committee to look at hot spots around the city areas and how, in cooperation and collaboration with the Adelaide City Council, we might be able to respond to hot spots within the city. We are putting money into our drug education program and extending that education program to our schools. We are working in partnership with police and the community with our local crime prevention program, and we have put in place a violence prevention program in Elizabeth. That series of measures, put in place over a number of months, indicates a coordinated approach to the issue of crime within the community. What we wanted to do was provide police with support to provide the services within the broader South Australian community.

The task force that we established will report to me by Christmas this year—or by the end of this year, or thereabouts. The task force will involve not only the association but also the Commissioner of Police, officers out of the prosecutors' division and other appropriate personnel in the crime, justice, law and order sector of government to look at a range of issues. With any major policy area there is not just one glib, simple solution. You have to work through the issues. If you want to be effective and efficient in the provision of law and order, crime prevention and safety within the community, there is a raft of measures that need to be put in place. As I hope I have indicated in my reply to the member's question, over a number of months certain steps have been put in place. The next, and logical, step is for this task force to look at the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It is good for him to arrive today. The task force is to report by the end of this year so that, if there are suggestions that the government ought to take into account in the preparation of its budget strategy next year, it can do so. I would have thought that that is prudent

and practical. It is a demonstration that the government wants to ensure that South Australia continues to be a safe place in which to live. Once again, I would argue that this demonstrates, in a visible and tangible manner, how the government is working together with the respective law enforcement agencies to tackle these issues—not paying lip-service to them but actually doing something about it.

Glib one-liners from the opposition are okay. They are not a policy solution. A policy solution means marshalling the resources of agencies and government to ensure that the outcome is what we as a community want: a safe community with adequate policing resources and effort dedicated and directed to the areas of particular need as they emerge and as they change, because there are changing patterns and emerging new needs. Flexibility in policy setting needs to take that into account, and any government or law enforcement agency that does not take that into account is not doing its job. Therefore, I understand that the task force which has been put in place today and which represents a landmark deal has not been put in place previously in South Australia. It is a clear demonstration of what we want to do: take practical steps with outcomes that are important for South Australians.

#### POLICE COMMISSIONER

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** Given the unprecedented criticism of the Police Commissioner by a serving police officer at the police association's annual conference yesterday, does the Minister for Police have full confidence in the commissioner, especially given the establishment of this task force today to oversee the work of the commissioner?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police):** Is it not interesting how disappointed the Opposition spokesperson is again with initiatives that the government has announced. The honourable member must have a really sad life. Of course I have every confidence in the commissioner. The commissioner is on the task force, and he is doing a very good job in implementing modern police management directions, as the honourable member well knows.

#### HOME INVASIONS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Will the Minister for Police outline to the House the government's response to what have commonly become known as home invasions?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police):** I thank—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And the Leader.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** What does not exist is the ability to be able to forward plan and develop policy on the other side; that's what doesn't exist—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will give his reply.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** I thank the honourable member for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will resume his seat. There are too many audible interjections across the chamber. I ask the House to come to order.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** I thank the honourable member for this serious question as, clearly, he has an interest in this issue. As most South Australians would know, there

has been a great deal of attention in the past couple of years in South Australia involving what are now popularly known as home invasions. At the moment, as all members of this chamber know, there is no definition of 'home invasion' in the law.

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Mitchell.

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And I warn the Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Views may differ about what is or is not a home invasion, as highlighted in the media only yesterday by a certain law professor when he commented about an initiative put forward yesterday with respect to this matter of home invasion. The best definition of a 'home invasion' is an incident involving unlawful entry into a house with an intent to commit a crime when the occupants are at home, including some type of confrontational violence or clearly attempted violence. This government realises that this is a major issue of concern for the public and has for some time now considered the overall issue.

Earlier this week the Attorney-General released a major discussion paper on home invasions that includes three draft bills for community debate and consultation. It is nice to hear a positive point from the shadow spokesperson when he said that it is an excellent discussion paper. It is nice for once to see someone responsible on the other side of the House commend the Attorney-General and the government by saying yesterday, as I recall, that this is a very comprehensive and responsible paper and a way forward to overcome this problem.

From material that has been reaching my desk for some time now, I believe that this relates to the national and, indeed, worldwide problem of illicit drugs. That is the reason why we have to look comprehensively and holistically at how we are going to deal with a range of law and order issues, and that is the reason why the Premier is heading up the state drugs strategy that dovetails with the Prime Minister's national drugs strategy. I suggest that everyone in this House would agree that the illicit drug problems in South Australia, Australia and the world today are causing major complexities.

The government has undertaken a thorough investigation into how the law currently operates, the definition of home invasion and, most importantly, how any new laws will impact on the charging practices of police prosecutions and the sentencing practices of the courts. Home invasions are not limited to elderly people: many people are victims, including 25 to 34 year olds. This discussion paper will clearly help to clarify complex issues that I think the member for Peake would agree are important initiatives in the complex issue of home invasions, and it gives everyone in the state with an interest in this an opportunity not only to think about the issues but to put forward responses that the government and the parliament will be able to look at. The submissions on the discussion paper are due by 11 November, and I look forward to some sensible support and debate in this parliament on the comprehensive papers that have been put forward.

#### POLICE FORCE

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My question is again directed to the Minister for Police. Given his previous answer, does the minister support the Commissioner of Police (Mr Hyde) and share his belief that the morale of our police force is being damaged by the actions of the Police Association through its

journal, or does he concede that the association and its members are right and the force does have a morale problem?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police):** Isn't the morale bad on that side! Let us talk about morale for a minute. The morale of the opposition is at the lowest ebb that I have seen in the six years that I have been in this House, so I can understand why the shadow spokesperson would have some interest in morale, particularly when he is regularly lurching. We have seen photographs in the media of the shadow spokesperson regularly lurching, because what he is interested in is not morale, not what is happening in South Australia and certainly not what is happening in his seat of Elder. I wonder if he is ever there.

What he and the member for Hart are interested in is how they can say 'Goodbye Mr Rann,' goodbye to the member for Napier, and jump in there. So, I know the morale is very bad on the other side. But also, what the shadow spokesperson wants to do is not only drive that morale—

**Mr HANNA:** On a point of order, clearly we are straying beyond what is relevant to answering the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order and ask the minister to come back to the substance of his reply.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will come back to further answering the question because I can understand the concerns of the member for Mitchell with the low morale in the Labor Party. The opposition spokesperson continually talks down all the initiatives, talks down all the good things happening with the police and talks down the opportunity of an exciting career in policing because it suits the opposition spokesperson to downgrade morale in the police force. What I am about as Minister for Police is supporting the police and encouraging young people through our recruitment program.

Currently, we have 72 officers in the academy, a minimum of 140 more to go through this year, a minimum of 110 next year and a minimum of 110 the year after that. I encourage those people not to listen to the opposition, which did not give them any career opportunity, but to capitalise on the good opportunities in the Police Department, go to the recruiting office in Flinders Street and take the opportunity of working with the best commissioner in Australia, for whom I have total support.

### DRY ZONES

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Can the Deputy Premier please explain to the House the extent of dry zones (as they apply to the non-consumption of alcohol) which have been established in communities throughout many parts of South Australia, their role and importance, and the cooperative and consultative approach taken between the state government and local communities in setting them up? Today the Legislative Review Committee agreed to the continuation of and the establishment of new dry zones in Wallaroo and Kadina in the electorate of Goyder.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier):** I thank the member for Goyder for his question, acknowledging that his area is one of the beneficiaries of this measure. Quite a few submissions to the Regional Development Task Force talked about the fact that local people in regional areas want to be empowered in decision making. They felt that they knew their communities better than people in Adelaide knew them and

they wanted us to listen and act on what they felt, particularly as it directly affected them in their local areas.

Dealing with the matter of dry zones, we have been able to react to those requests. Local people are very good at knowing their needs, and Neighbourhood Watch, Rural Watch and a whole range of organisations have input. The aim of dry zones is to keep alcohol in licensed premises and to ensure that safety and amenity are available in the more popular areas of the towns, particularly coastal towns, so that families can enjoy themselves with safety. To date in regional districts quite a few areas have been declared 'dry', including sections of Coober Pedy; Victor Harbor, where there has been a major move that has helped enormously; the member for Goyder's area, comprising Wallaroo, Moonta and the important holiday spot, Port Hughes; Clare and part of Port Pirie, in my own electorate; and Port Augusta, in Stuart.

The establishment of these zones comes about as a result of extensive consultation and cooperation among the local community to give that sense of security and safety. Many groups are consulted on this matter, including police, hoteliers, local hospitals and certainly local government, and a range of traders and other organisations also have input. It is really a terrific example of all levels of the community working together to create a safer environment to help address some of the issues involved, for example, domestic violence, truancy and, in some cases, serious crime.

It is very important when we talk about regional development that we remember it is not just about economic development: it is about a whole range of areas. As we have seen in some of the coastal towns, this measure gives people confidence to go there. If these communities are going to go ahead we need to create healthy and safe environments in which people can move around freely. It is another example of the government's commitment to get alongside local people, to listen to what they want, and to put in place what they request.

### MOUNT BARKER PRODUCTS

**Mr HILL (Kaurana):** Does the Minister for Environment and Heritage stand by her statement to the House on 4 August 1999 that emissions from the Mount Barker Products foundry exceeded standards by a factor of six or seven?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** The honourable member may be aware that the Mount Barker foundry and all matters relating to it are involved in a legal situation before the court at present. Therefore, all elements now become sub judice.

### CRIME

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Can the Minister for Human Services outline some measures being taken to alleviate concerns that some elderly have about fear of crime and the threat to the security of their home?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I am delighted that the member for Fisher has raised this point because there is no doubt that the fear of home invasion, that is, the fear of being attacked in one's home, particularly with older people in the community, has a significant impact in terms of their lifestyle and their own health. In fact, some American studies show that people who have that fear then tend to start to live in isolation: they withdraw from having social contact with others within the community, and that, in itself, can have a dramatic impact on

their health. One study showed that the impact of that social isolation can be even greater than that of tobacco smoking.

Therefore, it is very important indeed that we create a feeling and an environment of safety for older people in their own home, particularly as we have an ageing population and increasingly we are encouraging that ageing population to live in their own home. That is why programs such as Home Care, Meals on Wheels and many other programs put in place by the voluntary sector and by government are very important in terms of social contact on a daily basis and, at the same time, in checking on people to ensure that they are safe.

We have released a 10 year strategy on ageing, and it picks up a number of these key issues about making people feel safer in their own homes and therefore allowing people to live independently there, rather than their having to move into large institutions and, at the same time, ensuring that we deal with some of the safety issues. For instance, in relation to the Housing Trust, members will recall that about 15 months ago I announced a program to put security doors or safety doors on every cottage flat in South Australia. There are about 6 700 cottage flats. I am delighted to report to the parliament that, although I gave the commitment to do it over a three year period, we look like being able to complete that program in just two years. It is a massive task, involving 6 700 homes.

I am delighted to report that 1 000 homes have already been completed in the country. It is hard to put an exact figure on it for the city because we have progressed a fair way down the track, but it would suggest that about 4 000 homes have been covered, some of the work still being under way. So, members can see that out of 6 700 homes we have made significant progress.

I picked up that program because this was virtually the first issue that was raised by a consultative group of older people in Housing Trust homes who meet with me. They wanted, particularly in the small cottage flats, to have a feeling of greater security. One way in which they could cool their homes off at night was to open the door, but they were not willing to do that because of this insecurity that they had. I am therefore delighted to report to the House that we have made headway in that respect.

Another initiative is the urban renewal programs and particularly the upgrade of Housing Trust homes. Again, many of the old homes did not have appropriate safety screens; they had inappropriate doors for the homes. As we build or renovate those homes, one of the important things that we do is improve the safety of those homes. Again, that is reflected in all the urban renewal programs that we have operating both in the city and the country. Literally thousands of homes are now on that urban renewal program.

A third key area is the development of community housing. For some of those people at greatest risk, for instance, people with a mental illness and in particular single mothers with young children, we need to give them the security, and through community housing we are able to provide them with a number of houses in the one location with backup support. Again we are finding excellent results coming out of that such as much greater social contact, a much greater feeling of security for the residents who are involved and an ongoing support if any of those residents have any particular concern.

We are therefore taking a number of key initiatives within the housing area to ensure that people are safe and feel safer within their own homes. All I can do is pledge to this

parliament my ongoing commitment to make sure that programs such as this are progressed as quickly as possible.

### MOUNT BARKER PRODUCTS

**Mr HILL (Kaurna):** Why did the Minister for Environment and Heritage fail to make a statement informing the House that the results of emission tests conducted by the EPA at the Mount Barker foundry and reported to parliament on 4 August 1999 by the minister were wrong? On 4 August the minister told the House:

The results show that Mount Barker Products is emitting levels of metal fume that exceed levels permitted by the environment protection air quality policy.

Again, she said:

...modelling results show that the maximum odour levels near the school and residences can reach six to seven odour units...

A letter from Finlaysons to the EPA dated 17 September 1999 states that two EPA testing officers have confirmed that there was an error in the testing model and that, as a result, they both now agree that the level of odour near the school was 1.5 to three units, rather than six units. Documents also show that the flawed analysis understated particular emissions—

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I rise on a point of order, sir. I have announced to the House that this is a matter that is in the courts; therefore, it is now a matter of legal procedure, which makes the discussion of all the matters relating to this issue sub judice.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will remain silent so I can hear the minister.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I ask for your ruling, sir, that this be considered a matter of sub judice because of the facts relating to the situation.

**The SPEAKER:** In this case and based on custom, the chair is bound to accept the word of the minister that the matter is before the courts and is in fact sub judice. The chair is guided by the minister in this regard, and the minister must stand by her advice to the chamber. I therefore rule the question out of order.

### OPERATION FLINDERS

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Minister for Youth and Minister for Employment inform the House of the benefits that Operation Flinders provides to the youth of the state? The minister would be aware that a number of notable South Australians give their time freely towards this excellent concept which has been developed, and they have provided opportunities for young people, notwithstanding that certain sections of bureaucracy in the Attorney-General's Department did try to scuttle the whole project.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government):** I thank the member for Stuart for his question and acknowledge that Operation Flinders is run in his electorate in a very important part of this state, in the Flinders Ranges. In addressing this House in answer to the first question the Premier spoke about law and order for this government being a package of measures and a sensible balance. If there is a program in this state that encapsulates the government's desire for a package of measures and a sensible balance it is Operation Flinders. A number of members of this House bothered to take the time to go up there; the Premier and I have been up there, the minister for police and the current minister for Y2K compliance have been up there, as have a

number of members of the upper house. Not one of those people who has seen this program in action has a bad word to say about it. Opposite, there are some doubting Thomases. I suggest they take part; they will freely be invited.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** The member for Peake had best be quiet. There is the greatest disappoint in this House; he cannot even sign his mother up for membership. This is youth week. In this week we celebrate 100 per cent of our youth; we celebrate them for their strength and vision and their rightful place in our present as well as our future. Within that 100 per cent of youth there are about 3 per cent who in reaching adulthood have problems. Operation Flinders tries to reach out to those young people and address their problems in a way that prevents their getting into trouble. The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services informs me that currently in this state it costs approximately \$37 000 per year to keep a person in incarceration. That is an economic cost and takes no account of the social cost to the young person's life or the disruption they cause to society. Operation Flinders, funded as it is with about three corporate dollars for every dollar of government involvement, and supported as it is with about 50 volunteers from all over this community, is a very cheap program for this state in human terms and in terms of what it achieves for those young people.

I was most struck by the story of a young man from Port Augusta High School who had been excluded from school in the week before he went to Operation Flinders. That young man—and several members will be particularly interested—was fully developed, was from a single parent family and was customarily in the habit of belting up his mother. He was an abusive child. The mother regularly telephones the Port Augusta High School, because in the 15 months since he has completed Operation Flinders he has not laid a hand on his mother. He went back to school and has gone into school for 12 months. At the end he went to the school and said, 'I can't take the pressure; this is not for me', and he has left the school but he has left the school not as a school refuser but as someone who has walked away at present and probably will come back in future. I cannot promise this House that that young man will never get into trouble again—nobody can—but I can say that this young man is one of a group of people who quite clearly has benefited, and whose mother has benefited, from a program—not a government program but a program supported by this government—largely run by the community.

I will conclude on this point. The opposition talks about police on the beat. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition of this. While I was in Operation Flinders there were two young and enthusiastic officers from the Star Force. They were not on the beat but were at the top of a cliff helping young offenders and potential offenders to abseil down a cliff. I think that those two people during that week were much better employed than they were in flak jackets running around the streets of Adelaide. That is what the Premier said about balance and about getting it right on law and order. There are cheap political points to be scored here and there is some common sense. This government stands for common sense. This government stands for a vision for our youth, a belief in our youth and a belief that 97 per cent of them have got it right and that the other 3 per cent will get it right. We do not knock, knock, knock: we produce results.

## BIKIE GANGS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the recent escalation of gang violence, including murder and bombings, on the streets of Adelaide, will the government work with the Local Government Association and enact new planning laws to eliminate bikie gang fortresses in our state? I have been informed that following similar gang violence across the Tasman special laws are now in place in New Zealand to allow police or local authorities to apply to the courts for the removal of fortifications where the premises are being occupied or regularly used by people involved in criminal activities and the fortifications are intended to injure or are being used to help conceal suspects or to facilitate the commission of offences, including the concealment of unauthorised weapons, drugs, the manufacture of drugs or stolen property.

The shootings in Wright Street earlier this month which left three people dead came just one year after an outlaw bikie gang won appeals under existing legislation to allow the gang to site their clubrooms in Wright Street. I have been informed that there are heavily fortified gang premises in a number of other metropolitan locations.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** As I previously indicated, the bikie disturbance leading to death is un-South Australian and is the type of activity that we have seen elsewhere interstate or overseas. We have not been accustomed, and thankfully so, to having that type of activity occurring in South Australia. I was quite disturbed to read those reports not only with the loss of life but also because we had that type of disturbance within the streets of Adelaide. As a result of that I indicated, certainly to the police minister and the Attorney, that these were issues in which we needed to support the police force. It is an operational matter for them to determine how they best manage both—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, I am getting to that. It is a matter for the police department, from an operational sense, to make its own determination as to how it handles those circumstances—including, for example, the marquee being put in place in a street yesterday without any prior knowledge, without any planning law support and without any local government endorsement to it. That matter formed the basis of a discussion I had with the Lord Mayor yesterday. I was somewhat perturbed that they were able to just put up a marquee in a street for their own purposes without discussion with anyone; it just went up. Then, having raised that with the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Pardon? It was of some concern to me that groups within the community could take actions of their own initiative which impacted against other sections in the community. I raised that concern with the Deputy Commissioner of Police, who indicated to me that, from an operational point of view, the process that had been put in place by the police, in consultation with the Adelaide City Council, was the most appropriate way to handle the situation without any further disturbance, violence or untoward activities.

That then begs the question as it relates to planning laws, because during the course of conversation with appropriate authorities regarding this issue it was put to me that the residents in the district were somewhat concerned about the location of the headquarters but were too frightened to appeal

against it in the planning process for fear of retribution. That is certainly an unsatisfactory set of circumstances. Through the Capital City Forum that we have with the Adelaide City Council, it is an issue that I propose to pursue—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, I accept that. In relation to planning laws as they apply to other local government areas, having had this circumstance highlighted to me yesterday, I think it is an issue that ought to be further explored. I think that, after all is said and done, genuine fears and concerns of citizens and residents ought to be taken into account.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Can the Minister for Police advise the House whether he is taking up with other interstate ministers the issue of outlawed motorcycle gangs?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police):** I appreciate the question from the honourable member, who has been discussing this issue generally with me for some time, and I am happy to give him an answer. As the Premier has already said, he has been discussing the issue concerning outlawed motorcycle gangs right across Australia, right across each jurisdiction, with me, as police minister, and the Attorney, for some time. As has been the case in other states in the past year or so, there have been incidents that have been totally unacceptable and foreign to South Australia generally with respect to outlawed motorcycle gangs. Clearly, whilst outlawed motorcycle gangs might like to name themselves in that way, they are not outside the law: they live in Australia and they abide by Australian, and South Australian, legislation.

I will give members a comprehensive overview of this matter. On 16 August the South Australian Police Department, from an operational point of view, hosted a national outlawed motorcycle gang conference in Adelaide, and it was attended by both state and federal law enforcement agencies. At the conference all state and territory law enforcement agencies reaffirmed a commitment to the free exchange of information and a cooperative effort to address issues of concern with respect to outlawed motorcycle gangs.

With respect to local issues, since August Operation Avatar was established to attack this problem right at the state level. Operation Avatar involves the investigation of gangs as entities, looks at significant criminals in the gangs and the identification and seizure of criminal assets and, importantly, interagency operations. To answer the honourable member's question specifically, on 3 November the Australasian Police Ministers Council meeting will take place in Sydney. Some months ago—in fact, quite a few months ago now—I wrote to all other police ministers in other jurisdictions asking them what concerns, issues and ideas they had with respect to the outlawed motorcycle gangs. If you cast your mind back you will recall that in states such as Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales in particular there have been a range of totally intolerable circumstances with outlawed motorcycle gangs for some years. Clearly, it is a national problem.

I was pleased to see and to report to members that all Australasian police ministers have confirmed that they believe we should look at this at the Australasian Police Ministers Conference on 3 November. I am pleased to report to the honourable member that it is now on the agenda and that we will look holistically at all the issues from the point of view of policy and police ministers' involvement in relation to outlawed motorcycle gangs.

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Exactly how many police officers were permanently dedicated to the police force's major anti bikie gang Operation Avatar prior to the 7 October shootings?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** I thank the honourable member for his energy in asking some questions today. With respect to the specific number, I will take that on board and get a response back to the honourable member as soon as possible.

## SCHOOL PROPERTY

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training tell the House what success the government has had in reducing crimes against school property?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education):** One of the issues that is always popping up in education is the security of our schools. As members in this House would know, we do not have two-metre high fences with razor wire around our schools to keep people out: we try to make them as friendly as possible, and they are quite open places. As a result, at times they are at risk of either vandalism, arson or theft.

For some time now the government has been very active in implementing strategies to overcome attacks on school property. The patrols of selected schools on nights and weekends, or 24-hour patrols, is necessary. Security patrols and also police, when they patrol a suburb, are encouraged to look around the school as they pass by. Monitored smart alarm systems, including intruder and fire detection systems, have been particularly successful in alerting fire authorities and police when a break-in has occurred and a fire has started. When the alarm goes off, it rings immediately within fire headquarters so that we can send a fire engine and get police to attend at the school. As a result, the spread of the fire is not as great because of the instant action and it therefore decreases the amount of damage to the school.

Just the other day I allocated in program maintenance, minor works projects, for the year 2000 a further \$1 million to put fire detection systems in our schools so that we can better protect our schools from arsonists. The increase to the School Watch program is having an impact within our schools. This program asked neighbours of schools in their normal daily routine over the weekends in particular and at night to see what is happening and to keep an eye on the school property.

Another initiative is a curfew on school grounds from midnight to 7 a.m., which enables the police to accost people and question them as to why they might be on school grounds and, if they are found to be acting suspiciously, to escort them from those grounds. Another issue is that of improved security lighting around schools, particularly around those schools that are high risk. In areas that have been targeted for arson, theft or vandalism, it has been and continues to be a program of the department to improve the lighting around those buildings so that it is more obvious if people are moving on the site.

Another aspect is increased ETSA night sight program lighting for lighting around the boundaries of schools, so that anyone moving into a school during night hours can be observed by neighbours, by police patrols or by anyone who might be walking along the street at the time. In high risk areas we have installed security cameras. Again, this is mainly in schools where we have had repeated arson attacks

or vandalism. We put in 24-hour closed circuit television cameras to monitor movement in the schools and to try to improve security. There is a \$25 000 reward for members of the general public who provide information leading to the apprehension of arsonists, again encouraging the public to keep their eyes open and to listen to what is going on. Finally, the taxi industry has been involved in Taxi Watch for the past couple of years.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** They do a good job.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** As the member for Peake indicates, they do a great job. If they happen to be delivering a passenger near a school, the idea is that the taxi will go into the school grounds, do a quick run around and check that everything is okay. We really appreciate the cooperation of the taxi industry in providing another security measure for our schools. If they do see someone, they are not encouraged to take any action themselves but immediately get on the radio and notify the police that there are intruders and, as a result, the police attend.

To give some figures on arson attacks on South Australian schools over the past four years, in 1995-96 there were 23 attacks, which accounted for \$2.97 million damage by fire; in 1996-97 it dropped to 21 attacks, involving a cost of \$3.3 million; in 1997-98 there were 26 attacks at a cost of \$3.48 million; and in 1998-99 there were just 13 attacks at a cost of \$1.9 million. So, over time there has been a 43 per cent decline in the number of arson attacks on departmental property, and a 35 per cent saving on costs. This is particularly due, first, to the smart alarm system, whereby we can very quickly react to a fire that starts on a school property, and secondly to increased lighting of schools to ensure that any movement on school property is much more obvious, which is a deterrent to people who want to damage school property.

The situation with vandalism is not as good, I must say. The cost to the taxpayer of managing vandalism attacks has increased by \$1.2 million over the past four years, which reinforces the fact that we must continue the program of security alarms and lighting to maximise security on our school sites. It is quite some program, because in my department there are 1 035 sites, so one can imagine the sorts of costs incurred. Finally, in terms of theft, the figures are relatively stable but, again, it is a matter of ensuring that we continue that security program. But, the increased security is having an effect, I am pleased to say, and we are doing all we can to prevent further attacks on school property.

## OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Ms KEY (Hanson):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises stand by and act on his ministerial statement to the House of 25 March 1999 when he indicated that he had taken steps to ensure that the Department of Administrative and Information Services' occupational health and safety inspectors aimed to meet or exceed the number of prosecutions in their 10 year average of 20 per year? On 10 November 1997 a worker working at Email cooking products at Dudley Park was crushed to death. I am advised the matter has been under investigation by workplace services for 23 months but still a decision has not been made despite the two year limit.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** While I do not remember the exact detail of the statement made on 25 March this year, given that it related to prosecution of appropriate people who have not upheld relevant occupational health and safety standards, the

answer to the question is 'Yes.' In making that observation I note that a lot of people would identify that a punitive approach is not necessarily the best—and I identify to the House that the member acknowledges that that is the case. So, I think a willy-nilly pell-mell advance into prosecution for prosecution's sake would not achieve what I believe the member for Hanson wants (and certainly what the government wants), namely, better occupational health and safety.

However, it is appropriate that organisations which have been less than adequate, shall we say, in observing occupational health and safety regulations ought to be brought up sharply with a potential prosecution, if that is the case—and the government would certainly stand by that. In this instance I acknowledge that that length of time has elapsed. However, I believe that the honourable member's explanation included words to the effect that the matter 'has been under investigation by DAIS inspectors' for this length of time. Factually that is incorrect. A number of legal processes must be looked at in laying any potential charge.

However, I do identify to the member for Hanson and the House that DAIS workplace services is fully aware of the time in which a prosecution would need to be commenced if appropriate investigations identified that that was the right way to go. We are certainly aware of the issue. We will not let the matter slip if it is deemed appropriate. As I indicate, if that is the case we would be happy to come down on the side of prosecution—not in this particular case but in any case. We certainly believe that in an appropriate circumstance that is a legitimate sanction to apply to companies which have not observed the appropriate standards. In essence, yes, we are aware of it; yes, I stand by the statement that we will prosecute, if appropriate; and, yes, we are aware of the limitations and we are taking that into account.

## MASTERS GAMES

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Will the Minister for Tourism tell the House what measures were put in place to provide convenient child care for competitors to allow the widest possible participation by parents and care givers in the recent Seventh Masters Games? Towards the end of the last week of the previous parliament, we heard a terrific report on how good the Masters Games were. However, I did notice in one of the newspaper reports that a high profile sporting person in South Australia was having difficulty finding adequate child care, and I wondered whether the organisers had put in place any special measures for child care to allow everyone to participate.

**The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism):** The member for Florey quite correctly says I was very congratulatory of the organisation of the games, and it certainly was a great success. I also must compliment the golden oldies who are here at the moment doing great things for our economy and also doing great things for the alcohol industry of this state. However, as the member specifically asks the question about child care, I am unaware of the exact details. I will check that out and let the member know.

## NURSES

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** What is the Minister for Human Services doing to recognise and enhance the very important role which nurses play in delivering health care? How does that role fit with the other para medical profession-



als such as social workers and occupational therapists? I recently read in the *Government Gazette* that the new Nurses Act has been proclaimed after being passed in parliament earlier this year.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** The member for Hammond is quite correct that the new Nurses Act has now been proclaimed and I know that this parliament put a great deal of time into debating that act. There is no doubt that that act is a significant step forward for the profession of nursing in South Australia and, as a result of that, with the first meeting of the new board now under the Nurses Act last Friday, an air of change and progression is starting to occur within the nursing profession. In fact, last Friday I also had the chance to attend at some length the second nurses' round table. It was a table I set up representing the broad interests of the nursing profession from the academics to the professional bodies, to the royal college and to the actual hospitals involved and I was delighted to see the very high level of attendance from those who had been invited to attend.

A number of very significant issues were dealt with and I touch on some of those. In the country we have ongoing problems with the recruitment and training of people for nursing positions. In particular, there is a difficulty in obtaining midwives in areas such as Barmera, but in many other country areas as well. There is an increasing problem developing throughout the whole of Australia with regard to the sufficient recruitment of nurses to meet increasing demand in the hospitals and in home care with the ageing of the population. This was a subject we dealt with at some length at the round table.

A number of working groups have been established and a number of initiatives have been put forward, and some considerable progress has been made on a number of these issues. Issues at which we are looking are how we provide better accommodation for nurses in country areas and how we recruit nurses in country areas. In fact, I have now authorised a development of a web site so that there will be a specialised web site for the recruitment of nurses and to give information particularly about country hospitals to people who may be overseas or interstate and who may wish to apply for a job.

In addition, we have doubled the money available for the marketing of nursing as a profession amongst people undertaking their secondary schooling. We have now allocated \$200 000. A group of young people who are at university—we are using undergraduates—go out and talk to school children and produce promotional material about nursing as a profession. Another crucial issue is the scholarship scheme. This was initiated by the former Minister for Health. It is an excellent initiative, in that 10 students a year are now selected from country areas. We provide them with \$5 000 a year for three years to undertake an undergraduate course in health and it is predominantly in nursing. They must go back to the country, though, for three years after completing that training.

In addition, the White Foundation has now backed up that with a further two scholarships, and so a total of 12 scholarships are now allocated each year. Also as part of the enterprise agreement that we negotiated with the nurses last year, \$1 million a year is specifically put into training, retraining and upgrading of skills. One of the things at which we are looking is the potential for a scholarship scheme for enrolled nurses, particularly from the country, to complete their training to become registered nurses. A number of other issues are being dealt with by the nurses' round table. We are

tackling a long shopping list of issues and I will not go through all of them, except to mention that two of them will have particular interest to members of the House.

One is the establishment of nurse practitioners, which shows that we are pushing ahead with an expanded role for nursing in South Australia. I have now received a report from an advisory committee on the implementation of nurse practitioners and I expect decisions to be made very quickly and very shortly indeed on that. Another issue is that the guidelines for clinical and admitting privileges for nurses and midwives has now been released. In fact I am delighted to say that one or two nurses have been granted approval for admission rights. A classic example is a mental health nurse working with homeless young people has admission rights to the Women's and Children's Hospital. I expect that type of very pragmatic approach to continue so that nurses have the opportunity to play an expanded role within our health care system. I think that is extremely important indeed, especially in areas where perhaps access to medical services such as in smaller country communities is very difficult to achieve.

The nurses' round table has been a success. I was interested to hear the comments of the nurses during and particularly at the end of that conference. They thought very considerable headway had been made on a number of broad issues. They urge the government to continue with that approach and I certainly will do so.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the chair is that the House note grievances.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** In September I attended the opening of the new Belarus Orthodox Church, a church under the patronage of Saints Peter and Paul, on Torrens Road at Kilkenny. The church was built with a half a million dollar subvention from the state government, and it is not every day that one sees the state-of-the-art orthodox church built by the state of South Australia, but it is a very beautiful church and I was pleased to attend its opening. Indeed, it is the church closest to my home. I had worshipped in the Belarus Orthodox Church of Saints Peter and Paul when it was located at Hindmarsh at the back of the Hindmarsh Stadium. The church there had been built in the mid 1960s but, owing to the Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment, the church came under some pressure.

I should explain that the Belarus is a newly independent country (previously known as White Russia) with its capital at Minsk and it is bordered by Russia to the east, Poland to the west and Ukraine to the south. There is a small number of Belarus migrants living in South Australia. In the mid 1960s they established their church at the back of the Hindmarsh Stadium, on Hindmarsh Place, and their priest was Father Szczurko at that time. When the Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment plans were released, the parish council came to see me because they were concerned that the southern terrace of the Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment would necessitate the closure of Hindmarsh Place and when it was completed that terrace would overshadow their church. Indeed, they were worried that there would be no access to the church for a hearse in the case of a funeral or a wedding car in the case of a wedding.

It seemed to me that there was very little we could do because the government was so determined to expand the Hindmarsh Stadium and was not offering to relocate the church. I tried to secure guarantees from the government about car parking, access to the front gate and no use of the public address system at Hindmarsh Stadium until the holy liturgy had finished on a Sunday and on holy days such as Christmas. But, much was my delight when the parish council pointed out to me that the government would be trying to close Hindmarsh Place and would have to do so under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act. Indeed, the parish council said, 'We suppose the government can do that; they are the government.' I said, 'Actually, no; experience tells me they cannot just do that.' With my help the church put in a formal complaint—a protest under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act—against the closure of Hindmarsh Place. They said that the road was reasonably required for public use by their parish, and from that moment the tone of the government and its attitude towards the church changed altogether.

In fact, as a result, I suppose, of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act and the expansion of the Hindmarsh stadium we now have a beautiful new church on Torrens Road at Kilkenny. Its interior is lovely. The icons were carried in procession from the Hindmarsh church to the new church at Kilkenny on the afternoon of Saturday 18 September. I joined the procession. The government provided us with a police escort, two TransAdelaide buses and an ambulance, should any of us have perished during the journey. On Sunday 19 September we had a 3½ hour holy liturgy to consecrate the church, presided over by the priest, Father Peter Kosacki. After that we had a supporters Belorussian banquet in the new church hall, built by the taxpayers of South Australia. I thank the government and in particular I thank the member for Adelaide.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I wish to raise another chapter in the branch stacking exercise at Coober Pedy. I am pleased that the member for Hanson has taken her place, because I am reliably informed that at a recent school function attended by a number of the citizens of Coober Pedy, including the federal member and others, thanks to the activities of friends of the members for Hanson and Elder, the member for Giles was forced to stand at that school function and apologise to the community for the behaviour in signing up blind Aboriginal people. She had to have a school function. She was invited by the school principal, Mr Fiddler, a well-known Labor Party activist, to apologise to the community for the behaviour of rogue elements within the Labor Party who had gone up to Coober Pedy. The member for Hanson is smiling; I understand that she is well versed on what took place there.

**Ms Key:** I have never been to Coober Pedy.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I know—

**Mr Koutsantonis:** You're no virgin on this, Gunny; be careful what you say.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Hello; we must be getting close to the mark.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I think I have got pretty close to the mark; I reckon I have got a bullseye first shot. I am told that, much to the amazement of that school community, the honourable member made an apology to the community for the behaviour of these rogue elements of the Labor Party. I would have thought that the purpose of holding a school function was, for instance, to reward people who had

performed well in the field of education and to recognise the hard work of the staff and school community—not for it to be a forum for Labor Party apologies. So, we have reached a new saga in the branch stacking exercise. I understand that the membership has dramatically reduced at Coober Pedy; I think the only one left at Marree is Reg Todd. I will pay more attention to that facet of this exercise at a later date.

I want now to say one or two things about the referendum we have to have on 6 November. I want to make it very clear that I think we have an excellent system. We do not need to change, and I certainly do not want a Turnbull-Keating republican model foisted on the people of this country. When you have a system that is working well, why change it? If this country becomes a republic, it will not create one more job or hospital bed and it will do nothing for the people of the isolated communities, but it will give the Prime Minister absolute executive power. Many people have come to Australia—the sixth oldest working democracy in the world—to enjoy a united, prosperous, stable and decent society. We are the envy of the world. Thousands of refugees have come here from republics which have the most dictatorial regimes; they come here and they live under the protection of the crown. Why would you want to change it? Who would be so foolish?

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** We have an Australian head of state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Now you are reflecting on the Governor-General. We know that the honourable member is good at branch stacking but not too good at anything else. I ask the honourable member: when the Australian government was forced to send troops to East Timor, who were the first ones to stand and come with us?

**Mr Koutsantonis:** The Nepalese.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** No; it was the British Gurkha regiments. So, I say to the honourable member and those republicans—

Time expired.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake):** It is not a pity at all. The French were the first ones ashore at East Timor, not the British; and they were the first to commit troops to help the Australian Interfet forces. However, the French republic is a completely different topic. I want to comment briefly on a discussion I had with Father John Fleming on 5AA, where I felt that people who are campaigning to remain a constitutional monarchy are arguing some very unfair points in trying to cause a scare campaign to frighten Australians into not voting yes at the referendum. One of the campaigns they are running is that the Australian flag will change if we become a republic. I reject that argument completely. Australia is the greatest country in the world and we have an excellent flag, and I see no reason whatsoever why we should change the flag. One of the 50 states of the republic of the United States has the union jack in a corner of its flag, and that is the state of Hawaii. At the turn of the century a number of states, including Massachusetts, had the union jack in their flag and decided not to change it.

**Mr Atkinson:** How many were there?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** There were six of the 13 original colonies, but I cannot remember exactly which ones. I want to go on to say that—

**Mr Atkinson:** Hawaii was not one of the originals.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No, it wasn't; it was 1856. Massachusetts was definitely one of them, but I will now go into detail about some other facts. The original flag of the army that George Washington assembled was the union jack. George Washington himself expressed concern that after the revolution was successful the union flag should remain as the flag of the new state. Of course, other reactionaries and revolutionaries changed that, and the new president accepted the flag. The United States flag was not ratified by legislation until 1912 under President Taft.

There are people in our community who have a great affinity for our flag, and it is disgraceful for monarchists to be running around waging a scare campaign, saying our flag will change if we become a republic. That is simply not true. We are having a referendum on a republic because public support is about 50-50 one way or the other, but if we had a referendum on changing the flag there would be overwhelming opposition. The Australian community is in no way ready to change its flag. People do not want to change their flag. They like the way it looks; it is quite distinctive and probably quite pretty as well. The difference between a republic and the flag is that a republic is supported by the majority of Australians. Whether it is passed in the majority of states is completely different, but I believe that the referendum will receive 50 plus 1 per cent of the vote in favour of a republic. However, I believe the republic is doomed to failure this first time.

**Mr Clarke:** They cannot even convince Jack.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** They can't even convince Jack—that's right. Monarchists are not being responsible and are calling for direct election models. Monarchists are out in the community saying that if we are to have a President we should be able to elect him directly. That is the most irresponsible thing any Australian could ask for. I do not believe anyone should be calling for the direct election of a President.

**The Hon. M.K. Brindal:** Your wisdom transcends the rest of this nation. We are all instructed by you.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It's amazing, isn't it? Direct election will cause a conflict between the parliament and the executive. I reject the member for Stuart's argument that the Prime Minister's being able to dismiss the President will mean that the Prime Minister will ride roughshod over our democratic processes.

The member for Stuart talked about branch stacking. I understand that a bit of branch stacking is going on in the Liberal Party right now in the seats of Kavel, Davenport, Morphett and even Unley. I understand also that the member for Colton in his preselection had members of the Liberal Party joined up in the country of Greece—they did not even reside in Australia. You do not even have to reside in Australia to join the Liberal Party, and you have voting rights from another nation in choosing our members of Parliament.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I wish to continue the debate on the referendum, which is getting very close and will be held on 6 November. The argument for the yes case is compelling. I will not mention what was canvassed in a previous griever in this place, but I was delighted that we eventually obtained a preamble. I wrote to the Prime Minister and asked specifically (I am not claiming that it was due to my action alone) that we recognise the sacrifices of those who defended our country and liberty in times of war. I am delighted that that has been inserted. I also suggested that we should give greater acknowledgment in the preamble to the contribution of pioneers of this country. Sadly, that is not in

there, but one could argue that it is inferred in terms of the contribution of migrants over generations.

Despite many mistakes that were made—and it is easy to find mistakes with hindsight—the pioneers did endure a lot and did put up with a hostile and difficult environment due to lack of medicine and so on. It would have been appropriate to acknowledge what they endured because I totally reject the view that Australian history began in 1960, which is a popular sleight of hand of recent times. That is not to diminish the contribution of people who have come in recent years, but without the efforts of the pioneers and without the longstanding Aboriginal culture of 60 000 years, the Australia we have today would not be anywhere near as rich and productive as it is. I am pleased that the preamble includes at least reference to those who gave their lives for this nation.

The no case has been presented in a somewhat mischievous way. All these issues are emotive, but some of the arguments about its being a politicians' President is tugging the leg a bit too strongly. The present Governor-General, as with other recent Governors-General, has been selected by the Prime Minister. The Governor-General is in that sense a politicians' Governor-General.

I note also that for the olympics we are not having the Queen or the Governor-General open it but the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) is to do it. That is a very strong comment by the Prime Minister in terms of who he perceives to be the real head of state of this nation. That is something the monarchists need to reflect on.

Likewise, in respect of what has been occurring in Bosnia, Australia was limited in terms of intervention for Steve Pratt and others because the Queen of England, who is also the Queen of Australia, heads another country that was at war with the people of Bosnia, in particular in Kosovo. We were limited because we had the same—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** We did not officially involve ourselves as it was a NATO-led contribution. The involvement of the United Kingdom, headed by the Queen of England, meant that there were restrictions on what we could or could not do as a nation to intervene for our citizens. Members need to reflect that the head of state in the not too distant future is likely to be Prince Charles, the person who has been talking about Frankenstein foods, which is not helpful to our farming community.

The one concern that I have about this whole debate is that it should not end up being divisive, and I hope that whatever the outcome on 6 November we can get back on track as a unified people and that we will not have lingering bitterness. Ultimately, the republic will happen. It may not be this time, but it will happen. Before it takes place and into the future, I trust that any divisions in our community will end and that we will work together as one nation. That is my fervent wish for now and certainly beyond 6 November.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** It was with great sadness yesterday that I read in the *Advertiser* of the death of another road accident victim, and that accident occurred in my electorate of Torrens. The accident happened at the Sudholz and North East Roads intersection at Gilles Plains on 14 September. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the family and the loved ones of the lady who passed away. This intersection is one of 10 dotted around Adelaide that are considered to be in the worst category.

The intersection of North East and Sudholz Roads is a death trap, and certainly those constituents in my electorate

and others from outside it who use it will confirm that. Many residents try to avoid the intersection because of the dangers and prefer to use back roads, thereby putting much more pressure on our inner suburban roads. Others have complained about the inadequate timing mechanism of the traffic lights in that they do not allow sufficient time for people to pass through the intersection and create long delays where traffic is banked up. Many people are complaining—certainly our local people are complaining—that the traffic is often banked up back to the entrance of Regent Gardens on Sudholz Road. That occurs particularly at peak hours.

Many drivers have stated that there are only 30 seconds to cross North East Road during peak hour periods, particularly in the late afternoon, and drivers are speeding through the intersection and running red lights because they are impatient. It is particularly the case for drivers travelling eastwards and making right hand turns from Sudholz Road on to North East Road when heading into the city. It is almost impossible to make a turn.

At the moment the government is not prepared to look at the turn right signal issue, and this is causing a great deal of aggravation to local people who are running the gauntlet across the busy intersection. The government will have to address the situation. Our concern is that if it does not do so accidents will continue to occur and, sadly, so will the tragedy rate. Given that this poor lady passed away some time after the accident, our understanding is that her death will not be recorded as part of the accident statistics, and that means that the statistics are not quite accurate and it makes it more difficult for us when presenting an argument for the need to have the situation addressed. So, I hope we can deal with that issue quite quickly for the sake of everyone who uses the intersection.

I would like to have a little grizzle about an ETSA account. An ETSA account was received for \$408.20 and the due date for it to be paid was 13 September. It was paid on 5 September. A cheque was sent, along with a lot of other cheques, and that was the end of the matter—so one thought. Then the final notice came (that was received on 30 September) for \$408.20. The billing section staff of ETSA (which is now handled by EDS) were rung. They said that they had not received a cheque, so they were informed that a stop would be put on that cheque and payment would be made at the post office that same day (30 September). That occurred: the payment was made. Then on 19 October an account was received, which stated:

We advise that the cheque presented in payment of your account for \$408.20 has been returned by the bank. Please note payment must be made by cash or certified bank cheque by the due date, otherwise the supply of electricity will be disconnected without further notice.

The account was for the amount of \$408.20, the bank dishonour charge was \$7.50, less a credit balance of \$408.20 (so, they obviously received the second payment). The account stated that the amount now due was \$7.50, and stamped all over it is 'Cash settlement only.'

This morning I rang them about this and said, 'You were advised that a stop was put on that first cheque, and payment has been made, which obviously you have received. Why would you want to cut off someone's power for \$7.50?' They rang me back and said that they would withdraw that \$7.50 penalty. However, had I not rung up and said to them, 'This is ridiculous, you have made a complete error here,' our household would have been without power, and we would have been most distressed. I hope they get their act together.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I am distressed to learn what the honourable member has just told the House. As that organisation heads into private hands, and its accounting services have been outsourced, there is clearly some gross incompetence involved. To my mind, if other members of the general public have experienced the same difficulties as the honourable member has had with that program, there ought to be a simple legal remedy available to them for damages, if they suffer damages in consequence of it. I trust that EDS and ETSA simply, in the common vernacular, pull their finger out. That ought otherwise become the member's most celebrated cause in this term of the parliament, to ensure that that kind of thing cannot happen. It has never been the case before.

I now turn to the two matters to which I wish to draw attention today. I wish to draw attention to the outstanding lives of two citizens whom I have known during my term as a member of parliament. The first person is the late Mr Allen Bryan, who died on 20 August. In 1995, in the Queen's Birthday honours, he was awarded a medal of the Order of Australia. He was an outstanding man who, for 35 years, was Father Christmas at the Murray Bridge Hospital and for other charity organisations. He was an original member of the Tailem Bend Food and Wine Club (he was a life member of that organisation) and a member of numerous other organisations in the community, some of which I will now detail, if I may, to indicate to the House what I consider to be—and what I am sure all honourable members consider to be—outstanding examples of citizenship.

He was an author, having published a book entitled *Recollections of Seventy Five Years of Racing in Murray Bridge* in 1989. He was a member of the committee of the South Australian Jockey Club for four years, founder of the South Australian Provincial Race Clubs Association and he served as a delegate for 14 years, and three years as President. He was for five years on the Totalizator Agency Board as the representative of South Australian country racing. He was a committeeman of the Murray Bridge Racing Club for 45 years. He was Master for eight of those years, President for seven years and a life member.

He was blessed with three children, John, Raeline and Kay, in his marriage to Laurel, which lasted and was celebrated for the rest of his life for 62 years. He was an excellent horseman. He was an outstanding footballer, cricketer and tennis player and in later years, in bowls. He was part of the Jervois football team, which won 11 premierships from 1926 to 1939. He certainly was an inspiration to other people in it. He was a man (along with his widow Laurel) whom I count among my friends. I will sorely miss him.

The other man I wish to mention is the Reverend Paul Hermann Proeve, who died on 13 September. He was an outstanding man. He was a pastor of the Lutheran Church. He was born in Minnesota in the USA. He was ordained as a Lutheran pastor in 1949 and had public ministry at the church in Warrambo, where my parents had farmed earlier in life. I came to know of him at that time because of my family's friendship with people in that area.

Reverend Proeve was resident in Murray Bridge after being appointed there as pastor to Christ Church in 1974. He retired in 1992. He became a member of the Meals on Wheels committee, the Lutheran Homes, the Lerwin Homes for the aged. He was a member of and President of Rotary. He chaired the Concordia College Council here in the metropolitan area. He was an outstanding tennis player and also enjoyed indoor bowls. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the

establishment of the Unity College of the Lutheran Church in Murray Bridge. I will miss him.

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WILLIAM LIGHT SCHOOL**

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I move:

That the one hundred and fourth report of the committee, on the William Light School Redevelopment, be noted.

In 1996, schooling in what is known as the Anzac Cluster, was formally reviewed by the Education Department. The aims of that review were to evaluate the educational needs of students in the area and to maximise the available resources for the benefit of students. Consideration in that process was also given to the need to reduce excess capacity at existing sites and reduce the maintenance liability. The schools affected were Plympton High School, Netley Primary School, Camden Primary School, St Leonard's Primary School, Richmond Primary School and Plympton Primary School.

The review incorporated a high level of community consultation and a three subschool R-12 school as the preferred educational solution. The main components of the reorganisation approved by the Minister for Education and Children's Services in December 1996 were the closure of Camden and Netley Primary Schools at the end of 1997; the establishment of an R-12 school on the Plympton High School campus commencing at the beginning of 1998; and the establishment of three subschools by the end of 1999—the subschools on that campus being reception to year five, then a middle school, years six to 10 and a senior school, years 11 and 12.

All money from the land sales was to be spent on the remaining Anzac cluster schools, with the majority of funding going to the Plympton High School site now known as the William Light R-12 School. The committee was told that the advantages of the William Light school would be: the provision of separate learning programs for students in the middle years of 6-10; the scale of the school will enable resources to be provided at levels which allow a higher quality set of programs for students (in particular, the William Light school will have an improved focus on information technology, literacy and numeracy programs as well as programs for students with special learning needs); and the new facilities will enhance the existing school to work programs (in particular, the strengthened information technology resources will increase the opportunities for graduating students).

The committee is told that a review of the enrolment outlook for the William Light R-12 School indicates that the school is serving an area undergoing revitalisation in households with dependent children. The review supports a potential need to accommodate up to 850 students, which is the planned design capacity. On 16 June a delegation of the committee conducted an inspection of the William Light school and its environs and saw at first hand the inefficient, outdated and generally restrictive nature of the classrooms yet to be refurbished and upgraded. More importantly, members noted the potentially high occupational health and safety risks associated with a number of these rooms, highlighted by the limited ventilation of the existing technical studies building. The committee was shown the classrooms which have already

been upgraded (stage 1) as well as those which were refurbished as part of stage 2.

The committee was pleased to note that as an R-12 educational unit the school has been designed to allow subtle separation of junior, middle and senior students whilst they co-exist on the one site and share the same basic extracurricular activities. For example, in stage 1 the canteen was designed to provide separate access for junior students and for those in years 6 to 12. The site inspection substantiated the need for the proposed work.

The committee is told that a cost benefit analysis undertaken in August considered eight options. The option implemented was to close Camden and Netley Primary Schools and for Plympton High School to become known as a reception to year 12 school—now known as William Light. Implementation of this option has to date resulted in the completion of stage 1 construction. The revised cost benefit analysis has been undertaken since, and it takes into account that stage 1 has been completed and incorporates the current funding arrangements and updated figures for student enrolments. The analysis compares an option A, to accommodate R-12 enrolments without undertaking further redevelopment of the site; option B, to continue redevelopment of the existing facilities; and option C, provision of all new facilities. The net present value cost, using 7 per cent as the discount rate, of option A is \$44.8 million, compared with \$44.7 million for option B and \$55.7 million for option C.

Although there is an overall incremental net present value cost of \$3 million, option B has been pursued. The result of the economic evaluation indicated that there are some efficiency gains through lower maintenance costs in undertaking stage 2 construction. Further, both stages 1 and 2 are essential to the relocation process and to achieve the intended educational outcomes. The net present value calculations were not done in a holistic manner on the benefits to the community which the school confers upon it but merely the benefits of the changes or the costs of those changes. Some greater, more rigorous attempt needs to be made, perhaps by an honours student on behalf of the department, into the way in which it evaluates education in society and then the various variations in the outcomes that various models of school structures, both organisational as well as in terms of their facilities, can provide.

The William Light R-12 School project will update the infrastructure and specialist areas on the site of Plympton High School, as it was, and provide redeveloped accommodation for the R-5 students. It will convert specialist areas to alternative uses, upgrade occupational health and safety features in the school, construct a new gymnasium, and undertake general civil works about the campus. In doing so, the school is designed to reflect current best practice in school management and allow the provision of a high quality educational environment in which there is appropriate separation of junior, middle and senior students. Given the foregoing information, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I rise briefly to support the report of the committee on this project. Generally, it was reasonably straightforward; however, it did give us the opportunity to look at a couple of issues that are of concern in a number of projects. The first one is in a positive light, that is, the issue of safe drop-off points at school. We have

raised this issue previously in relation to the Playford Primary School where we were very disturbed to find that there was no provision for a safe drop-off point for children coming to school and later being picked up. Instead, parents faced hefty fines and had to drop off their children by parking on a road with a speed zone of 70 km/h, and that was unsatisfactory all round.

We discovered in pursuing this matter as part of the Playford school project that the department of education's policy in relation to safe drop-off points is somewhat out of date and does not really reflect the current circumstances where so many children are dropped off from cars at schools, whether or not we think this is a good thing. I do repeat my urging to the minister to review this policy urgently. However, it was very pleasing to see that in relation to the William Light school the proponents had considered this important issue and had provided an adequate and safe area for dropping off and picking up children.

Another issue that arises at Public Works Committee hearings from time to time is that of oversight and accountability of consultants. It also came up at the Public Works Committee's conference in Hobart recently. It seems that around Australia Public Works Committee members are becoming concerned that a lot of money is being paid to consultants with no clear evaluation of the consultancy and that with so much work being undertaken by contractors the supervision of them is not always as rigorous as we might hope with the expenditure of the scarce tax dollar. In the case of the William Light school, as the Presiding Member mentioned, stage 1 had already been constructed, and we were able to review those facilities on our site inspection.

Part of stage 1 involved the upgrading of the home economics area. Having previously experienced difficulties in the upgrading of home economics areas at the Christies Beach High School, I inquired of the teacher as to whether I could inspect the cupboards. She indicated that I was welcome to do so but wondered why I was asking the question. I indicated that it was because at another school the upgrading of the domestic science area had been far from adequate and that there was ample evidence of vermin being present in the cupboard as well as mould and decay. A look of relief passed across her face at that time because, indeed, there had been a problem with vermin in the cupboards, and that was directly due to inadequate work in the refurbishment of the premises. She could show me exactly where the mice were able to enter, because holes had not been properly blocked up. This was exactly the same as the case at Christies Beach High School.

I drew this matter to the attention of the Department of Education and Children's Services' officers present, and they undertook to have the matter rectified immediately. They did in fact seem a little relieved that somebody had noticed this issue and that the Public Works Committee took an interest in the quality of work being undertaken, because they have found great difficulty in getting contractors back to complete work adequately when this sort of problem is detected.

The DECS officers seemed to consider that the fact that the Public Works Committee was taking an interest strengthened their case. I do not really want to get the reputation as the member for vermin, but I can assure everyone concerned that I will keep on looking for vermin and asking questions about the matter, because I want our schools to be safe and hygienic and I do not want taxpayers' money to be wasted on inadequate work.

The other issue that arose related to the considerable autonomy that many of our schools are displaying in the way in which they respond to the needs of their local community and develop entrepreneurial activities that enable others to take advantage of the expertise gained within the school. At the William Light school it was evident that the principal (Roger Henderson) had been very active in packaging the skills that so many of the teachers had and in making use of relationships with the business community to enhance the educational opportunities of the students and some of the development opportunities of the staff, so that they could maintain their knowledge of issues that keep on developing in the technology area in particular. It is important that teachers know what is going on in industry and that industry knows what is happening in schools.

My concern is that, under Partnerships 21, innovative principals such as Mr Henderson will be so burdened with administrative work that they will not be able to undertake that type of activity. I very much support increased autonomy at the local level, but I am concerned, as are so many people in my local community, that Partnerships 21 is not the way to do it. However, in general, I commend Mr Henderson and also Ms Maureen Cochran, the district superintendent, for the way they went about the redevelopment of the school, the consultation with the community and the general spirit of cooperation, innovation and determination to reflect the needs of the community, and to offer the children of the area excellence in education through the public system.

**Ms KEY (Hanson):** It gives me great pleasure to hear the debate and to read the one hundred and fourth report of the Public Works Committee, on the William Light School redevelopment. Having been member for Hanson since October 1997, I was pleased to reap the benefit of a lot of the work that the previous member, Stewart Leggett (admittedly from the Liberal Party), had done in relation to the amalgamation of the various schools in the area. It is important to note that a lot of time has been put in not only by Stewart Leggett but also by me to make sure that the community's needs with regard to amalgamation have been listened to.

Unlike many other areas where concerns were raised about schools being closed, the community really did get together to discuss whether the amalgamation of a number of schools—Plympton High School, Netley Primary School, Camden Primary School, St Leonard's Primary School, Richmond Primary School and Plympton Primary School—would result in a bigger and better school. After a lot of discussion and certainly some worry about that, the William Light High School as it stands today is testimony to community work and the work done by the educators in that area.

However, there are still some concerns. The Presiding Member mentioned the Camden Park Primary School gym and its multimedia program. It is true to say that the inheritance from Camden Park Primary School has been great in this new complex. However, concerns have been expressed about the disposal of the land, and a number of people living around the primary school have raised issues of community access to what is a very good oval for most times of the year, although if there is a lot of rain it can be flooded.

I also note from the report that William Light High School is the fifth largest public high school in South Australia, with its more than 700 students, the target being 850 students. The parking issue raised by the member for Reynell has certainly improved, but a number of concerns are still raised by parents at school council meetings about safety and the speed at

which people come to and go from the school. That is an ongoing issue.

I must compliment the member for Reynell: I know that she has been absolutely thorough on any of the school inspections in which she has participated. Members of the school wanted to compliment the Public Works Committee for what they thought was a fair hearing and to see that there was some genuine interest in the progress of the area. I would like to pass that on to the Public Works Committee, along with my appreciation that it is so conscientious.

The last point I would like to make relates to the principal and staff and the parents at the school. As I noted earlier, difficulties were experienced in going from a number of schools into one school council. I had the privilege—although I am not sure if it was the pleasure—of being at the annual general meeting when the school board was elected. Some 45 parents nominated for a 16 person school board, and it was very interesting being a returning officer on that occasion, trying to ensure that not only was a fair election conducted but also that we could actually, without the assistance of computers or voting theories, make sure that the system of electing those 16 people could be finalised on that night and the result delivered.

In complimenting the school council and staff, in particular Roger Henderson, the principal, I would like to say that I am always impressed in relation to the schools in the area of Hanson by the amount of volunteer work that is done by parents in particular and by the various parent committees of William Light school. I hope that if Partnerships 21, which is not an initiative that I personally support, becomes a factor at the William Light school, where they do have local responsibility for everything that happens at the school, the amount of time and dedication that has been put in so far will be acknowledged, and that those parents who end up taking those sorts of responsibilities will have proper indemnity insurance attached to them so that they do not end up literally having to wear any of the problems that may arise in the school.

In closing, I would compliment the Public Works Committee on its work and to thank it for being as thorough and enthusiastic as it has been, and also to acknowledge the good work of the staff and parents and, not least, the students at William Light school, who also participate in that process.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE**

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I move:

That the one hundred and fifth report of the committee, on the Adelaide Convention Centre extension, be noted.

The Adelaide Convention Centre plays a crucial role in South Australia's \$2.7 billion tourism industry. Unfortunately, the Public Works Committee is told that larger venues for convention centres are now established in Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney and that the Convention Centre here in Adelaide compares poorly in size and flexibility with its major Australian competitors.

The centre is unable to capitalise upon the size of its main auditorium, we are told, due to the lack of adequate supporting space for banqueting, exhibitions or both. An expansion of the 7 000 square metres in net lettable floor area with a 10.5 metre ceiling for that space is proposed, and it has been costed at \$85 million. The committee is told that the proposed increase in area and height is the optimum choice: smaller

expansions will not provide sufficient space to secure larger conventions, and the lower ceiling will prevent the Convention Centre from being able to accommodate conventions that feature tall purpose-built displays constructed to internationally accepted specifications of the advertising industry.

The committee understands that an expansion of this scope can be provided at a cost of approximately \$30 million less than that proposed for this project. Consequently, the committee has been concerned to determine whether less expensive options would provide the necessary additional facilities and flexibility to ensure the Convention Centre maintains its position as a leading convention venue. The committee has been provided with an economic evaluation that indicates the model chosen will make the facility more marketable and so reduce the risk associated with expenditure on the project or, more particularly, the risk associated with whether or not we will get an adequate return on the project. The committee is less convinced by evidence that argues that the additional expenditure is needed to make improvements of symbiotic ambience to the vicinity of the riverbank.

The committee sought more detailed evidence from the consultant. The explanation given was in advance of what would otherwise have been provided at any earlier time in the committee's existence in support of the project about its economic viability but in the future will still be inadequate to satisfy the committee. That analysis has to be based on more valid blocks of data and more rigour than this analysis or any previous analysis has ever had.

The major features of the proposed extension included in this project are the ability to accommodate 4 870 guests in up to five separate banqueting rooms; new meeting rooms; a new entrance off North Terrace eliminating the existing bottleneck at the Hyatt forecourt; public spaces and break-out areas opening out and overlooking the Torrens River; a winter garden atrium providing a public meeting place which also serves as a focal point for a north-south pedestrian promenade through the site and the movement of delegates between the existing and the new buildings; as well as opportunities for extensions of more than 4 000 square metres to be made to the green space in the parklands.

It should be noted that no impingement on the parkland area is required to accommodate this facility because it is to be built over the railway tracks on the western side of the station. The building is to be constructed in that area where a plaza will provide the podium for it, that is, the building structure. Approximately 25 per cent of the cost of the building is involved in creating that podium together with the required ventilation of that site. The exhaust and vibration isolation which comes from the activities of the Adelaide railway station will ensure that the presence of the railway station and movement of trains through it does not compromise the capacity of the Convention Centre to function in a way which will be acceptable on international standards for the kinds of organisations and activities for which it is being constructed in its target market.

It is to be constructed, in part, on top of the existing plaza car park—to help members come to terms with the geography of the location. Approximately 200 public car park spaces and 100 TransAdelaide spaces will be lost in consequence, but the committee has been given evidence that the proposed reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces can be accommodated through better parking management techniques. Well, we will see.

The design incorporates a central chilled water system for airconditioning purposes. Whilst this has a higher capital cost

than the alternatives, we are told the energy consumption costs are 10 to 15 per cent lower and that carbon dioxide emissions in power generation are significantly less. The project will marginally increase stormwater run off but incorporates modifications to the system to cater for the additional flows and interception devices will be included to treat dirty stormwater prior to discharge into the Torrens River—things such as trash racks, sedimentation ripples and so on.

The project includes extensions and modifications of the existing railway station exhaust system, as I have already said, to maintain current extraction rates of that diesel contaminated exhaust. The project will also not compromise the opportunity for the interstate rail terminal to be returned to that site from Keswick. The committee was told that proceeding with the extension at this time will maximise the positive flow-on effects of the year 2000 Olympics and the century of federation celebrations the year after that. It will also put South Australia in a position to host a number of major conventions and exhibitions, including a major international wine convention in October 2001.

The committee was informed that in a recent 18 month period events involving approximately 40 000 delegates had to be diverted to interstate or overseas venues. In contrast, soon after the proposed extensions became known to potential users, nine new conventions were generated that could not otherwise have been accommodated and these represent an additional \$23 million in the gross state product. The euphemistic term used to describe those events which are diverted elsewhere is that they are 'regretted bookings'.

A recent economic impact assessment for the project found that the proposal may attract 41 500 new delegates by 2005-06 and 75 000 delegates by the financial year 2010-11. The net present value analysis shows an indicative present value of the economic benefit from visitors' spending over a 10 year period estimated at \$340 million. The project produces an economic benefit to cost ratio of almost five to one. Alternatively, it can be considered that incomes generated within the state will pay back the project's capital expenditure within three years—and that is pretty good; that is close to 30 per cent.

The committee has also been informed that construction spending will support economic spending over four years of \$80 million value added and 1 300 full-time equivalents in employment. The additional dividend payments to Treasury of the order of somewhere between \$0.3 million and \$0.8 million per annum are expected. That is, of course, no dividend whatsoever in the strict sense on the capital invested, but the gross state product will expand immensely and that is the basis upon which the evaluation has been done.

The committee supports the notion of access to the edge of the Torrens River, and was pleased to learn in November last year that this proposed Adelaide Convention Centre extension was to include provisions for free and safe pedestrian access to the river. However, the proposal put before us did not do that—and still does not do it. The estimated cost of the project includes \$7 million to comply with the riverbank master plan principles, in particular by providing a north-south linkage that allows pedestrian access from North Terrace to the river's edge. Nevertheless, the south side of Festival Drive is the boundary line for this proposal and Festival Centre Drive remains uncovered as, if you like, a suicide drop from that plaza to the pavement on Festival Drive. That is a pity because the committee's initial

enthusiasm for the concept is dampened by what it sees as a deficiency in its planning.

The committee is informed that works to cover Festival Drive will occur as an integrated part of a later component of the riverbank improvement work in this general vicinity. Nevertheless, we believe proper integration would be better assured had the extension formed part of the proposed work of this project. The committee also notes that the expanse of glass overlooking the Torrens River will change the current presentation to the river and the committee wishes to draw this to the attention of the wider community. The committee believes the community is not fully aware of the impact of the proposed building on the current environment and considers there has been inadequate consultation about the development.

It is clear, yet again, that project proponents do not properly understand the committee's statutory obligation to thoroughly examine significant public works to safeguard the public interest. This is illustrated by the fact that bookings for September 2001 have already been taken for the extended centre and that they rely on the project being completed in August 2001. This clearly presumes an unrealistically short period for the Public Works Committee's deliberations and it clearly presumes also that the committee would make a final report on the proposal within that time frame which thereby enables work to begin.

We remain concerned at the cost of the proposal and its failure to facilitate free and safe pedestrian access to the water's edge of Torrens Lake. However, we accept that the proposal offers significant economic advantages to the state's economy while putting effective measures in place to avoid negative consequences for the environment and other nearby users of the space. So, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

**Ms THOMPSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General and budget results 1998-99 to be referred to a committee of the whole House and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the papers in accordance with the following timetable:

Premier, Minister for State Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Year 2000 Compliance (45 minutes);

Deputy Premier, Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development (30 minutes);

Minister for Human Services (30 minutes);

Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, Minister for Employment, Minister for Youth (45 minutes);

Minister for Environment and Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (30 minutes);

Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Local Government (45 minutes);

Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Information Economy (30 minutes);

Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services (30 minutes).

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As there is not an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House present, ring the bells.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Motion carried.



In committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare open examination of the report of the Auditor-General and the budget results of 1998-99 and call on the Premier, Minister for State Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Tourism and Minister for Year 2000 Compliance. I understand that 45 minutes has been set aside for questioning of those ministers. Are there any questions?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In terms of budgetary strategy, audit says that the government has not kept to its May 1994 financial strategy. The Auditor-General says:

The trend in the overall level of spending by the non-commercial sector was upwards and substantially higher than projected in May 1994—

contradicting government claims that it has made reductions in outlays. On page A.2-21 the Auditor-General also says:

... outlays are expected to grow significantly from 1997-98 to 1999-00 and then to be generally maintained at that higher level.

The last budget raised outlays by over 5 per cent in real terms. Do you accept the Auditor-General's findings that the government has been increasing its spending, particularly in the time since you have become Premier?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Additional funding was put into health and education, and I cannot give the specific amounts, but I can recall seeing a graph that had a substantial movement upwards in relation to health and education. I make no apology for that; in fact I would have thought that it would have some common support here, because the opposition has asked for increased current funding in a range of social service areas and that is what we have done. In relation to the specifics of the dollar amounts I invite the leader or the opposition spokesperson to ask the respective ministers of health and education when they are before the committee outlining their portfolios to perhaps further expand on the dollar figures for the benefit of the leader.

In relation to the overall strategy, in 1993 the government sought to have a containment and reduction in recurrent outlays. Adjustments were made during that seven year period through to this financial year. It may well be that the reference of the Auditor-General accurately portrays that—I am not suggesting it does not—but they are competing demands on government, and strategies need to be appropriately flexible to meet the emerging demands.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In his report the Auditor-General states that the government's increased spending has exceeded any reductions in outlays and that this has been covered by increased taxes. He states that over the two years 1998-99 and 1999-2000 alone taxes will have risen by \$424 million. Of course, we remember that prior to the 1997 election the then Treasurer Stephen Baker said that, whilst there may be changes in the mix of taxes, there would not be any increases in the quantum of taxation. So, the Auditor-General is saying that over those two years since that election taxes have risen by \$424 million, which is nearly half a billion dollars over two years.

Again, we are talking about what the Premier is saying compared with what the Auditor-General is saying. The Premier is talking about not increasing the quantum of taxation, but he has been jacking up taxes to a significant degree over the past two years and still ran a deficit budget last year.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I point out to the committee that increases in expenditure over the period also reflect wage and salary growth, inflation and other non-discretionary items.

There have been increases in wages, and I would put to the committee that the negotiation and wages outcome, whether it be for nurses, fire officers or police, have been negotiated with containment in mind. However, there have been increases. I would put to the committee that those increases have not been excessive or exorbitant, and I am sure the respective unions would also argue that they have not been excessive or exorbitant. Rather, they have been on the basis of appropriate annual adjustments. The only reference I would make as an aside is that the fire fighters union ought to get its facts right. The politicians have not had an 18 per cent increase as it put on every banner it could muster and every fire engine in the state in January. That aside, I come back to the point that the wages movement has been appropriate, responsible and certainly not excessive.

If you are going to increase the outlays—and, as the leader would know, the wages component of the budget is a very substantial component of the outlays—it will have a disproportionate effect in the cost structures. That is in relation to outlays. As it relates to the question of revenue increases, yes, there have been revenue increases in the area of taxation, based on gambling machines. The fact is that there has been an increase in gambling machines over a period of time. As there has been a take-up of gambling machines, there has been a commensurate increase in taxation on gambling machines. Yes, the government did put in a 'super tax' on gambling machines, and some sections of the industry balked at that. But I make absolutely no apology whatever about that, because some within the industry were making a very handsome profit—in fact, a profit far in excess of that which we in this parliament when it passed the legislation (without my support) had anticipated would be the outcome.

So, if there is a growth based on legislation on which the tax is struck and which provides for an increase as it relates to gambling, so be it. As it relates to the introduction of a gambling super tax, then I also wholeheartedly support it and will defend and justify it. Not only was there an increase for those who were making substantial profits but there was also a reduction for community hotels and clubs. We wanted to reduce the taxation burden on community hotels and clubs whose profits in both instances are returned principally to provide infrastructure such as sport and community facilities that ordinarily one does not see provided by the private sector. As a result of sports programs and infrastructure, particularly for young people, we thought it was appropriate for the clubs and hotels to have a reduction, and there was a commensurate reduction in their gambling taxes whilst there was an increase, which in some terms could be considered to be substantial, as it related to gambling machines.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I refer to the ETSA privatisation. Since the government got the ETSA privatisation legislation through this parliament, I notice that, in addition to the \$100 million claimed as a net benefit from the privatisation, the government has somehow found another \$20 million in net benefit to take another \$20 million off the emergency services tax. That \$20 million assumed benefit is in addition to the \$100 million which is already factored into the budget forward estimates, but on 12 October the Treasurer, Rob Lucas, referred to an extra \$100 million for spending on health, education and police. Will the Premier confirm that the government's target net annual budgetary benefit from the sale of ETSA has gone up from \$100 million to \$220 million; if so, how was this figure arrived at, contrived or concocted?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The leader would know that nothing would be concocted or contrived. If the Treasurer has

found another \$100 million that I am unaware of for the provision of spending on education, health or the police service, I will be delighted to see it, and I will check the Treasurer's 12 October statement. I am unaware of another magical \$100 million; if only there were! I will make a point in relation to the \$100 million. The leader would be aware that when we were attempting to get the legislation on the privatisation or sale of the power utility through the parliament we said that, should the legislation be passed, we would not proceed with the \$185 per annum average increase in power bills for South Australians. In good faith and to honour the original commitment, as soon as the legislation was passed we indicated that we would immediately halt the increase in the power levy. That effectively meant that the budget that had been structured for this financial year had \$100 million revenues in it from the power bill levy that we announced would not therefore be collected.

So, we started this financial year \$100 million in deficit or short. In proceeding with the sale or privatisation of the assets, we then decided as prudently as we possibly could to advance those sales. The leader knows that the poles and wires—that is, distribution and retail—are being sold, privatised or leased in the period through to December. That is and will be a good bulk of the total asset sales, and settlement is due in January. If we can therefore get those proceeds in January, it takes out six months of the financial year exposure of that full \$100 million, so the \$100 million reduces over the 12 month period. Given that there were then five indicative bids on the table which had been received on the Friday, based on those two factors we felt confident on the Monday to take to cabinet a proposal for a reduction in the emergency services levy. We decided in effect to bring forward the dividend—the advantage—and reduce the emergency services levy. In addition to that, actuarial advice we had received in the month of August was that state government superannuation was performing better than was previously anticipated.

The actuary advised us as a result of the better performance that we would not be requiring agencies to contribute the same amount. There was a saving of the order of \$7 million or \$8 million in that, so the \$20 million is made up of \$7 million or \$8 million where agencies will not have to pay into the super fund based on actuary advice, which advice is for a period of three to five years from now and the remainder of the \$20 million was a bringing forward of the dividend or benefit of the lease privatisation sale of our power utilities. We decided to pass on those benefits sooner rather than later.

The next question from the Leader I guess will be: 'What will be the outcome on 30 June related to this?'. I cannot anticipate what that might be and I have not been in receipt of advice recently from Treasury that would give me a reasonably accurate position on the outcome as at 30 June. We certainly hope with the speed and the interest we are getting in relation to the power utilities that the \$100 million exposure we originally identified would be substantially reduced, given that the first and substantial component of the leasing proceeds would be received in January next and, therefore, instead of a 12 month exposure you have perhaps a seven month exposure, which brings down your \$100 million. As to the additional \$100 million, I will ask the Treasurer.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier mentioned superannuation doing better than expected. Audit estimates that your decision to push out full funding of superannuation liabilities by an extra 10 years gives the budget an extra \$44 million per

annum at least. The Auditor-General has also said repeatedly that you have used super funding as a balancing item to be adjusted to make it look as if the budget target is being met. The effect of doing this is that net debt plus superannuation liabilities will be \$600 million higher in 2003 than they were in 1997. I refer the Premier to audit A2-55. Will he explain this, given that he says that it is important to run tight budgets? In terms of that superannuation liability, does the Premier agree that under his premiership we have seen a loosening of financial disciplines as mentioned by the Auditor-General in terms of superannuation liabilities of an extra \$600 million by 2003?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I put to the leader that these questions would be more appropriately addressed to the Treasurer, who has specific ministerial responsibility, rather than myself.

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** With that caveat I am happy to put down a view for the committee, but I stress that the accuracy needs to be confirmed in the Treasurer's appearance. We are paying off our unfunded superannuation liabilities 11 years ahead of New South Wales and Victoria. I put to the leader that that is not a bad outcome—11 years before New South Wales and Victoria. In fact, it could be argued, 'Why would we want to do it 11 years ahead of the others?'. Therefore the fiscal discipline we are showing in this regard will stand us in good stead for Standard and Poors and Moody's in establishing new credit ratings for the state to reduce the interest rate exposure of the state.

We have seen an adjustment and it gives some short-term realignment of the payments and the repayment schedule is adjusted over the time line, but the time line has remained exactly the same—it is the adjustments in the time line that have varied. I also point out to the leader that in his rigour to ensure that the government is prudent in its financial discipline he needs to take into account a whole range of unforeseen circumstances that have been inflicted upon us from a Commonwealth level and by the High Court, which have seen millions of dollars of adjustments to forward estimates and revenues. For example, I refer to the abolition of the rights of the states to collect fuel taxes, taxes on tobacco and alcohol—rights that this state has had for as long as I can ever recall, and suddenly a High Court makes a determination that the revenue capacities of a state will stop—full stop.

We saw the Commonwealth say that it will adjust for it in the short-term until the GST comes in, when we will abolish wholesale sales tax, and then there will be other adjustments and it will be wound out. That was okay but for the tobacco industry, which decided to beat the system by doing a paper shift of stock out of Victoria and New South Wales into Queensland one day when the stock in bond is valued upon which the tax is therefore levied. They shifted out of bond out of New South Wales and Victoria on paper all the product to Queensland the day the tax was determined and shifted it back the next day. We have said to the Commonwealth Treasury, 'Hold on a minute—what you have seen as a result of that is a reduction in the tax paid by the tobacco companies in a windfall to them, but we the states are being short changed tens of millions of dollars—who will make it up? You said it would be on the basis of equality.' Well, it was not, is not, and we have simply had to absorb that.

We have other things like grants commissions. I have referred previously to the fact that the Grants Commission on a three or five year review had a very different outcome for

South Australia. We took up that fight in Canberra and got unanimous agreement but for New South Wales and, because at Loan Council meeting and at the Premiers' Conference we could not demonstrate to the Prime Minister unanimous agreement, the Prime Minister said, 'Well, if you cannot have unanimous agreement this is the recommendation that will follow,' despite the fact that all the states had agreed that we could make an adjustment. The overs and unders, from 25 under to 22 over or thereabouts, was of the order of a \$47 million variation. When you have variations like that in your budget during the course of a year of decisions that are unseen and unknown and simply have to be incorporated, you have to have a degree of flexibility in your decision making.

I also point out, however, that as it relates to the superannuation employee benefits there has been a decline in absolute terms in the level of debt of unfunded superannuation liabilities in the state. Our record in relation to removing those unfunded superannuation liabilities has been exemplary and something that the other states ought to follow. I point out to the leader that the simplicity of the argument that you have made a variation—

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am making the point and it is valid and appropriate for the government to be able to respond to the circumstances that have unfolded that bring about these changes. Any government at any time is faced with those adjustments—it is how you manage the adjustments that is important. I refer to the need for a continuing directional thrust of debt reduction, with a gradual increase in the allocation. For example, health funding over the seven years is up 24 per cent or in real terms health funding spend is up approximately 16.1 or 16.2 per cent over the seven years.

There is an increase in police funding and there is an increase in education funding—a far cry from the broader public perception, I hasten to add. But they are the facts of the matter. At the same time, where wages are nearly 70 per cent, or thereabouts, of outlays, when you adjust the salaries of public servants there will therefore be a large expenditure increase. We have attempted to be fair to the work force in terms of outcome for it without being unfair on the taxpayers.

I point out that both SACOSS and the Australian Democrats have publicly called for further increases in revenue to fund a range of programs that they think are important. The leader of the Australian Democrats has said on a number of occasions—and publicly—that they will not criticise revenue increases that are matched to specific purpose expenditure in the provision of human services. SACOSS also has argued fairly consistently to increase our tax take so that we have the capacity to put greater resources into expenditure on social services. What we have attempted to do is find a reasonable or fair and equitable balance between their calls and the broader taxpayer call for, effectively, containment of taxes and charges.

**Mr WRIGHT:** My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. The Auditor-General has reported extensively regarding his concerns over whether the Ciccarello consultancy delivered value for money. The Auditor-General's concerns included lack of documentation, inadequate specifications for the engagement of a consultant, lack of a public tender process, no formal contracts and no evaluation of the consultancy. Why and how did this appalling situation come about, what action has the government taken to ensure that the Auditor-General's concerns have been addressed and

can the minister indicate whether other consultancies awarded are as fast and loose?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The member for Lee knows that I am very happy to answer questions on the soccer tournament. However, the consultancy to which he refers was originally let by the Department of Industry and Trade and the Office of Recreation and Sport. My understanding is that that consultancy was concluded on 28 February 1999. So, that specific question will have to be directed to the appropriate minister. I am very happy to talk about the tournament, though.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Can the minister assure the House that the money for that consultancy came out of the industry and trade or recreation and sport budget—that it definitely did not come out of the tourism budget?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I can say that since I have been the Minister for Tourism it has not come out of the tourism budget, but I will not answer for one of my ministerial colleagues. I cannot be specific. What I can be specific about is that the appropriate minister reported to this House that the consultancy was concluded on 28 February this year.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I think it might have come out of the tourism budget. If that is the case, I think that the minister should answer the question.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** The specific advice as of today is that it did not come out of our budget.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Referring to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, specifically what did the Chief Executive Officer of premier and cabinet do to justify his pay increase this year, which is as much as \$30 000, which brings his salary up to as much as \$260 000 a year? How does the government justify an increase in pay of \$30 000 in one year? Does Mr Kowalick hold any company directorships or private consultancies—or did he hold company directorships or private consultancies during 1998-99?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am advised that the suggestion that there was a \$30 000 increase is not accurate. On the Auditor-General's figures, the Chief Executive last year had a salary package (that is, a TEC) of \$250 000. This year, his TEC is \$252 922.87. That is the advice that I have been given and those figures, I understand, are from the Auditor-General's Report. Therefore, he has had a \$2 922—

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** A bonus? Not that I am aware of. He has had a \$2 922.87 increase, and I think that that would be the ordinary CPI increase that applied across the whole public sector, including the chief executives. The chief executives receive the average of the movement across the public sector. That is paid retrospectively and after the movement across the whole public sector to get the percentage increase, which is then applied to the chief executives.

In relation to directorships, since this matter was raised recently I have sought to ascertain pecuniary interest updates from all chief executives, and I have also asked for contracts from all chief executives to be referred to me so that I might shortly have a look at those. I am in the process of receiving some of them. Mr Kowalick, of course, is on leave at the moment and it would be appropriate that upon his return from leave he is able to update (if that is appropriate—and I do not know) either his pecuniary interests or any matters related to the contract. So, contracts and pecuniary interests have been called for. They are in the process of being transmitted to me for consideration.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier mentioned that he is looking for an update from Mr Kowalick and other CEOs.

However, leaving aside the updates, there are two questions. Has he, up until now, before the update, been a shareholder, a director or undertaken work as a private consultant? Also, in terms of updating, I thought that it was a requirement under the Premier's code of practice that the CEO was required to seek his permission before taking a directorship or a consultancy.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am not prepared, in the Committee of the House, to work off the top of my head. I am more than happy to subsequently provide accurate information to the leader. I would think that, in the interests of simple natural justice, Mr Kowalick ought to be able to return from leave. Upon his return from leave he will have the request there, the same as every other chief executive has had the request and, no doubt, he will then provide me with the information. So, can I take that question on notice? I will be happy to refer the information to the leader upon Mr Kowalick's return.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Certainly, the opposition has been informed that there is some private arrangement there but I thought that they had to get permission from the Premier. So, perhaps the information is not correct. Can the Premier explain why it is that the number of people in premier and cabinet who receive in excess of \$100 000 has almost doubled since 1998? Apparently, 11 employees were receiving salaries in excess of \$100 000 in 1998 and there are 20 today. Why is that so?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am glad that the leader asked me this question, because a restructuring took place in 1997-98. If you go back, the number of employees, as identified by the Auditor-General, was 11. But if you take, prior to the restructuring, the number across the portfolios that were then incorporated, it is 18. So, the shift is from 18 to 23—not from 11 to 23, including TVSPs. The leader was referring to 11 to 20. Once again, the 11 in year 1997-98 includes TVSPs: the 20 in this year does not include TVSPs, but it now does with the figure of 23 which I used. So, if we compare like with like, there were 11 employees but there were also employees on that salary band in other departments. As the leader knows, we restructured into 10 key departments. So, it was not an increase in the number of people, because they were there previously in the system on that salary band. The increase is therefore one of 18 to 20, that is, two people, if you exclude the TVSPs.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is almost Jim Hacker-like! Perhaps the Premier could also explain the explosion in the number of \$100 000 plus persons on the unattached list, what used to be known as the transit lounge, from one in 1998 to eight in 1999. Who are these people? What positions did they hold before becoming unattached, even though they are on \$100 000 plus? What are they doing, given that the figure has increased from one to eight?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I point out that two are included here because they actually had separation payments. The separation payments took them into the salary bands identified there.

**An honourable member:** Bruce Geurin?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** He is unattached, but there is just a big bill to his unattached component. The increase from four to eight was due to one employee previously receiving just under \$100 000 moving into the \$100 000 to \$109 000 category because of an annual increase; one employee whose salary is \$100 000 plus being assigned to the unattached unit as of July 1998; and two employees who received less than \$100 000 moving into the \$100 000 plus category because

they left government employment during the year. The Auditor-General reports their remuneration as including termination payments which, in turn, included significant amounts for untaken leave entitlements, hence forcing them into this band, the point to which I referred a moment ago.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** What is the Premier's response to criticisms of his government by the Auditor-General in relation to contracts for chief executives? In particular, the Auditor-General says that criteria for evaluating performance are unclear; that the breakdown of relationships rather than inadequate performance were used as grounds for the dismissal of people such as Mike Schilling, Carol Hancock and Denis Ralph; that these people were led to believe their performance was adequate prior to their being sacked—and, indeed, I understand they received bonuses in some circumstances—and that these practices led to the danger that the CEO could become 'a mere lackey of the executive government'. It seems that while some chief executive officers have enjoyed a charmed life others have been given short shrift for what the Auditor-General believes are somewhat unusual circumstances. The Auditor-General concludes:

... circumstances regarding the removal of several chief executives in the South Australian Public Service do not reflect an understanding of the legal and procedural requirements of the law.

What is the Premier's response to that?

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** In relation to the member for Lee, I thought that the Auditor-General's Report this year was, by and large, a constructive report and that this year it reflected a good performance by the government in management.

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well, Bruce Geurin's name has been mentioned. I would have thought he would be the perfect candidate for the description the honourable member used a moment ago, but we will not labour the point. Contracts and fixed-term appointments were first introduced in South Australia in 1985—and I remind the leader that that was under the Bannon Labor Government—and the 1995 Public Sector Management Act continued that trend. So, the trend about which we are talking was introduced and implemented under the Bannon Labor Government. These changes are also consistent with, as I understand it, Australia-wide and overseas legislative moves. The changes are there to ensure a focus on performance and accountability issues and that there is some natural justice in chief executive and executive employment matters.

The Public Sector Management Act, as amended in the parliament, is what I would describe as 'prescriptive' in terms of rights. It also ensures that natural justice is applied and that, without fear or favour, the public service can advise its cabinet. It would be foolhardy not to have a position where a chief executive did any other than frankly, openly and honestly advise a minister. Having a chief executive who simply tells you what you want to hear is not conducive, first, to good government, and, secondly, to longevity of the minister concerned, because it is important to have professional and substantial advice available upon which a judgment can be made. In the cases referred to by the leader and raised by the Auditor-General, that is, Messrs Schilling, Dixon and Ralph, they have all been clearly actioned within the prevailing legislative framework.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** What about Hancock?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well, I do not mention that simply because the matter is subject to litigation. One would

not want to prejudice the interests of the state in that. In terms of performance management, the approach that we are developing is an attempt for a strong, all round management reporting approach rather than focussing on individual employment performance contracts. The changes in employment and associated reforms have quite rightly led to substantial discussion about the advantages and risks involved. The Auditor-General reflects the issues raised in the national and international debate. I understand that is at page 64 of his report.

We have more flexibility and accountability, as well as changing career paths and options for senior public servants, including opportunities in the private sector and academia. I think it is important to have those options. The global market place is changing, and it is important for governments to have available to them advice that is broad base without fear or favour. From time to time, chief executives and senior management should have an opportunity to upskill, whether that is in specific programs, courses here and overseas or whether it is a stint in the private sector. The benefit is for better government. We want to ensure that the arrangements work properly, fairly, equitably and with some natural justice to the persons concerned. And I think we achieve that.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I refer to Mr Denis Ralph. Given his position at the Centre for Lifelong Learning, after being sacked as CEO of the Education Department on the basis of a prior agreement that he had a right of return to a public sector position at chief executive officer level, in which contract was this provision that guaranteed him employment at chief executive level provided for? He was given his position at the Centre for Lifelong Learning after being sacked as Chief Executive Officer of the Education Department but, we are told, on the basis of a prior agreement that he had the right of return to a public sector position if he was fired at CEO level. That was in his contract, we were told.

Was it in his contract and what contract was it that guaranteed him employment at chief executive level, the same level as the head of a giant, billion dollar-plus department, as head of education down at the Centre for Lifelong Learning, which is not quite so giant?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I would ask the Premier to provide a brief response; the time has expired.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Our view about the establishment of the Centre for Lifelong Learning as a new policy direction from government is no small beer, as will be demonstrated by the commitment and the resources that will be put into it. The people we will be bringing in, in terms of the Policy Advisory Council, will demonstrate that it is one of the most important new policy initiatives. It is absolutely fundamental to private sector new capital coming into the state to have upskilling, reskilling and development of a work force that meets the needs of a global marketplace. Lifelong Learning is that objective.

We have not had that position in the past. You have only to look at software engineers. If eight or 10 years ago we had determined the need for software engineers, we might not be in the position now of having a dearth of software engineers, with companies saying, 'We would like to come to Adelaide but what is the quantity of software engineers to meet our demand?' The Centre for Lifelong Learning is an endeavour to anticipate and coordinate our educational institutions to ensure that we have the skills base and the quality of the skills base. That will be a very significant competitive advantage for South Australia in the long term. That is why I say that the policy that Denis Ralph is now involved with

and has responsibility for is a significant thrust of the government.

Time expired.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call on the Deputy Premier, Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development, and declare open examination of those lines.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 752 note 1 states that the Department of Primary Industries and Resources is a key department for, among other things, research and development. Will the minister give a detailed list of current members of the South Australian Primary Industries Research and Development Board, including details of remuneration for each board member; when did the minister replace the Deputy Chairman of the SAPIRD board, Mr Malcolm McLachlan, who was recently banned from acting as a shareholder and investment adviser because he had not performed efficiently, honestly and fairly in his duties as a representative of a securities dealer (that was from a media report in the *Advertiser* of 24 September 1999)?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** In relation to the SAPIRD board, which is under the chairmanship of Andrew Thomas of wool industry fame, the previous Deputy Chair (Malcolm McLachlan) has resigned from that position. I think that is unfortunate. I know that there were articles in the *Advertiser* and there have been some findings that brought about Mr McLachlan's resignation, but I put on the record extremely solidly that not only as Deputy Chair of the current board but as Deputy Chair of the previous SARDI board Mr McLachlan has made an enormous contribution to ensuring that our research dollars in South Australia have been used in an appropriate fashion.

He is a man of great experience and a man who, I feel, has been somewhat maligned. I will not make any more comment on that, apart from saying that I really appreciate the effort that he put in, and I have written back to him in those terms. The effort that he has put in both to the previous SARDI board and now to the SAPIRD board has been a credit to him and to the industry. As far as the full board membership and remuneration of board members are concerned, I will obtain a reply and give that to the deputy leader.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 757 note 14 outlines royalties that have been received by the state government. Will the minister explain why there has been a significant decline in royalties received from gas licences (down from \$10.3 million in 1998 to \$7.8 million in 1999) and coal (\$1.7 million in 1998 to \$1.4 million in 1999)?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The coal figure is based on production. As far as the gas licences go, I would need to check, but the system of gas licences is changing. I believe that it is on a diminishing scale as they go to the new system whereby it will be under the Regulator, and there will be a change in the way that it is administered.

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** My belief is that it is progressively dropping away by 1 per cent a year, the reduction in the licence fees.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 752 note 1 states that the Department of Primary Industries and Resources is a key department that delivers a wide range of services to, among others, the fisheries sector. When will the minister table his response to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee's report on pilchards, which is now overdue?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I have actually signed off on the report so, if it is not here, it is somewhere between my desk and here. I will find out where and make sure it comes in.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 760, in relation to employee remuneration packages, note 31, the Auditor-General's Report states that 18 employees received total remuneration packages above \$100 000 compared to 14 employees above this level in 1998, and that the total cost of these packages increased by 22 per cent from \$1.8 million to \$2.2 million. Will the minister give the reasons for these increases?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** As the deputy leader said, the audited statements show that there were 14 in 1998 and 18 this year. However, those figures include five TVSPs which were paid. Therefore, they come into that category, increasing their remuneration to \$100 000 or more. In reality, the level of permanent employees who have remuneration packages over \$100 000 has actually reduced from 14 to 13 over the 12 months.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 755 there has been an increase in the allocation of funds to 'collaborative payments' from \$1.3 million in 1998 to \$3.46 million in 1999: that is note 5, 'grants paid; private sector'. Can the minister say what is the purpose of the payments and can he give the reason for this increase?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I need to get a break down of what is actually included in the collaborative payments. I will undertake to get that itemised for both 1998 and 1999 so that the deputy leader can make a comparison.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 755, note 5, lists organisations and agencies which received grants from PIRSA. Under 'other government agencies', the type of organisations listed include the Animal and Plant Control Commission and the Dog Fence Board. At the bottom of the list, \$456 000 is allotted to 'other'. Under 'private sector' which allocates funds to, among others, the Remote Areas Energy Scheme and Ovine Johne's disease, 'other' receives \$1.441 million. Can the minister provide details of the organisations that fit into the 'other' category and explain the process by which these funds have been allocated?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I will undertake to provide the deputy leader with that information.

**Ms HURLEY:** Can the minister explain why the amount granted to 'other' has doubled in the 'other government agencies' allocation and increased in the 'private sector' allocation; and where was this money allocated in 1998-99?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Obviously, they vary from year to year and that will become more obvious when I provide the detail.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 755 an allocation of \$300 000 has been made to the SA Food and Beverage Exporters Association (which is in note 5 'grants paid: private sector'). Can the minister explain the purpose of this allocation and how the allocation has been spent?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The South Australian Food and Beverage Exporters Association is a body which has been formed resulting from consultations involving the Premier's food council. It was decided that one of the strengths of the wine industry in Australia was the forum provided through the setting up of the Australian Wine Export Council to allow all wine producers to actually collaborate in getting into overseas exports. Many people point back to that time as being one of the key features to the success of the wine industry.

One of the features which became evident around the table with the Premier's food council, and with other parts of the

Food for the Future scheme, was that in South Australia we have a relatively small number of very successful exporters. Many other producers wanted to export but did not have the expertise or experience to know where to start or where to go. We were working on that through a series of delegations and bringing in buyers, but it was felt, particularly by those who were successful exporters, that by pulling together in an association the successful exporters could sponsor or help many of our budding exporters to get into the market.

It was decided to form the association. Cabinet agreed that money would be put into the association for the first four years, after which time the association is to become totally self-funding. It is not totally government funded at the moment: members of the association themselves have put in substantial funds. Concerning the use of moneys, Mr Des King, an ex Austrade officer, has been employed as the executive officer in Adelaide. An officer has been employed in Japan to work with the association to get our producers into that market, and there are plans afoot to put an officer in Taipei as well.

It is a very successful initiative, and it is terrific to see the support it is receiving from some of our successful exporters. Maurice Crotti, Glen Cooper and Angelo Kotses, in particular, have done a lot of work and they have received terrific support from other exporters. People have not only shown support but also made financial contributions to try to make the association a success.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 755 'funds for rural counselling', allocations referred to in note 5 'grants paid: private sector' are not specified in the financial statements supplied by the Auditor-General. The sum of \$170 000 was allocated in 1998. Can the minister explain why this service appears to be no longer funded?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I noticed that just before I came down. I will get the answer for the deputy leader, but I can point out that the rural counselling service is still funded. I do not know whether that is a timing thing, but even the amounts do not seem right. It may be coming from another line. Certainly, the federal government has changed the way it puts in its funds, but I will get a satisfactory answer as to why it does not show on that line because we still fund rural counselling services.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 756, referring to 'revenue from fishing licences', shows an increase from \$5.3 million in 1998 to \$8.3 million in 1999. With respect to note 10, 'user charges, fees and rentals: fishing licences', can the minister give details as to the sources of the increased revenue?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** My recollection of licence fees is that they were set for two years. I do not think there was an overall increase. One of the problems here is that the department came into being on 23 October in the 1997-98 financial year. Because of the amalgamation of departments after the last election, the 1997-98 year is from 23 October through until 30 June. I think that explains the difference in the two figures. If it is any different from that I will let the deputy leader know, but my recollection of fishery licence fees was that, while some went up and some went down in a net sense, I believe the amount raised from licence fees which goes into services was roughly the same. I am sure that is a matter of the full year versus a part year, but if that is incorrect I will make sure it is corrected for the deputy leader.

**Ms HURLEY:** Could I clarify that? You said it started on 23 October 1998. So that was a short period from July to October? Was it a different calendar year—it was not based on a financial year?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** It was a financial year, but it was not a full year because four agencies were brought together. I will explain. This is one of the anomalies that occurs because four agencies were brought together under the restructure which occurred when the number of agencies was reduced. The comparative figures in the operating statement of cash flows for 1997-98 (which is the right-hand column) represent the period from 23 October 1997 through until 30 June 1998, 23 October 1997 being the date on which the Department of Primary Industries and Resources SA was created. Unfortunately, it is not possible to compare full year results in 1998-99 with part year results from 1997-98. I do not want to mislead the deputy leader and, if that is not the reason for the difference in the fisheries licence fees, I will ensure that I correct that with her.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 756, note 11, under 'Advances and Grants', 'Commonwealth Grants' the natural heritage grants for 1999 total over \$10 million, of which \$6 million has been allocated. Will the minister give details of approved projects, including their location, and details of the approval process, including why such a large proportion of the grants for 1998-99 have not yet been expended?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Certainly I believe that the annual report for 1997-98 was signed off on the other day. That will give the listeners quite an extensive list of what was involved. In relation to the current year, one of the problems with NHT funding is the timing issue, and it is not included in the 1998-99 budget estimate as a final distribution to the states because the commonwealth had not determined all the grants at budget time. It is one of the ongoing problems that we have had with NHT. As Mr Chairman knows, sometimes the federal government is not very quick at giving the okay and handing over the money.

**Ms HURLEY:** How is the approval process organised?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Quite a complicated application form has to be completed. They have tried to simplify that, but then we have regional assessment panels that look at each project to do an initial screen on them and to try to prioritise projects out of each region. Then there is a state assessment panel which looks at those priorities from each region. There are several what might be called buckets of money. There is a complicated system of pulling together all the regional ones. The state assessment panel ensures that the priorities are set and that they are put into their correct categories, and from there they go to Canberra. However, normally the priorities put forward by the regions are pretty well reflected in what the state assessment panel puts forward. That is then signed off by the Minister for Environment and me, and from there they go to Canberra. In general, the priorities are not changed greatly, but the federal government, as a major financier of the whole scheme, occasionally tends to want to have a say on what the priorities might be.

**Ms HURLEY:** Again referring to page 756, an increase in commonwealth grants has occurred from 1998 to 1999. The figure for the rural adjustment scheme has decreased from \$2.6 million in 1998 to \$1.2 million in 1999, while the Natural Heritage Trust has absorbed the national landcare program, taking the Natural Heritage Trust grants from \$4.1 million in 1998 to \$10 million in 1999 (note 11, 'Advances and Grants'). Will the minister explain the reason for the changes to these grants and whether the absorption of the national landcare program into the National Heritage Trust will affect the national landcare program activities? Given that the Natural Heritage Trust is funded by the sale

of Telstra, is the minister concerned that these programs will not be funded in the future?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** As far as the national landcare program, yes, that has become a component of the National Heritage Trust (NHT). Once again it is hard to compare the two years because of the timing issue to which I referred previously. Regarding the impact on the national landcare program, landcare still continues to perform extremely well. We have more than 300 groups in the state, and I think that has been a terrific success as a community project, and the NHT, if anything, has been a boost for landcare. One of the constant complaints with landcare was that the money was going into administration, plans and whatever. Under the NHT many of those landcare groups have been able to see money going into on ground programs. Overall there has been a fair improvement.

Regarding the future of the Natural Heritage Trust, I suppose until budgets are put in place there is always some uncertainty. Certainly it has been a massive success, and I would hope that, with the continuation of money coming from Telstra, the federal government in the future will look favourably upon continuing the program because it has been a terrific boost mainly for the environment in South Australia and includes a fair component of the Murray-Darling basin work, which is extremely important to us. It has also been a great boost for those who have been involved in landcare and the other programs over a period. It has been a reward for that hard work and has given them a real boost. We hope that in the future federal governments will continue to fund the Natural Heritage Trust in some way.

**Ms HURLEY:** Is the minister confident that, if the Natural Heritage Trust is not continued, the landcare program will continue?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Once again I suppose it is crystal ball gazing, but I think that any government on a federal level that removed the funding for landcare, whether it be directly or indirectly, would feel a fair backlash because, as I said, over 300 groups are involved in South Australia, and there is a terrific awareness within the community of the work they do. They are really paying us an enormous environmental dividend. Therefore, I would be confident that in the future (and I do not know what form the funding will take) the honourable member will find that landcare will continue to be resourced and funding put forward for groups to do the work.

**Ms HURLEY:** On page 756, note 11, the financial statements list all commonwealth and state grants. Will the minister give details of all non-government bodies other than those listed that receive grants under this allocation?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I will undertake to obtain a full list for the deputy leader for 1998-99.

**Ms HURLEY:** Page 755, note 6, lists supplies and services. No comparative figures are available from 1998 because this category was adopted only this year as a result of the implementation of the new chart of accounts. The first item listed in this category is titled 'Professional services'. Will the Minister state what are the professional services referred to in this category?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** Once again, there would be a lot in there. Obviously, I would understand that consultancies would come in there, but there would be a whole range of services. Obviously now that we have got these chartered accounts I can get more detail for the Deputy Leader. I think it would be quite a comprehensive list.

**Ms HURLEY:** Again, with reference to page 755, under 'supplies and services', travel is listed as costing \$6.539 million. Will the minister detail the components of travel costs within the department, in particular the amount of travel within the state, the amount of travel to other states and how many PIRSA officers undertake travel in their employment? Does this item include travel costs incurred by the minister and his office? If not, what are those costs?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I will endeavour to do that. Obviously, in the department there is quite a bit of travel within the state—probably more so than most other departments—as well as interstate and a component of overseas travel. I will take the question as put by the Deputy Leader out of *Hansard* and will supply the information.

**Ms HURLEY:** Again on page 755, at the bottom of the list of items under supplies and services, an item classified as 'other' cost \$690 000 in 1998-99. Will the minister detail the components of this allocation?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** That is 1 per cent of the total supplies and services budget, so it is probably a list of smaller things, but we will endeavour to get the information from the chartered accounts.

**Ms HURLEY:** I refer to page 758 note 19, which details the property, plant and equipment held by PIRSA. The independent valuation of land at 30 June 1999 shows a decrease in the value of the land held from \$12.8 million in 1998 to \$9.7 million in 1999. What land has been disposed of in 1998-99 and what price was received for that land?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** There has been a transfer of some land from land at independent valuation versus land at cost. I will have to get the detail of why that has happened. That may well be a purchase. The land holdings of the department change over time, and I will get the detail of the changes that have occurred.

Time expired.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I call on the Minister for Human Services.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister for Human Services has 30 minutes for investigation of those lines.

**Ms STEVENS:** I want to make a brief comment before I start. I am disturbed that we have 30 minutes to question the minister in relation to this department. Its budget is \$2.46 billion. For 30 minutes it comes out at \$82 million a minute, which I think most people would agree is fairly laughable if we are talking about a proper analysis of the issues contained. I will not waste any more of the 30 minutes, but it is almost a pointless exercise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the honourable member have a question?

**Ms STEVENS:** The member certainly does. The first question relates to page 65 of volume A.3, concerning the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer, Ms Christine Charles. The Auditor-General states that the appointment of Christine Charles to the statutory office of Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission is invalid and that the arrangements may be pre-emptive of possible legislative changes to the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976. The auditor states that, given the potentially serious consequences of any future ruling by the Supreme Court to the effect that Ms Charles' appointment was unlawful, the

Health Commission act should be amended retrospectively. I know that we asked questions about this last year following last year's report, and the minister would know that in this year's report the auditor has devoted a considerable number of pages to this matter.

What action has the minister taken to correct this apparently unlawful situation and does the government intend to amend the Health Commission act to accommodate the arrangement for the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Human Services also to hold the appointment as Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I appreciate that a significant legal argument is put there and documented well. First, a legal argument has been put by the Auditor-General—and I respect the Auditor-General as a lawyer of some note. Equally, a counter argument has been put by the Crown Solicitor. After the Auditor-General's Report of last year I immediately asked for legal advice from the Crown Solicitor to make sure that the appointment of Ms Charles was legalised as quickly as possible and that they were satisfied. I have received advice from Crown Law that they were satisfied once the appropriate steps were taken. So, what you have in the Auditor-General's Report is a legal argument between two groups of lawyers or, in some cases, a group of lawyers and an individual lawyer. As the honourable member would appreciate, I am not a lawyer and I will not buy into a legal argument between two lawyers; I respect both of them. First, the Crown Solicitor's advice is that it is a legal appointment. They are very satisfied with that, they have given that advice to me and that advice has been picked up and quoted by the Auditor-General in his report. Equally, the Auditor-General is saying that it is not a legal appointment and he disputes the advice of the Crown Solicitor.

Now that they have been going back and forth on that for the best part of 12 months, I intend to bring amendments into this parliament to the Health Commission act so that there can be no argument between the two groups of lawyers. I would ask for the support of the opposition in doing that. I have asked them to start looking at that already. I know that we have an act before the Parliament at present. It is inappropriate to deal with it in that measure for a couple of reasons. It needs to be part of a balanced broader picture in terms of the amendments as there are other accounting issues I want to pick up in the same way. For instance, we are preparing a set of accounts for the Health Commission and a set for the department, and in many ways they are very similar but there is a lot of additional work involved in it. We can simplify a number of those steps and simplify the relationship between the South Australian Health Commission and the Department of Human Services. It is a little more complex than simply a one-line amendment and I want to consider it properly. I will be bringing in amendments. I am taking the advice of the Auditor-General, despite the counter advice from the Crown Solicitor, to make sure, and I will make it retrospective, as he suggests.

**Ms STEVENS:** I am pleased to hear that. Obviously the opposition would be pleased to ensure that we removed any possible liability to the state if it came to the crunch in the courts in relation to those two opinions. We look forward to receiving those relevant changes as soon as possible.

My next question relates to volume A4, page 29, and to the Food Act and the comments the auditor made. He made comments last year about this matter as well. Nikki Robinson died on 1 February 1995. On 28 September the government said that it accepted the Coroner's findings and would act on



all recommendations. On 12 October 1995 health minister Armitage said he was keen to explore amendments to the Food Act to allow the institution of proceedings in a more realistic time frame. Now for the second year running the Auditor-General has revealed that no legislative changes have been made and that local government inspection of premises in some councils were of low frequency and inadequate.

On 28 October last year the minister said he had operated for national legislation rather than amending our own act, as Victoria did in 1997. What does the minister now have to say this year in relation to the government's failure to put in place a satisfactory code of food regulation and inspection? We need this to happen and for it to happen as soon as possible. It is two years overdue.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is a fair comment in looking at the Auditor-General's Report to say that he had raised the issue of a lack of follow up with local government last year and that he has now agreed that that occurred during the past year. I was somewhat surprised because my reading of what the Auditor-General said over several pages led me to a somewhat significantly different conclusion from the conclusion drawn by the honourable member. He says on page A32:

The South Australian Health Commission forwarded a follow up request for information to some councils—

and states that local councils were circularised in June 1998, a particularly important focus being the collection of information relating to authorised officers and the type and scope of inspection activity being performed by these officers; that that matter was followed up; and that all councils ultimately responded to the request. He is acknowledging the fact that we have done what we said.

**Ms Stevens:** What about legislation and regulations?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** First, let us go back to what the Coroner recommended. All of the Coroner's recommendations have been acted upon.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have gone through that previously and the former minister has gone through the detail of that. I have been through it in this House and I believe we have acted on all the recommendations. There is one area I have highlighted where we need to develop a national code in terms of food hygiene. I have been a strong advocate of that and have been pushing for it.

**Ms Stevens:** It hasn't happened yet.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No. I have been one of the ministers pushing harder than almost any other minister because I have seen at first hand the situation involving Garibaldi and Nippy's. If you ask other health ministers they will tell you that when we met on 5 August there had even been a move to have it deferred from the agenda that day. I immediately rang ANSVAR and insisted that it go ahead, that it be on the agenda and that they could not unilaterally take it off the agenda. In fact, I got it discussed on 5 August. We are due to meet again this week. I have a concern because it would appear that the federal government has done two things: first, it has insisted that this matter be now referred to the heads of government meeting, taking it out of the hands of the health ministers; and, secondly, it has insisted that there be a potential delay because of the introduction of GST, and on small business in particular it would be a huge imposition to run the two together.

There is a two-year time frame—and in some areas of low-risk food a four-year time frame—for the implementation

of the proposed new food hygiene standards. I have been arguing for a shortening of the time (and I put that forward to other health ministers) and also that there be no deferral. There is now a draft bill and I am happy to sit down with the honourable member and go through it as this issue needs to be approached by all governments in a bipartisan way throughout the whole of Australia. We have had good cooperation between Liberal and Labor governments around Australia, but it concerns me because we have a draft bill, which still requires tidying up.

By the time it gets through the respective parliaments it will take us at least past the middle of next year or later and then there is a two or four-year time delay beyond that. I do not believe it will get mixed up with the GST in any way, and I think the honourable member would agree with me. By the time the legislation is implemented, they have two years after that in high risk areas to adopt federal standards. I assure her that I am a very strong advocate of pushing ahead with this matter as quickly as possible, but I cannot answer for the other states. I have already been rolled by a majority of ministers on some of the aspects in terms of timing. Be assured, though, I am a strong advocate. The honourable member may recall that I was the one who said that I would like to see these measures in and operating by the time of the Olympic Games. Unfortunately that will not occur.

I will highlight the two things we have done. First, I commend 44 of the state's 65 councils on now already adopting Food Safe and being trained in Food Safe. That is a significant step forward. I have sat down with a number of organisations, such as the Small Retailers Association, whose role I have commended in already effectively implementing the program, which is to train staff and help companies develop their food plans. So, even though we do not yet have national legislation, I assure the honourable member that I am actively encouraging organisations and associations to start the process and effectively start implementing it, even though it is not backed formally by legislation at this stage.

The other matter I am involved in concerns meat retailers and the Q quality that has been developed. I went down and handed out the certificates for the meat retailers who had been involved in it. So, it is being put into practice much sooner than the legislative framework that is finally being developed across Australia. However, I share the member's views in wanting to see it adopted as quickly as possible.

**Ms STEVENS:** My next question relates to capital projects (volume A.3, page 97). The Auditor-General notes that the South Australian Health Commission has implemented new processes for capital project management in line with an overall government strategy for improving the management of capital programs, particularly slippages and cost overruns. What new procedures have been put in place to manage capital programs in the South Australian Health Commission, how are priorities established and what capacity exists for public consultation on plans? I would particularly like the minister to refer to that last matter in relation to the latest proposal to downgrade the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** First, the priority that has been adopted by the government is that the entire capital works program of the government goes to the Senior Management Council, which considers both the broad areas of expenditure and the individual projects, the major projects. It puts a recommendation to cabinet, which, as part of the budget process, then considers those recommendations and makes any appropriate adjustment. I might add that, before it even gets to the Senior Management Council, we have a

process within the department (and I can obtain for the member more details with respect to some of those points about which she asked) to pick out the key areas where we believe expenditure needs to occur. This is across the whole department. The capital works program, in very rough terms, is about \$200 million, taking into account housing as well. Over the past five or six years we have substantially increased the capital expenditure program for hospitals.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** We are spending most of it. In fact, if you look at the under-expenditure, I think the figure is now about \$12 million out of a \$200 million program. However, if one sits down and looks at the individual projects where it occurred, one sees that, in some cases, they were slippages of a month or two weeks or something like that.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will come to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because it concerns me that large projects take a lot of planning and a lot of time to go through the process. In terms of priorities, that is the process. Initially, it is within the department; then it goes to the Senior Management Council and then to cabinet, and cabinet makes the final decision.

In terms of where we make our allocations, it is a mix between, for instance, aged care facilities, particularly in country hospitals. I do take into account there some factors, such as if a local community is putting up substantial funding of its own on a voluntary basis—and there are some examples of that. Booleroo Centre has put money up; in Jamestown an individual put in a personal donation of \$200 000 for aged care; and Snowtown has made an offer of approximately \$900 000 for aged care, donations having been drawn from the community. Where that occurs we try to put in a priority.

Secondly, priorities are set partly in aged care by the federal government with respect to where it is allocating commonwealth funded beds. In the last year, it has been very much in the Wakefield health region. This year, it is very much in the South-East, because that is where the commonwealth government has allocated those beds, and we are dictated to by that allocation.

In relation to hospitals, I suppose it is a blend of upgrading equipment and minor works. I am trying to increase the funding for minor works, because I believe that gets spread right across the hospitals and, I think, enables essential and fairly urgent work to be carried out. There are some priority areas; for instance, a priority area is accident emergency at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. That work will be finished very soon into the new year. It has been undertaken already. Also, some urgent priority work is being undertaken at the Noarlunga Hospital in terms of accident emergency.

Then we get to the really big projects. The Royal Adelaide Hospital is now planning for stage 2 and the detailed design work therefor. The honourable member needs to appreciate the very difficult task of how you go through that whole process of design, planning what services you have in mind, the design work associated therewith, all the detailed costings, then a cabinet submission, then the Public Works Committee and then, finally, the letting of tenders. Frankly, it is about a two year process.

The honourable member knows that there is currently consultation with staff and the community by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital board—or the board of the North Western Health Service, but it is for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Dr Kathy Alexander has been engaged as part of that process. I

understand that the board of the hospital is considering the outcome of some of those consultations at its next meeting.

I do not know the detail of what has been going on at the individual meetings. That is a matter for the board to go through and then finally to report to me; then I will look at the recommendations that it makes. But I know that it is meeting with the council. I think that has occurred already, but if it has not it is about to. I know that there have been meetings with the staff and a number of other interested parties. So, it is a matter for the hospital, once it has had that consultation, then to report back. At the same time, it is trying to take into account some of the outcomes from the clinical reviews that have also been completed.

So, it is a very complex process, but I think that if you are going to have detailed planning it is important to be done thoroughly, particularly on a redevelopment—because we are looking here at a new hospital that will cost about \$43 million in the first stage. So, it is a very big level of expenditure, and it is important that we get it right.

**Ms STEVENS:** I agree that it certainly is important that you get it right. Certainly, too, if we look back over the last few years in terms of the announcements and reannouncements about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and about its capital works redevelopment, it seems that there have been considerable changes from year to year, budget to budget and press release to press release about just what will happen at that hospital. I certainly agree that it is a complex process, and I would have thought that community consultation and consultation with all the stakeholders was really important right at the beginning. I am interested to hear that Dr Kathy Alexander has been appointed to consult after the fact, really, when we are almost towards the end of the process, rather than back at the beginning of working through the issues in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am interested to know the extent and the terms of reference of her consultation. I presume that it also includes the Lyell McEwin, as they are amalgamated campuses. Is that the case—or just exactly what is she consulting about?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will obtain that information for the member. I understand that she was jointly engaged by both the hospital and the department. I am not familiar with the exact details of the terms of reference she was given, but I will obtain that information.

**Ms STEVENS:** My next question relates to year 2000 compliance (volume A4, page 51). The Auditor-General says that \$421 million has been allocated for health related remedial projects. Is that correct?

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** I don't think it was quite that much.

**Ms STEVENS:** No, I also do not think it was quite that. I was just testing the minister! I think it is \$21 million. Perhaps the minister might correct that for me. I think we have a—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**Ms STEVENS:** Yes, it was a '4' instead of '\$'. That is very good, minister! Of \$21 million allocated for health related remedial projects, only \$2.3 million had been spent at the end of June 1999, and that of expenditure continues to lag behind. Some upgrades may not be finished until after 31 December 1999. The point is that too late may not be good enough. What guarantees can the minister give the committee that his department will be Y2K-proof by December 1999? Can the minister guarantee that all hospital systems have been cleared?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I can give the honourable member an assurance, as cabinet gets a full briefing on this once a month right down to every individual component now. The honourable member needs to appreciate that the figures give a somewhat false picture in terms of actual expenditure, because a lot of work has been done. Perhaps the accounts have not been paid because some of the work is still being trialled, tested and so forth. For instance, the Auditor-General himself says that, out of the \$21 million allocated, \$13 million has been approved and committed by the department. So, that work is under way.

The much bigger picture is that in a report received only on Monday of this week there were only three or four areas outstanding in the whole department, including the health units. All the health units have now finished their tasks in terms of testing equipment. I believe that 11 000 items of equipment have been tested. In relation to the four units, one related to a piece of software within FAYS, and that is due to be operating on 8 November. There was another item within, I believe, the Health Commission, and that is due to be operating by the end of October. There was one other item that was not a critical item which is expected to be in and operating by the end of November, if I remember rightly, but I will get the honourable member the details. Basically, almost everything has now been done and completed and is operating.

The one thing I have to check on is whether the new heart monitors are in and operating at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but I believe that they are. That was one area about which I had some concerns in terms of delay, because earlier this year the manufacturer, somewhat into the process, walked away and said, 'We are no longer standing by our product.' They are fairly old heart monitors, so we immediately had to speed up the process to get approval to purchase. We have been very mindful of the need to buy these as quickly as possible, and we have speeded up that process. We have had some help from the supply and tender board to speed up that process.

I am happy for the honourable member to be briefed by Tom Stubbs, who is in the department, who can provide all the assurances and who go through all the systems with the honourable member. I think that that is appropriate, because this is a crucial issue. Not only have they checked the medical equipment but they have checked the software systems used in hospital administration, which is where most of the problems have been. They have checked the software systems within the department; they have checked the software systems within the statutory authority.

Our total expenditure in this area is estimated to be about \$32 million; \$21 million has come from a special allocation of funds and the rest from within our normal budgets within the Health Commission. So, one can see that it has been a huge task, by far the biggest in the whole government. But I am very satisfied that we have a system which appears to have had an enormous amount of work done, and I think it will be proved that the detailed work has in fact been done.

Further, they have done a risk analysis even on suppliers. Every hospital has done checks on the situation if the power, water, gas and all those other things fail. What if the ambulance system fails? What if the pathology services fail? They have backups on all those as well. So, they have backup systems not only within the internal systems but on the external services provided.

Time expired.

*[Sitting suspended from 6.16 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr VENNING:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare open for examination the report of the Auditor-General relating to the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, Minister for Employment and Minister for Youth.

**Ms WHITE:** One of the issues I want to concentrate on first is the Minister's sacking of his former chief executive officer, Denis Ralph. In his report the Auditor-General is very critical, expressing concern at the termination of chief executive officers generally. He singles out two chief executive officers for attention, one of whom is Denis Ralph. In relation to Mr Ralph's replacement as chief executive officer of the minister's department, the Auditor-General commented:

This is a further example of conflict with the avowed aim of the Public Sector Management Act to achieve accountability in the public sector.

That is quite strong criticism, I am sure the minister will agree. This comes about under this government's system of contract appointments of chief executives, following earlier legislation. Mr Ralph, after being a staffer in the former education minister's office, was appointed chief executive under a contract signed in January 1995. At that point he did not have a fallback right to chief executive officer salary within the Public Service but, either with that contract signed in January 1995 or with a subsequent contract signed under this current education minister's term in October 1997 when the education department was restructured, that fallback right to a chief executive salary occurred.

They are both five year contracts. When did that fallback right to the full chief executive officer's salary occur? Was the contract signed during the Hon. Mr Lucas's term, in January 1995, or under the current minister's administration, in October 1997?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** First, the contracts currently in place for CEOs are no different from those instigated in 1995 by the Bannon Labor government, so it has been a continuation of that five year contract regime. The contracts that sit there now for CEOs are no different from that which applied to Bruce Guerin under the Labor government. However, the fact is that the contract is with the Premier. I have no role and take no part in the signing of or terms and conditions of the contract. That contract is with the Premier.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I have no idea, because the contract is with the Premier.

**Ms WHITE:** Does the minister then accept the criticism of the Auditor-General when he says that this contract was an example of conflict with the aim that the minister's government put forward in the Public Sector Management Act under the changes that his government made to achieve accountability in the Public Service?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The Auditor-General is commenting: I would not say it is a criticism. The contract was in place. Section 11(b) of that contract, as quoted in the Auditor-General's Report, says that the Premier can terminate that contract under the conditions of that particular section, and that is the contract that is there. Mr Ralph and I had a very good working arrangement throughout the time that he was CEO with me, but when I looked at the type of change required in education, at what was going on elsewhere (both in Australia and internationally), it was then a matter of my

wanting a different style of management to be able to introduce the sort of change that is now occurring throughout the education system.

**Ms WHITE:** We are referring to the Public Sector Management Act 1995. It is not an act that was promulgated under the previous government at all. They were very different contracts, and when the government brought them in it said its whole purpose in relation to the chief executive arrangements was to stop permanent tenure for chief executives in the public service. But this government granted a contract which included a provision that this particular public servant did not have: he did not have permanent tenure at chief executive salary, and that was written in during either the Hon. Rob Lucas's time in 1995 or your own time in 1997.

The minister has said that he had a good working relationship with the former chief executive. That is not the impression that the Auditor-General gives. According to the Auditor-General, when it came to sacking this man, the minister did not even do it: it was left to a 4 January 1999 summons by the chief executive of another department to call in this man with whom you state you had a really good working relationship.

*The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:*

**Ms WHITE:** I am referring to page A3-60. No reasons were given. Do you accept the criticism of the Auditor-General in pointing out that, in fact, not only were no reasons given but also that Mr Ralph was expressly told that it was not on the basis of his performance at all that he was being sacked—given that you have just stated that it was on his ability and performance that he was sacked?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I have not stated at all within this House or at any time that it was over Mr Ralph's performance. In fact, on page A3-62 the Auditor-General in his audit comments:

As outlined, Mr Ralph was not replaced due to his performance but rather the minister doubted Mr Ralph's suitability to implement aspects of the government's proposed reform agenda for South Australian education.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Mr Ralph and I did have a very good relationship. Mr Ralph was not sacked. Mr Ralph was offered another position by the Premier. I have nothing to do with Mr Ralph's contract. The Premier holds the contracts for all CEOs, along with the Commissioner for Public Employment. If any contract is to be terminated, then it is the Premier who holds the contract. I do not hold the contract, nor do I draw up any details of the contract.

Mr Ralph went overseas in April 1998. He went to the United States and undertook a management course. He then went on to Glasgow and visited the Centre for Lifelong Learning there. It was an area in which he had always had an appreciation, and he was very impressed by the Glasgow unit. He came back, advised me of what he had seen and said that he thought this was an area that the government should be considering in the direction of its policy. The Premier in his trip overseas in October 1998 also visited that institution and came back with the same sort of report. It was decided at that stage that this would be a direction of government at some time in the future.

As I said earlier, after being in the job for about nine to 12 months, having looked at the direction in which I wanted education to go in South Australia and having looked at the massive change which was required to undertake that direction, I believed that it required, first, someone who had

a lot of experience in major change and, secondly, a different management style. So, Mr Ralph was never sacked because of his performance—as the Auditor-General recognises. I looked at it and said that it needed a different management style. Mr Spring is the best Australian administrator and is recognised internationally. He had undertaken changes in management practices in both the Northern Territory and Victoria. I decided that that was the style of management I wanted to bring into South Australia, so it was a matter of having someone to do that particular job. I had no problem with Mr Ralph's performance at all while he was with me, but it needed a different management style.

**Ms WHITE:** According to the Auditor-General's Report, this contract was only signed in June 1998. The minister signed off on Mr Ralph's performance agreement on 20 July 1998 but at no time communicated to Mr Ralph any indication or unhappiness about his performance or management style. That is the impression given in the Auditor-General's Report. Is it not simply the case that you have cost taxpayers an additional chief executive's salary—we learn now \$230 000 a year—because you did sign off on a contract about six months before the man was terminated as chief executive?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** No, not at all. The fact was that our policy direction was going along the line of forming a Centre for Lifelong Learning. So, even if Mr Ralph had remained in the position, we still would have been appointing a director for that Centre for Lifelong Learning at Mr Ralph's level at any rate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** So somewhere down the track that would have occurred. As I said before, Mr Ralph looked at the Scottish experience, as did the Premier. Both were convinced that was the policy direction we should be taking. It was discussed with me at that time. Mr Ralph gave a number of seminars to Education Department staff during that time explaining what he had seen in that area overseas. It is entirely the right direction. When you look at the changes that will occur during a person's working lifetime, as a result of changes in technology, people do require and will be required to undertake retraining throughout their working life. The Centre for Lifelong Learning is set to liaise with industry and to identify areas they can see on the horizon where we are not currently training people to fill jobs. For example, if we had more research five or 10 years ago in the area of software engineers, we may have said, 'Here is a path that economic activity will undertake,' and we could then have had a lot more people trained in that area than we currently have and so would have been able to respond to demand in the workplace. That centre will undertake that sort of research and will liaise with industry. So, even if Mr Ralph had stayed in the position, we still would have gone down that path, so the cost to the taxpayers would be no different because that centre was to be set up, anyway.

**Ms WHITE:** It seems to me that the minister has just implied that it was his idea to set up a Centre for Lifelong Learning with the chief executive salary of \$230 000. That seemed to be what the minister just said.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I did not say that at all. I said that we were setting up a Centre for Lifelong Learning and that it would probably be at that level, but that is a matter for the Premier. The contract is with the Premier. The Premier sets—

*Ms White interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! This discussion will cease across the floor. The member for Taylor will ask the question and the Minister will respond if he wishes.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The Premier has complete control over the level of salary that is in the contracts. I have no control whatsoever.

**Ms WHITE:** Who came up with the idea that the director of a \$1.3 million centre should get a salary of \$230 000? On what basis was that done; against which standards was it set; and was there a formal process which came up with that salary? I believe that the minister has said on the record that the Centre for Lifelong Learning was always going to attract that salary.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Again I cannot say this any more clearly, other than saying to the member for Taylor again that the contract is not my responsibility, nor is the setting of the level of the remuneration that anyone will receive. That is a matter between the Premier and the person who will undertake that contract.

**Ms WHITE:** The chief executive's contract was a five year contract signed in June 1998, perhaps dating back from October 1997, I am not sure. That runs out in four years' time. Will the minister be responsible for whether that centre continues and, if so, in what form; or is the Minister telling the House that the Premier will be taking control of that centre and the appointment of the chief executive? I ask the question because obviously taxpayers of South Australia are carrying this \$230 000 salary.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Currently the costs of the centre are split equally between the Department of Education and the Department of Premier and Cabinet, \$650 000 each. As I said, the Premier is the one who holds the contract with the chief executive of the Centre for Lifelong Learning, so the terms of contract are at his discretion. The control of the centre comes under the Premier's department. We are making a contribution towards the running of that centre because of the education component of it.

**Ms WHITE:** The centre controls a budget of \$1.3 million. A typical high school controls a budget of several million dollars with a principal who is paid much less than half of what this public servant is receiving. A senior sergeant at a police station who controls a significant budget does not get paid this sort of money. A similar position at a university does not attract this sort of salary. Does the minister believe that this salary is appropriate, given that his department has to contribute to a centre that, let us face it, was set up basically to find a job for a displaced public servant?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I think the last comment by the member for Taylor is quite outrageous. As I said earlier, it was a policy of this government that we were moving to set up this centre and the government made a decision to do that. So, it was not one which was created for Mr Ralph at all. Again the matter of the remuneration of Mr Ralph is between the Premier and Mr Ralph. It is not my responsibility and I do not hold the contract. The Premier holds that contract and he is the person who decides on the remuneration.

**Ms WHITE:** I take it that the minister controls the performance of the centre; that is, he has responsibility for assessing the performance of the centre and setting output targets—I am assuming that the minister might correct me. What is the centre meant to achieve in terms of output targets and how many support staff are provided from the education budget?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The management and reporting of the centre is with the Department of Premier and

Cabinet, and so we have no role in terms of the reporting procedure. We can certainly have an input in suggesting what the centre may want to research as an education department, but the actual reporting goes to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**Ms WHITE:** I refer to the Computers Plus scheme. In June 1998, in response to a question I asked the minister in estimates, he revealed that the Computers Plus program (which was an election announcement by the Liberal Government) had been funded out of the DEC*Stech* slippage. At the time the minister said that the Treasurer had instructed him to use the slippage before new money was allocated. This year the Auditor-General talks about the failure to obtain cabinet approval for the \$10.6 million Computers Plus scheme. Has any new money been allocated and spent, or has the election promise been met by slipping money out of funds budgeted to support schools to purchase computers?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** If the member for Taylor remembers, the figure for DEC*Stech* 2001 was \$75 million over five years and the additional \$10.5 million in Computer Plus adds up to \$85 million. So, yes, the total amount is \$85 million. We did not use the \$10 million out of education by taking it away from somewhere else: it is a factor of \$10.5 million. It is a matter of how you manage it where you end up with slippage. You might end up bringing the Computer Plus scheme in and using some of that slippage, but the total amount that will be expended will be \$85.5 million.

**Ms WHITE:** In Vol. 1, page 194, the Auditor-General talks about the Partnerships 21 project. The Auditor-General talks about the close off date of 27 August 1999 for schools to express their interest in Partnerships 21. In preparation for that schools were sent details of their global budgets. A number of schools have contacted me and advice has been given to the opposition that a significant number of errors have been made in those budgets. One was an error to the tune of \$9 million in advice to schools. The minister would have to confirm this for me, but I am told that the error was made in calculating the global costs of SSO salaries. Is it true that there has been a \$9 million error, and what does this mean for the global budgets of schools?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The member for Taylor is confusing a resource profile of a school with the global budget of a school. They are two entirely different things. The resource profile looks at the amount of resources that are going into a school, and it is quite different from the global budget. So, there were always going to be discussions with schools to work out exactly what their resource profile was. The department would come up with an estimated resource profile and it would be a matter of sitting down and talking with the school to do some settling around the edges about how it equates with what they have on the ground. But that is quite separate from the global budget that is now in process.

**Ms WHITE:** So, the global budget figures that all schools have been given are guaranteed? I am looking here for a guarantee that the money that has been promised will not be downgraded.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** What we have been dealing with here is a 1999 resource profile and therefore a 1999 global budget, which is what schools have been issued with thus far. Obviously, we must then look at estimated student numbers and all those sorts of things for 2000, but I can guarantee that the global budgets for 2000 will be released to schools within the next few days. They will be set for the next

three years. I guarantee that no school will be any worse off than it was under the old system, so all schools will be at least at the same level or better off; and that that budget will remain in place for three years, depending on the number of students in the school. If the number of students goes down by 50 they will not get the same global budget, because some of it is calculated on a per student basis.

**Ms WHITE:** If the school retains the same number of SSOs as was communicated to them in their profile, then they will get the amount of money that has been indicated in that document for that number of SSOs?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Yes. As the honourable member would know, SSOs are allocated according to the number of students in the school. So, as long as the number of students remains the same, the SSO allocation will remain the same. In the global budgets the costing of SSOs has been an average SSO cost, so that needs to be kept in mind, but the student and SSO ratio will remain the same.

**Ms WHITE:** On page 8.34 of this year's budget paper 4, the budget for minor works is shown to be \$7.8 million, which was a fall from a budget of \$10.3 million last year. I understand that these funds have now been allocated. How much has been allocated to projects and how much of that money has been redirected to the Partnerships 21 project?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I do not have those figures with the Auditor-General's Report; I do not have the budget papers in front of me. This has not been raised at all in the Auditor-General's Report.

**Ms WHITE:** Sir, the Auditor-General devotes several pages to Partnerships 21. This is a question on that very project and the funds allocated to minor works; has some of that money been redirected into Partnerships 21?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I do not have those figures in front of me, but I will obtain them for the member for Taylor. As I said, it is a budget issue.

**Ms WHITE:** I have a question on the Construction Industry Training Board, which is dealt with on pages 167 and 168. To recap, the board was set up in September 1993 and there was a commitment in that establishing legislation that there would be a review of the CITB. The Auditor-General refers to this. The then minister, the Hon. Bob Such, was quite late in doing that review, but a report was brought forward in November 1997. On page 168 of volume 1 of his report the Auditor-General lists a number of recommendations that were made. He then goes on to comment that last year he stated in his report that there had been no outcome from that minister's review of the independent report and that this year the position at the date of the preparation of this report was that there had been no outcome. Why is it taking so long to address the recommendations of that report of November 1997, which is now almost two years old?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Yes, that review was conducted, and in seeking further advice from both the industry and the Crown Solicitor the Crown Solicitor raised the issue of the levy, so we are currently looking at the way in which that levy on the construction industry can be undertaken. I would expect that by early in the new year we will have a model which will satisfy Crown Law and that we will be able to collect that money from the construction industry.

**Ms WHITE:** One of the recommendations of that report is the rather controversial proposal to raise the level of the value of works to which the levy applies: the suggestion is up to \$15 000. I know that some very strong lobbying has been going on for a number of years, and I suspect that that is one

of the reasons why this has taken so long. Is the minister in favour of that measure or against it?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I stand to be corrected but, from memory, the recommendation from that review was that the levy should drop to \$5 000, and I support that. A number of industries raised the issue of the \$15 000. We looked at interstate levels and they were significantly lower than \$15 000. I am fairly sure that the review recommendation was \$5 000.

**Ms KEY:** I will direct my first question to the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training with regard to salaries and wages, and also records. I note that on page 178 of volume 1 of the Auditor-General's papers comments were made with regard to salaries and wages systems. I was interested to read about some of the initiatives and changes that are taking place.

I have had a number of inquiries in my office, mainly to do with my industrial relations responsibilities for our party, with regard to the lack of records for auxiliary workers in particular, that do not exist in the Education Department with regard to long service leave, superannuation and other leave entitlements. Is the minister aware of the issues that have certainly been raised with me, and has any action been taken or practices put in place to remedy the situation? The two examples are, first, a school cleaner employed by the Education Department who later went on to a contract to do cleaning at the particular school. So, it was understood that the contract of employment changed, but there were no records of the 15 years service which that woman had had with the Education Department.

More recently I have had two people come to see me who had worked in school canteens and understood that they were employed at least initially by the Education Department and, when they went to leave the service of their school, in both instances for 11 years, they were told that there were no records whatsoever of their employment with the Education Department over that period and they were requested, and then instructed, to bring in their time books that they had coincidentally kept for the 11 years to work out whether they had the entitlements they said they had.

I have also had a couple of other examples of SSOs coming in to see me to say that they had been told, in the two instances I have dealt with lately, that their long service leave, carers leave or urgent necessity leave was hard to work out because no records were available to them. I hope I am just seeing a few people in these circumstances, but I would appreciate a comment from the minister.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I thank the member for Hanson for her comments. The auditor has raised a few comments in his report and the department is acting on the issues he has raised. We are working with the Auditor-General to seek a set of standards that he is happy with in terms of payroll performance so that that can be measured.

In terms of the contract cleaners, I am advised that that has always been a contract with the school, so the school, and not the department, should be holding those records. The same applies with canteen staff as the school council employs those staff, so the school council or the school should be holding those records. If the honourable member has any problems or queries she should not hesitate to contact me and we will sort them out.

**Ms KEY:** I will now direct my questions to the Minister for Youth Affairs. I refer to an announcement made in March this year both at a multicultural youth speak out and an announcement by the Premier in a media release with regard

to ethnic youth development officers in local councils. In looking through the Auditor-General's Report it is difficult to identify very much to do with the youth affairs area, which was of concern to me, but to cover my question I refer the minister to page 176, where the new structure of the Office of Employment and Youth is set out, and perhaps see whether he can shed some light on what I see as a very important role of ethnic youth development officers in councils.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** The shadow minister for youth is quite right: it is not covered in this report, so she catches me—as her colleague caught the minister—quite unprepared. I will give the best answer I can and will follow up with some supplementary information. It is true that we sought to embark upon a program in concert with the Office of Local Government. We had a number of aims in that program and invited expressions of interest in it. I believe we had a number of councils that put in expressions of interest. Those expressions of interest (and there have been three) in at least two of the cases simply did not meet the criteria sought and in the third the criteria was not satisfactory. That being the case, having said we wished to do something and having asked who would be interested in doing it, we were faced with the fact that we had no satisfactory respondents to what we sought to do and we are now rethinking the way we do that.

The shadow minister is quite right: the area of non-English speaking background young people is an important area. I have reason to believe that the shadow minister herself went so far as to try to facilitate some new rapport between the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia and the MCC, and I commend her for doing that because she is a better person than I if she could achieve that aim, and I now she could not. By that action the shadow minister acknowledges that it is a very important area and, in whatever we do for all youth, we must not neglect the needs of specific youth such as those of any NES background. I will get a fuller answer on this, but I hope the shadow minister will accept the fact that, just because we seek to do something, we will not throw money at it unless we get proper, decent programs. We want to achieve something in this area, but throwing money is not the answer—getting good programs is. This is having a glitch upon the way, because we have to get good programs up. I will answer the question more completely later.

**Ms KEY:** I notice on page 209 of volume 1 that there is reference to output class for employment services and for youth affairs. I am pleased to say that in looking at the Liberal Party's focus on youth policy before the last state election there are a number of initiatives the minister seems to be following through with regard to the youth affairs portfolio. The amalgamation of employment and youth has been criticised by some quarters, and if we had more time I would be interested to examine that area and the rationale for doing that.

In the election policy there was a promise of three year funding for the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, and I wonder whether the minister could comment on whether that election promise will be fulfilled and whether it does fit with very positive output class in the youth affairs area over which the minister has presided.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** Very briefly, there is no amalgamation of the departments. I happen to be Minister for Youth, I happen to be Minister for Employment and I happen to be working in concert with Minister Buckby in a larger aggregation. We are seeking to provide the most streamlined service to me as a minister wearing two hats, and we are

doing that by reallocation of staff. However, there will be, within my portfolio areas for which the minister has given me responsibility, a discreet youth provision service as there will be a discreet employment provision service, where there is some bringing together in the policy development area because, as the shadow minister will appreciate, policy is a very specific area and there are very few gifted people on it. So, we are trying to put a small gifted team together that can think across two areas which, although different, are not dissimilar in the way you bring to bear on it. But it is not amalgamation of youth and employment; it is a better use of our services.

In regard to YACCSA (and I am quite sure that the shadow minister can ask me a thousand questions and keep asking me questions on this matter, and I will keep answering them), there has been a decision this year to fund YACCSA for one year. It has a performance agreement which it is currently considering—a contract which it is currently considering—which was not drawn up by me; it was drawn up by Crown Law at arms-length from me and it is being discussed between my officers and its officers. That is about to be signed. I have told YACCSA that for next year it has been invited to put forward the case for triennial funding. I have also told YACCSA that the funding given to me by the Treasurer (and given, I think, to the minister even in his department) is an annual funding. Given the percentage of the youth portfolio that goes to YACCSA, it is difficult, without the Treasurer's agreement, to ongoing commitment from my perspective to just grant carte blanche over 10 per cent of that budget committed in advance. But I go back to saying that I am open to discussion. I have invited YACCSA to discuss the matter with me with respect to funding from next year. With respect to funding for this year, the government has made a decision, the government has announced its decision and the government will implement its decision.

Time expired.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I now call on the Minister for Environment and Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. I understand that 30 minutes has been allocated for this line.

**Mr HILL:** My first question to the minister is a general question that covers a number of the specific areas of the portfolio document, and it is to do with the Y2K compliance provisions. Initially, I draw the minister's attention to page 310, which is the report in relation to the northern Adelaide and Barossa catchment authority; to page 316, which is the Onkapinga catchment authority; to page 304, which is the Torrens Catchment Water Management Board; and to page 297, which is the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board. I do this because, with respect to the first two to which I referred, it is stated:

While the board is making every effort to mitigate risks, there can be no absolute assurance that the year 2000 readiness program will be completely successful.

In relation to the latter two (the Torrens and Patawalonga, and I think it also refers to one of the other boards), the auditor says:

While the board is making every effort to mitigate risks, there can be no reasonable assurance. . .

So, there is quite a difference in meaning there between 'absolute assurance' and 'reasonable assurance'. I would have thought that if you cannot give reasonable assurance it means that there is a high probability there will be a problem. I

invite the minister to comment on the two terms and how they apply to her various boards.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** In relation to catchment boards, they are statutory authorities and the Auditor-General does, of course, audit the books of the catchments. As the member for Kaurna has quite rightly pointed out, there are difficulties at the moment that have been recognised in terms of taking the boards through to a reasonable mitigating factor on Y2K. However, as the Auditor-General has also pointed out, the boards at this present time are taking every possible measure, although they may not, in fact, be able to conclude a satisfactory arrangement by the end of the year 1999. At the moment they are progressing to the greatest degree possible. I cannot give the member any assurances on behalf of the boards that, in fact, they will be able to complete the Y2K arrangements. However, I can assure him that every possible assistance will be given to the boards by DEHAA in terms of the information that we have that may support the moves towards their compliance with Y2K.

**Mr HILL:** Can the minister explain what risks there are in association with this low level of assurance? Is the community at risk in any way—is there anything likely to happen that we should be warned of?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** At this time, quite obviously, the means by which the catchment boards are using computer systems is mainly for data collection in the range of programs and, obviously, to complete some of their water allocation plans and their comprehensive management plans, the data collection is, of course, a valuable source. At this point in time, we do not see that it will have any realised mitigating factor that will impede the progress of those plans—both water allocation or the comprehensive management plans.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to page 289 in relation to the River Murray Catchment Water Management Board. The auditor goes on, I think at fair length, about some of the problems with the board. He says, in part, in the first paragraph under General Control Environment:

... the financial aspects of the board's operations could be improved. Most of these observations related to the adequacy of internal control mechanisms and the level of documented policies and procedures and included observations relating to revenue and grant expenditure. . .

He goes on to say:

... there continue to be fundamental control weaknesses that inhibit the reporting of reliable financial information on water-based levies due and payable to the board.

Can the minister comment on some of these problems and say what action has been taken to address them?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The member is quite right. The fact that the River Murray board has, indeed, been qualified requires some perspective in as much as, to date, as the member would know, six catchment water management boards have been established, and the enormous effort and achievements that this government has made in relation to their establishment should be recognised. In fact, all boards are now operating with minimal direct support from the department, which is certainly a major step forward. Nevertheless, it is recognised that, obviously, there can still be further refinement. The River Murray board, the South-East board and the North Adelaide board have all moved through very similar circumstances. In terms of time and effort that has been spent on addressing the very specific concerns that have been raised by the Auditor-General, and with the introduction of various controls and procedures, we do not expect to see the catchment boards, in effect, qualified in the

future. Some of the controls and procedures that we have looked at putting in to make sure that the move to no qualification in the future have been improvements to systems issues, further controls relating to the water licensing system, reconciliations that are now being performed on a monthly basis and looking at new internal controls and reporting structures within many of the different areas that obviously the Auditor-General has been concerned about. However, as I say, we believe that the catchment water management board's statements will not need to be qualified in the future because of these measures that have now been put into place.

**Mr HILL:** I am sure that we are all comforted by those guarantees. I refer to one other particular reference on page 290—and I find that this is of some concern, because it is in the area of grant expenditure. The Auditor-General states:

... there was little direct involvement in relation to the evaluation of projects, monitoring of performance and the acquittal of funds provided.

That would be of great concern, and I wonder whether the minister or the department have taken any particular action to make sure that evaluation is now occurring properly.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The Auditor-General did suggest that the River Murray catchment board needed greater involvement in the assessment and evaluation of the Natural Heritage Trust projects funded by the board. It is important to note that the funding of Natural Heritage Trust projects is sourced from commonwealth and state governments as well as the River Murray catchment board itself. Therefore, accountability must cut across each territory and in fact satisfy all the funds. Accordingly, the department has ensured that its own assessment and evaluation requirements have been met and has also instigated the River Murray catchment board's involvement. In fact, representatives of the board participated in the latest round of project evaluations and approvals for the Murray-Darling 2001 program. They will continue to be involved in future rounds of funding evaluations and approvals. The honourable member will find that it will be necessary for ongoing discussions facilitated by officers of my department to ensure that there is evaluation, monitoring and reporting of program outcomes to the board to meet its requirements while remaining consistent, of course, with the established protocols required across all levels of government that all take part in this cross funding of projects.

**Mr HILL:** I now refer to page 298, the operating statement for the year ended 30 June 1999. I ask the minister to comment on the line 'community education and awareness' in relation to the Torrens catchment board. It indicates that between 1998 and 1999 the sum grew from \$751 000 to over \$1 million in community education and awareness. I cannot help but think that that is an enormous amount of expenditure on what is public relations, publicity and so on. Will the minister provide more detail and assure us that this level of expenditure will diminish as time goes on?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The honourable member would be well aware that the catchment boards must report directly to the Economic and Finance Committee at the end of each financial year, including all their financial documents, in an annual report. That is the means of accountability and transparency that has been dictated by this parliament as a process to ensure that the funds that are expended through the catchment boards are subject to a great deal of scrutiny. I do not believe that there is in fact a qualification on the amount. I can only suggest to the honourable member that, if he is at



all concerned, he should direct a comment to the Economic and Finance Committee or in fact look at the annual reports of the catchment boards themselves.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to page 302 in relation to the Torrens catchment board again. This is not the only board where this occurs, but I note that some committee members of the board are now being paid between \$20 000 and \$29 999. I assume that they are part-time members of the board. Is this an unusually high amount to be paying board members?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Once again, because we have no qualification or question from the Auditor-General on this particular aspect, I can only suggest to the member that it shows in 1998 that no members received that amount; however, it is established that in 1999 one member received an amount between \$20 000 and \$29 999. I cannot give the honourable member a categorical answer about who is receiving that amount of money; however, it is also pertinent to point out that the rest of the members, numbering seven, receive an amount between \$0 and \$9 999. But I cannot establish offhand who is receiving the larger amount and the reasons why.

**Mr HILL:** I assume that it is the presiding officer, but it does seem to me an extraordinarily large sum for a member of a board, even if the member is the presiding officer. Perhaps we can refer that to another committee at another time. I refer to page 304 where the Auditor talks at point 14 about contingent liability and indicates that the Torrens board is in a dispute with a contractor that has been scheduled for hearing at the end of September 1999. Apparently, a contract of about \$260 000 is involved. It is now past late September 1999. Will the minister say whether or not this matter has been resolved and who was the victor?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** At this point I cannot say that the matter has in fact been resolved: I can only suggest that the comments we see here are the current comments and that the management board is currently in dispute.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to page 332 where the Auditor-General says that during 1998-99 DEHAA recognised \$121 million of non-current assets for the first time, including assets associated with both protected areas and non-protected areas. The Auditor-General also said that tests showed the records to include significant examples of incorrect data. Will the minister detail how this \$121 million was recognised and why it was not included in previous accounts?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I believe that we had discussions on this in last year's Auditor-General's Report as well, remembering that all the departments are moving towards the new accounting systems. Of course, the transition to accrual accounting has certainly not been easy. In the property, plant and equipment section, which I believe is the area to which the honourable member is referring, the Auditor-General noted that the department experienced some difficulties in recognising some fixed assets as required under the relevant Australian accounting standard, AAS-29. First time asset recognition under this accounting standard required implementation prior to 30 June 1999. This was a process that involved the identification of assets as well as the ability to ascribe appropriate valuations under the guidance of accounting policy statements.

I am pleased to report that officers of my department were able to attend to this task successfully, which the honourable member will understand was quite immense and certainly resource intensive as well as labour intensive. It involved a detailed program of identification and valuation of assets in some 300 parks or more and reserves throughout the state.

During the last financial year alone the department recognised over 30 000 assets for the first time in the agency statement of financial position. The quantum of assets incorrectly recognised, misclassified or, indeed, inappropriately depreciated, referred to by the Auditor-General, was less than 100.

Although there is a qualification in this area, it is very pleasing to know, given the time and effort taken over the past year to identify over 30 000 assets, that the only qualification related to 100 out of that complete total. It is not pleasing that we still have to worry about the 100 still there, but it is very pleasing that, out of 30 000, 100 or fewer were referred to by the Auditor-General. Once the errors were identified, remedial action was very quickly and efficiently attended to by the officers of the department.

The Auditor-General has also raised issues in relation to a lack of quality control, internal control and independent checking during the asset recognition work that was undertaken by the department, but I contend that any of the failings in these areas, whilst a general concern, did not preclude the department from producing an accurate picture of its asset holdings. I assure the honourable member that the department will continue to consult with officers of the Auditor-General's Department in order to refine the valuation methodology models and the internal controls that are currently implemented. The department has already facilitated discussions and provided an indicative plan to achieve improvement throughout the 1999-2000 year.

**Mr HILL:** I refer the minister to page 331 where, under 'Financial Management Framework', a number of dot points are made, the second of which refers to high risk policy gaps. The Auditor-General states:

DEHAA is in the process of developing a comprehensive risk management policy statement and has completed an internal control framework project which identifies 'high risk policy gaps' and the implementation of remedial steps.

Will the minister identify some of those high risk policy gaps and give some idea of the steps being undertaken to fill the gaps?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** This is quite an extensive area in terms of the risk management policy statement, and I am not quite sure how much information the honourable member would like. I know that he likes the answers to be fairly short so that he can move on to the next question, so perhaps we will attempt a bit of a summary although, as I say, there is a degree of complexity in this. Perhaps, first, it would be important to say that the department has made significant progress towards implementing the prescribed elements of the financial management framework during 1998-99 and coming into 1999-2000.

In terms of a summary of the framework that involves the strategies, we have a risk management and internal control; that is, the profile of risk management was significantly raised in DEHAA over the past 12 months. To cover risk management, a single framework internal control and prudential management has already been approved by the chief executive. Improved levels of administrative policy documentation and articulation were achieved as a result of the successfully completed internal control framework project. This project identified some high risk policy gaps and led to the steps to redress them. The risk management audit committee had been approved to set, to direct and to monitor risk, internal control, internal audit and prudential initiatives across the agency.

The committee will oversee an annual program of initiatives to be undertaken by the supporting management

assurance team, with the corporate operations branch. Recruitment of staff with the specialised skills in those areas is already well advanced. The management assurance team has primary responsibility for leading the mainstreaming of contemporary control and risk management measures across the agency. Facilitating development of the required skills for risk management at local management levels is in fact the key element of this strategy. Specialised training, as the honourable member can imagine, is also extremely important, once one has identified all these aspects.

Specialised training in risk management principles and their use at strategic management level has already occurred for six key managers in conjunction with the ACN organisation and SACOR. Consultants have also been engaged to construct and deliver a specialised internal audit training program for up to 15 key DEHAA staff. Risk management principles have been given prominence in the department's lead-up to the GST regime. Contract reviews and internal control adequacy in systems have all been given a high priority to mitigate potential loss and to take advantage of opportunities revealed in those reviews.

An advanced occupational health, safety and welfare management plan for the agency, also based on risk management and continuous improvement principles, is nearing an end and its consultation phase is almost over. We believe that will guide improved performance in the agency in this area over the next two years.

As to public risk liability management, exposures to the agency have been identified and they have been managed by the application of risk management techniques and treatments transferred from the agency's experience and expertise in occupational health, safety and welfare hazard reduction programs. A cooperative review by DEHAA and SACOR is in progress to establish opportunities for reducing the state's exposure from DEHAA's operations.

A range of prudential management and governance measures have been declared and articulated by the chief executive as part of a wide ranging project. The measures ensure that many of the boards and committees within the portfolio are all aware of their prudential responsibilities and are provided with the requisite authority to perform their respective roles. High on that risk exposure list are the prudential and control issues associated with contract negotiation, contract construction and contract management.

Risk reduction and management strategies for these major exposures are already in place, including insurance cover where appropriate. There has been a substantial project, which was completed in conjunction with the Crown Solicitor's Office and SACOR, to identify and improve contract documentation and management throughout the agency.

**Mr HILL:** I refer now to page 335, relating to waste depot levies. Following similar reports over the past two years, the Auditor-General once again draws attention to a lack of accountability for waste levies. On 18 February 1998, the Minister told the House that this would be fixed within six months, and on 19 June 1998 the minister said that all was in hand. Why has the minister not ensured that waste levies are paid? Has the minister any estimate of how much revenue is being lost each year? How is the plan to reduce waste to landfills by the year 2000 going? Will the EPA licences for the Dublin and Inkermann tips require weighbridges to be built?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The honourable member is quite right: this is an area that has plagued us considerably but it

is one in which we have done a lot of work. It is important to note that developing the mechanisms for reflective waste levy payments is indeed complex and, quite obviously, they are going to require changes to existing practices under the Environment Protection Act and the 1992 regulations. Perhaps if the honourable member wants me to cut this down, knowing that he is always interested in the financial aspects, I can deal with the question about the penalties.

The Auditor-General reported in 1997-98 that penalties for late payment by waste depot operators were not levied. The Environment Protection Act 1993 provides for penalties to be applied and interest charged if a company is in default of payment.

Subject to regulation 16 a person licensed to conduct a waste depot must as soon as is practicable after the last day of each month furnish a return to the Environment Protection Authority. In order to provide consistency in determining what is meant by 'as soon as is practicable' the Environment Protection Authority determined that returns be received within three weeks of the end of the month.

In relation to late payments during 1998-99, two companies out of 35 did not comply with the three week deadline. One company negotiated a four week deadline and has since complied with that deadline. Therefore, technically, the company is not deemed to be late. The other companies' disputing the amount of levy payable requires the consideration of legal issues. Accordingly, overdue notices have not been sent out while those particular legal issues are being addressed.

In relation to policies and procedures for late payments, the current procedure followed by the Environment Protection Agency involves the revenue officer contacting waste depot operators if they have not paid by the due date, that is, three weeks after the end of the month, and requesting immediate payment. To ensure that timely payments are received in 1999-2000 procedural changes have been implemented. First, the revenue officer now records the date the payments are received on the levy return schedule and, secondly, a financial accountant authorises the return each month and initiates any penalties that are required. This policy will be documented by EPA officers by the end of November 1999.

**Mr HILL:** I refer to page 335 under the heading 'Water licensing system'. The Auditor-General draws attention to what appears to be serious deficiencies in the water base licensing system with respect to recording allocations, levies, licences and licence transfers. Are these records being centrally kept or are they kept on a regional basis; what is being done to address these issues; and are there any implications for Crown revenue?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The Water Resources Act of 1997—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —only if it is sub judice— provides many changes to the licensing administration.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The department anticipated a number of these changes and amended the water licensing system accordingly. The water licensing system was ready from day one to issue new water based levy accounts and allowed for payments by instalment. Accounts receivable modules were developed in account for unpaid accounts. It was not until after the levies had been raised and the catchment boards were set up that additional requirements became

quite clear, for example, calculating interest on unpaid amounts and having different billing cycles, etc. As soon as these were identified programmers were engaged to make the necessary modifications to the water licensing system. One to two full-time contract programmers have been working on the system and making modifications and enhancements since January 1996.

As well as addressing the concerns raised by the Auditor-General, other modifications and enhancements are being made which will enable better licensing administration. They will also provide better management information and certainly will take into account new requirements in newly proclaimed areas. If the member is not satisfied with that portion of the answer, I can elucidate further if he wishes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would suggest the member for Kaurua needs to be satisfied with that answer because the time allocated for the examination of matters regarding the report of the Auditor-General relating to the Minister for Environment and Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has expired. I call on the Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and Minister for Local Government. I understand 45 minutes has been allocated for the examination of this line.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Has the Basketball Association of South Australia met all its government loan repayments for the Powerhouse on time and is it currently up to date?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The Basketball Association has been negotiating with government about extra government assistance in relation to development of the game. In part, that is in relation to the level of debt that the association carries on the Clipsal Powerhouse as owner of the Powerhouse. It has some broad concerns about the level of debt it is carrying and the interest payments on that debt drawing away from other areas to develop the game.

The government has been negotiating with the Basketball Association in relation to the stadium for probably four to six months, both through me and the Treasurer. We have gone back a number of times with suggested options. My understanding is that those negotiations are still ongoing. I do not have with me tonight the actual payments, but I am happy to get that detail to the honourable member. I am aware of some issues that the Basketball Association has raised. We are trying to be supportive to the association in relation to how it might be able to further develop the game.

In fact, tonight or tomorrow we are actually announcing that we have offered \$75 000 towards a new facility at the Daws Road area. Members might recall that one of the stadiums got burnt down. The stadium at Daws Road High School, from memory, is now being replaced and that is all part of the development of basketball. They have a strategic plan that outlines eight to ten stadiums throughout the State and we are trying to work with them on that plan. I can get the detail of the payments, etc.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The Auditor-General comments about Hindmarsh stadium. What is the detail in relation to the long-term resolution strategy which he says is required for Hindmarsh stadium? Are you able to add any further detail to the Auditor-General's comment?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that the Auditor-General has not articulated what that strategy might be or what the issues are that he is raising there. Obviously, those matters will be taken up with him, but I can only assume it would not be any different from the issues that other members have raised or the Public Works Committee has raised in relation to ensuring that the terms and conditions under the

deed are properly met—things such as operating a separate profit centre, resolving ownership of the land and so on.

As I advised the House the other day, we have been in negotiations with the City of the Charles Sturt for a little over a year in relation to ownership of the land. As the honourable member well knows, we have had discussions with the Soccer Federation for about 12 months in relation to the levy payments. That negotiation and consultation got confused because of the then Adelaide Sharks being put in liquidation. It was then very difficult for government to negotiate any firm outcome because we were not sure whether we would be negotiating with Adelaide City and Adelaide Sharks, or just Adelaide City, or a group organised by Peter Emery, or a new group organised by the federation itself. It has only been in the past few weeks, since it was clarified that there is only one team here, that we have been able to regenerate those negotiations. Certainly, it is the ownership issue and the terms and conditions of the deed, but we will be taking up the issues that the Auditor-General thinks need to be addressed in that regard.

**Mr WRIGHT:** My next question is about the Soccer Federation and the loan repayments. In what way and by how much has the South Australian Soccer Federation's loan repayments been altered since first negotiated; and is the federation meeting its current commitment?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Essentially nothing has changed. We suspended the payments pending the outcome of the consultant's review, and in the middle of that review the Sharks went into liquidation and the circumstances I have just described occurred. The Sharks were eventually wound up. We now find ourselves with one team. The House is aware that there were discussions with me and the Premier in the past fortnight—I cannot remember the exact date, but certainly in the last fortnight. In fact, I had another discussion with the Soccer Federation tonight about that very issue. The deeds are structured on the basis of a federation and two national soccer league clubs. We now find ourselves with a federation and one national soccer league club. In a way this will be the peril of all governments in the future because, as more and more professional teams become privately owned—not that our soccer teams are—then the future use of stadiums will become less certain.

Take the basketball fraternity as an example and the number of privately owned teams that exist for five years and then do not exist any more. What do you do with the stadium afterwards? Rugby is a classic example, and we saw what happened with the Adelaide Rams. They were here for 18 months or two years and then gone. It is very common in America where, in fact, states buy teams as an economic development exercise and transfer them across whole states. Australia is just reaching that point and a very complex policy development area for government is the matter of what it does with a publicly owned stadium that is used by a privately owned team when the private owners of the team decide they want to play somewhere else.

While we do not face that exact situation here at the moment, it will be something to which future governments will have to apply their mind, because trying to work out future arrangements of stadium management, income streams and that sort of thing will be difficult. On the matter concerning the suspension of the levies, we went back to the Soccer Federation with an option about a week ago and that is the matter about which they came to talk to us tonight. We are talking about options. I guess we are caught in not being able to resolve that matter tonight, in that the Adelaide City Soccer

Club and the federation have to come to some agreement and that agreement then has to be agreed to by government because it may impose more or less cost on government or involve different conditions under the deed. We are trying to resolve a three-way agreement, but I can certainly advise the honourable member that we are trying to resolve it quickly and obviously trying to resolve it so that soccer can grow in this state.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The Auditor-General has reported extensively regarding his concerns over whether the Ciccarollo consultancy delivered value for money. The Auditor-General's concerns included lack of documentation, inadequate specifications for the engagement of the consultants, lack of a public tender process, no formal contracts and no evaluation of the consultancy. I thought prior to tonight that that consultancy payment may have come out of tourism, but will the minister confirm that it was paid out of his portfolio area?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I saw in *Hansard* your earlier question to the Minister for Tourism, and I noted it with interest. I have checked with an officer of recreation and sport who was with me tonight and he advises me that the consultancy payments were out of the Office of Recreation and Sport or the industry trade section, not tourism.

**Mr WRIGHT:** In that case I have to progress with the questions. Why and how did this appalling situation come about? What action has the government taken to ensure that the Auditor-General's concerns have been addressed, and can the minister indicate whether other consultancies that were awarded were as fast and loose as this one?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I note the throw-away line at the end about fast and loose. There is a standard set of guidelines within the department, of course, and the department has been requested to ensure that future consultancies are let in accordance with those general guidelines. In relation to the first part of the question, I have answered those questions in the House before in relation to previous ministers with a view, as I understand it, that the olympic soccer tournament could be handled in one of two ways. One way was to bid by using internal public servants, and the honourable member has suggested using an organisation such as Major Events. Major Events still costs the taxpayer money. If you bring two or three people into Major Events to bid for the Olympic football tournament or any major event, then there are the associated salaries, secretaries, rent and accommodation. There are still all those costs, so there is still a cost to the taxpayer.

The minister of the day decided, for his own reasons, to bring in an external consultant to help negotiate, as I understand it, the memorandum of understanding with the Sydney Olympics. So, rather than an internal cost through the department, it was an external cost (still to taxpayers) through a consultant. I understand that that process took about three or four months. The first minister involved was Minister Ashenden. Then, as I understand it, Minister Ingerson took the view that the consultancy should continue. Therefore, once the memorandum of understanding with the Sydney Olympic Committee (SOCOG) was negotiated, the consultancy would continue so that the requirements of SOCOG and government were met and the consultant could advise the minister to ensure that all the requirements under that particular consultancy were being met.

The honourable member may ask what sort of requirements are involved under the MOU. As I understand it, under the MOU you have to deal with things such as training

venues, transport, accommodation, food—and bear in mind that different cultures will have different food and dietary requirements—translation services, cultural services involving different religions and so on. There are all those sort of requirements in a massive undertaking such as the Olympics. Over the years they have developed a set of requirements for each host venue and the consultancy, as I understand it, was kept on so that the consultant could advise the minister of the day that the government and indeed SOCOG were meeting their requirements under the terms of the memorandum of understanding, as well as indicating what the government should take up with SOCOG to make sure that certain things happen. That was the reason why the consultancy, as I understand it, was taken on.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I have one more question at this stage about the Hindmarsh stadium. I appreciate the negotiations that are occurring at the moment—and they are probably at a delicate stage—but has the minister given any consideration to the management of the Hindmarsh stadium if the Soccer Federation is not able to handle this ongoing problem as it stands at the moment?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** There are really probably only two or three outcomes available when you look at the position where government and soccer find themselves in relation to the stadium; that is, soccer, an independent committee or government could manage it. I have suggested to soccer on an informal basis that it should get some independent advice on its long-term capability to manage the stadium. I do that on this basis. Australia's population base is very centralised and I ask members to look at the number of stadiums that are built to get a financial return. In this state members could probably say that Football Park is the only stadium that has ever been built by commercial operators for a commercial return, that is, to cover its maintenance and rebuild cost. Football Park is probably the only one that has put its hand up to say that it can do that.

All the other stadiums have been built as pieces of social infrastructure, whether it be the velodrome built by the previous Labor Government, Pines hockey stadium, the Adelaide Aquatic Centre or, for that matter, the museum or library: they are really pieces of social infrastructure, not necessarily designed to return their full cost to the taxpayer or even to obtain a rate of return on the investment. They are part of living in Australia and part of the Australian culture, with its very strong sport and recreation ethic. The same can be said for walking trails in a way, too. A huge investment is put into walking trails and we do not charge the people who use them and never will. They are a piece of social infrastructure. They are important, we all use them, but taxpayers do not expect a return on them.

So, in that respect, on the management of the stadium we have talked informally to the Soccer Federation about going away and getting some advice on whether they will have the capacity to manage the stadium in the long term. We have raised the point that they need to think about all the other stadiums that are managed by independent groups or other committees, not necessarily the sport. They need to make a judgment within their own federation committee about whether they think they have the capacity to manage the stadium and take on the financial responsibility in the long term. I understand they have undertaken to get advice from a consultancy on that and that they have had preliminary advice on that, and they are coming back with more information on what that might tell them and what their options might be. We have an open mind in relation to the management.

Whatever management structure is put in place, it will be done only in what the government and the federation believe are in the best interests of the sport.

At the end of the day, whatever happens with the stadium, the sport needs to grow. It is one of the biggest participation sports in the world and certainly one of the biggest in Australia, and there seems no reason why it would not grow, given proper management and marketing. While the stadium is one issue in the development of the sport of soccer, I have just as big a concern and interest in their plans to grow the sport and get greater participation of kids in the sport so that, just as every SANFL under-eight wants to play at Football Park, every young soccer player will want to play at Hindmarsh stadium. At the end of the day that can only be a good thing.

**Mr McEWEN:** I want to follow up with a couple of questions in relation to the stadium. I heard what the minister said about the Ciccarello consultancy. Did that consultancy do any work on the likely cost to the government of having the teams here for the six soccer matches, including air fares, accommodation, support staff and so on? Did Mr Ciccarello indicate what that was likely to cost?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not know whether Mr Ciccarello's consultancy itself did that. Certainly estimates were done, because there are certain budget requirements under the MOU. In the estimates committees 18 months ago minister Ingerson released a figure in answer to a tabled question about what it would cost taxpayers. My understanding was that it was about \$6.25 million as part of the budget to run the SOCOG events here. So, calculations have certainly been done within government. Whether they were done formally as part of that consultancy is an important point I can check; if the point of the question is whether the sums were done, yes, they were done. If the question is whether they were done by the consultant, I will have to get that checked for the honourable member.

**Mr McEWEN:** I think it is important in terms of justifying the expenditure on the consultancy, so I will take that question on notice. If the minister is saying that that was part of his job, we would want to see some detailed work in terms of what the underlying cost to the government was likely to be. Has any work been done in terms of the recurrent expenditure for maintaining stage 2?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes; part of the consultancy that the Soccer Federation is having done relates to the question we have asked regarding the long-term management issue. My understanding is that the consultant is doing work in relation to the now increased costs of managing the stadium. Obviously, there are extra seats so there is extra cleaning; there is a larger area, so there is extra maintenance; and there is more painting and so on. The Soccer Federation is doing work by getting independent advice from a consultant as to what its now increased recurrent costs for managing the stadium will be. This is part of the question we have asked them about what they see as the long-term management of the stadium. We have asked them that exact question and to go away and look at their capacity to manage not only the sponsorships and ticket sales and those sorts of things but also the cost structure that is now becoming evident in relation to the management of the stadium.

**Mr McEWEN:** With regard to one of the main sources of revenue to meet the new increased liability, I understand that the minister said earlier that there would be no discussion with the one remaining national league club about leaving Hindmarsh and going to alternative stadiums. Have there

been discussions and has a proposition been put to the minister that would see the remaining club going to cheaper venues?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, we have certainly had discussions in the last fortnight with Adelaide Force and the Soccer Federation in relation to media reports that they were considering using the Norwood venue. I met with the Adelaide City, Soccer Federation and Soccer Australia representatives two weeks ago in relation to those media reports. We told them that it was our expectation that the agreement would be enforced in relation to playing all national soccer league games at Hindmarsh. That was the undertaking we had on letterhead from Soccer Australia, and we expected that to continue. They decided to break the meeting so that the three parties could go away and do some negotiations themselves. About 1½ hours later I received a phone call from one of the representatives at the meeting to say that the matter had been resolved and that they would be playing at Hindmarsh.

**Mr McEWEN:** Are the accounts of the South Australian Soccer Federation audited annually and does the minister have access to them?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My understanding is that the Soccer Federation accounts are audited annually and, under the terms of the deeds, I have access to any document that I request within five days. I know that for a fact, and I am pretty sure that there is also a requirement for them to send their final accounts to me anyway, so I understand I can get them under two mechanisms there.

**Mr McEWEN:** Is the minister satisfied with the latest audited accounts of the South Australian Soccer Federation?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We are still seeking advice on the final accounts and exactly how they have accounted for certain items. I would have had about six or seven meetings with the Soccer Federation over the past three or four months in relation to a number of matters. In fairness to the Soccer Federation, every time I have raised a question I believe they have made a genuine attempt to answer it. We have also tried to make some judgment about Adelaide Force's and the previous Adelaide Sharks' accounts in relation to whether some of their expenses were increasing due to player payments, increased coaches' fees, etc. So, we have been analysing the accounts of the clubs and the federation over the past two years now in order to try to get a grip on exactly how they account for their expenditure and income. We have raised with the federation the need to account as required under the deed, and particularly accounting for a separate profit centre, and I understand that they are making a genuine attempt to do that. As to whether I am totally satisfied, until I get the final advice I will reserve my judgment, but I think they are making a genuine attempt at least to account according to the deed generally.

**Mr McEWEN:** As a follow-up from that, is there a potential conflict of interest in that the South Australian Soccer Federation has a responsibility on behalf of affiliate clubs to manage the facility, yet the federation in its own right actually competes with its own affiliated clubs in terms of the use of the facilities? For example, they themselves sell the signage, and I would be interested in some of the arrangements and commissions that are part of selling signage. They themselves sell season tickets—at a discounted price compared to the price at which others can sell tickets. Does the minister feel that there is a conflict of interest between the overall management role of the South Australian Soccer Federation as set out in the funding deed of October 1996 and

the present role that it is playing in terms of gaining a revenue stream from the facility?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** This is the age old problem of stadium management by sporting associations. You could ask the same question in relation to the management of Football Park by the SANFL, which may have an interest in the Adelaide Crows' licence. Do they have a conflict of interest when Sturt plays Glenelg there or do they have a conflict of interest when Port Power plays there? It is a difficult question. The honourable member is right in raising the potential for conflict as there is always the potential for conflict in the circumstances you have described. The way to ensure that the conflict does not present itself is for the parties to sit down and have a very clear commercial understanding of under what terms and conditions one will manage it and one will use it.

My understanding of what happened with the soccer stadium was that there were significant negotiations between clubs and federations in terms of the licence arrangements that existed between the clubs, now club, and the Soccer Federation. There was a very clear delineation between who would have what seats or advertising rights. It is my understanding that for whatever reason the Adelaide Force Club (and in fairness the Adelaide Sharks also when it existed) raised some concerns about whether the deed or licence negotiated between the federation and the clubs would actually work. Even though all three parties negotiated in good faith, it is a fair summary to say they got six or 12 months down the track and the clubs themselves started to have some second thoughts.

That is why there have been meetings between the federation and the club to try to rework or rethink the licence agreement. As I said to the member for Lee in an earlier answer, whatever licence arrangements they come up with will more than likely have to be agreed to by government as it may have an impact on the deed the government had with the federation about the terms and conditions under which the government supports the federation and the stadium itself.

The member is right in raising the issue of potential conflicts. There is no doubt you could have a potential conflict given the two income streams or entities. It all comes down to the quality or accuracy of the agreement, and the manner in which agreements are administered is also important. The relationship between the clubs and the federation it is fair to say have been strained somewhat because of the licence arrangements. I am really pleased that after some months of negotiation Adelaide Force and Soccer Australia finally came into the negotiations two weeks ago and the federation is now sitting down trying to work it through. It is an important step in the whole process.

**Mr WRIGHT:** The Minister has acknowledged that the commitment for hosting the seven olympic soccer matches is \$6.6 million. The Auditor-General goes on to say:

The memorandum of understanding also provides ticketing and sharing arrangements in relation to revenue generated from the matches.

Will the Minister share with us any information about what the revenue sharing arrangements are with SOCOG? Obviously we are all concerned. We hope that each of the games are sold out, but if not are taxpayers liable once again?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My advice is that this question was raised in estimates both last year and I think this year—certainly last year with Minister Ingerson. I understand Minister Ingerson took advice on what information could be released under the memorandum of understanding in relation

to the costs and so on, and released a figure of around \$6.6 million, or whatever the figure was. I understand that Mr Ingerson took advice at the time and that was the only information that could be released. We are all aware that the olympics are a huge commercial undertaking and the arrangements are commercial in confidence under the memorandum of understanding. I understand they do that because they do not want to compromise the negotiations at the next city when negotiating with venues. It is my understanding that it is a requirement of SOCOG and that we have released whatever information we can in relation to that. That is my advice.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I now refer to racing. Will existing stake money be maintained?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am not quite sure what line in the Auditor-General's Report that relates to. Anyway, I have asked the incoming board of the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority to sit down and look at that with RIDA to see whether the comments made by the CEO on behalf of the previous authority truly reflects the position in which the thoroughbred industry finds itself. I assume we are talking thoroughbreds. I have given a commitment that stake money will remain as it is until the end of October and I am waiting for a report in relation to what the new board of SATRA and RIDA think of the CEO's previous comments and the position in which the thoroughbred industry finds itself.

In relation to stake money, I understand that the government has allocated around \$9 million extra over the past three or four years out of consolidated revenue towards a number of initiatives, including the breeders incentive scheme and, to some extent, stake money. In 1993, when the Speaker was minister, we increased profit share arrangements to racing to 55 per cent out of the TAB and 45 per cent to government (it was previously 50 on 50). We gave it .5 per cent from another area and introduced \$2.5 million for two years and \$2 million for the past two years. If you add that up over four or five years it is about an extra \$28 million over that time or around \$5.5 million a year that this government has put into racing in addition to what was the case under the previous regime prior to 1993. I put that point on the record.

We are also talking to the racing industry about the structure of the racing industry and whether it can possibly manage itself. Long-term if that occurs the decision on stake money will be for one of racing. That is probably where the decision lies long term—one for racing. If we can get racing to manage itself totally outside of government (and there seems to be a fair bit of discussion on that, and in principle, subject to the detail, some support around the place for that concept), in two or three years whether stake money remains at its current levels will depend on how the industry manages itself. It will also depend on the performance of the TAB. The government, as the honourable member is well aware, is still considering its position in relation to whether we should sell the TAB. We are trying to progress that matter sooner rather than later. So, to ask whether stake money can be guaranteed really depends on long-term management of both the industry and the TAB itself.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I have only one more question in respect to stake money. The industry is on its bare minimum with respect to black type races, which are so important for attracting the better type horses and so important to the breeding industry. What is the minister intending to do about this?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the member for Lee to identify the page in the Auditor-General's Report that refers to the matter about which he has asked the question of the minister.

**Mr WRIGHT:** That is very difficult to do, because it is not here.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is up to the minister as to whether or not he wishes to answer the question. This is not an extension of question time: it is a matter of questioning on the Auditor-General's Report. It is up to the minister whether he wishes to respond.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I really do not have much to add to the previous answer. All these issues in relation to the position in which racing finds itself, I think, come down to two or three key principles. While there are some short-term issues (which I acknowledge), I believe that I am taking, for whatever reason, a far longer view of where racing should be and how racing should be managed and, therefore, what is involved in its cost structure. So, I really do not have much to add to my previous answer.

**Mr WRIGHT:** I acknowledge and appreciate the minister's willingness to answer these questions when perhaps he does not have to, according to the format. Capital development is the foundation of the industry, and the industry has been waiting since 1996 for the government's recommendation on the venue rationalisation report. Can the minister give me some detail about how much has been spent on venue rationalisation, is the cash register still rolling and when will the industry get some results for the time and money that has been put into this whole issue of venue rationalisation?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I do not have a dollar figure on how much the discussions and the venue rationalisation may have cost. We released the draft report and we set up a working group to seek community comment, which has been received. I received a docket in the last two weeks (maybe three weeks) from the working group on venue rationalisation and the comments in relation to that matter. I am now considering those and I would expect that, sooner rather than later, the public and the industry in general will know the view on venue rationalisation. I note that the member opposite has expressed a view about continuing racing at Victoria Park, Cheltenham and at—

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, sorry, it was the member for Hart who expressed a view about continuing racing at Cheltenham. I think the member for Lee made some comments in the Gawler *Bunyip* about continuing racing at Gawler and continuing racing at Kapunda—

**Mr Wright:** No.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Not Kapunda, okay. So, again, it comes down to whose role it is to control the number of racing venues: I suppose that would be the fundamental question. But I certainly hope to resolve that whole issue prior to Christmas.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Can the minister inform the Committee of the total amount of the contingent liabilities under the Industry Incentives and Assistance Fund for the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, the netball stadium and the two SACA projects?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I refer the honourable member to page 480, which has a series of detailed notes on each of those stadiums. It may be of interest.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Given that the minister is looking at the sale of the Ports Corporation, why has the number of employees on more than \$100 000 per year risen from 10 to

16, and what did the CEO do to justify a pay increase of as much as \$20 000?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I suggest that that question is better directed to the minister responsible for the Ports Corporation.

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, Minister Armitage. It is under government enterprises, which I think is to be discussed tomorrow morning.

**Mr WRIGHT:** Is the \$5 million loss to the department from the sale of the Australis MDS licences the final loss from the Australis debacle or is there the prospect of more losses, and what are the total losses to the public from the Australis collapse?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised that we do not have all the working papers in relation to that matter. I will get the honourable member a brief regarding that issue.

**Mr WRIGHT:** On pages 476-7 reference is made to two water industry consultancies totalling as much as \$70 000. Did United Water, which is contracted to develop our water industry, contribute in any way to these studies, and will the minister release these reports?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I assume that the honourable member is referring to the Arthur Andersen report on the water industry alliance. Can he clarify which consultancies he is referring to?

**Mr WRIGHT:** The two to which the minister referred are the correct ones, I think—the Arthur Andersen ones on page 477.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I can see one Arthur Andersen report on water referred to on page 477. My understanding of the question was that there were two consultancies in relation to water. I can see one for Arthur Andersen for water, and the other Arthur Andersen ones are a corporate services review and an internal audit/business improvement contract. I cannot see the other water one for Arthur Andersen on page 477.

**Mr WRIGHT:** There is the water one on page 477, and I will find the other one.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The answer with respect to that one is that I think the honourable member will find that it was probably done through the Centre for Manufacturing in relation to our water industry best practice program. I think, from memory, the question was in relation to United Water's possible involvement. I will seek some advice on that matter and get a brief to the honourable member.

**Mr WRIGHT:** For the past two years, the Auditor has been critical of inadequate information and inadequate controls over the public assistance given to private companies by DIT. He said that file information was not up to a standard conforming to the department's own policies. What is the size of any taxpayer potential liability from this poor standard of records management?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** My understanding is that there were some comments in previous Auditor-Generals' Reports relating to auditing or record keeping on the matter the honourable member has raised. My understanding is that there are some more positive comments in this year's Auditor-General's Report in relation to the effort by the department in trying to bring better controls and better auditing processes to that particular area within the department. In fact, my understanding is that on page 469 the Auditor-General states that, as a consequence, the independent audit report does not include a qualification with respect to the 1998-99 financial statement disclosure. So, there was

some comment in previous years, and I know that under Ian Dixon, when he was CEO, considerable effort was made (and it has been continued, of course) to ensure that the issues to which the honourable member refers have been properly dealt with.

Time expired.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I rise tonight to report to the House on a lecture I attended during the dinner break, namely, the Clare Burton memorial lecture, delivered by Professor Rosemary Hunter, who is about to take up a senior appointment as Professor of Law at Griffith University. The lecture was delivered at the University of South Australia as part of a nationwide series of lectures to commemorate Dr Clare Burton, who died last year.

Dr Burton was passionately interested in the question of pay equity, in looking at the value of women's work and in ensuring that women got full value for the work they did. I first met her in the 1980s when I was employed as the Equal Opportunities Officer at the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Like many, I was incredibly impressed by Clare's fine mind, her unending energy and her commitment to equity for all workers, but particularly for women workers.

Clare was my idea of an ideal academic in that her work was always strongly based in both theory and practice. As an equal opportunity practitioner, first at the South Australian College of Advanced Education and then as Women's Adviser to the Minister for Labour and Occupational Health and Safety, I found that the work that she was doing on a theoretical basis was easily applied in my work either in policy advice or in program development. Conversely, she enjoyed working with those of us who were in the field approaching the issue from a practical basis and discussed with us anomalies and peculiar patterns that we would identify. She would then apply her fine mind and considerable skills to analysing what was happening to enable us to develop programs to address the problem. It is fitting that a series of lectures has been introduced to understand better the issue of pay equity in memory of Clare Burton, who died very suddenly last year at the very tender age of 50.

In her opening remarks this evening, Professor Hunter said that it is customary to begin discussions of pay equity by noting its elusive nature. Justice Mary Gaudron captured it most famously and most succinctly when she observed that women had won equal pay in 1969, again in 1972, again in 1974 and yet we still do not have it. Justice Gaudron was speaking in 1979, but tonight, unfortunately, I can say that in 1999 not only do women not have equal pay but also that in the last five years the pay of women in South Australia in relation to that of men has become worse.

We all here remember the days when there were separate rates for women and men and that that is what was abolished through the equal pay cases of 1972 and 1974 in particular. As a result of that, there was a tremendous improvement in the position of women's earnings. The normal way of looking at this is by comparing average weekly earnings—ordinary time for full-time workers—so that we do not take account

of the difference in overtime earnings that men generally have or the larger participation of women in part-time work, which seriously affects their earning capacity.

If we stick to average weekly earnings—ordinary time—for full-time workers, we see that in November 1989 in South Australia women earned 88.1 per cent of male earnings. In November 1994 that had crept up to 90.1 per cent, but in February 1999 women's earnings had fallen to 85.4 per cent of those for men. This trend seems to be continuing, with the latest figures for May 1999 showing that women's earnings are now down to 84.1 per cent of those for men. I ask the House to note that the equal pay cases occurred when women's earnings were about 75 per cent of those of men. So, they reached 90 per cent but are back to 84 per cent. This is not a happy trend.

Tonight's lecture looked at why the earnings of South Australia are going backwards. Happily and unhappily, I can tell the House that women in South Australia are not alone. Women in Australia everywhere are experiencing decreasing earnings relative to men; the only difference is in the rate of decent. Professor Hunter, in her lecture tonight, looked at some of the reasons for this. She looked at the fact that in the late 1980s we had the award restructuring process, when many people were hopeful that a mechanism might have been discovered where women's work could be genuinely considered in relation to that of men, where career structures could be developed in areas where women traditionally had none, where skills could be audited and recognised in a way they had never previously been and where a new, organised, career-based and skill-based pay structure could be developed for women and men across the range of occupations. Indeed, it is probably this sort of process which is reflected in the increase in women's earnings comparative to men in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

However, we then were faced with the move towards enterprise bargaining. Those of us who were involved at the time feared that this would represent an attack on women's earnings, as international studies showed that the more centralised the system of wage determination the more equal were women's and men's earnings. This was as a result of studies conducted in all OECD countries. So, some safety mechanisms were introduced, particularly in New South Wales, where part of the Labor government's commitment when elected in 1995 was to conduct a pay equity inquiry. It started with a task force which indicated that there was need for much greater understanding of the issue, and it moved to an inquiry which reported in 1997. The results of this inquiry are still being studied today, with a view to implementation, we hope, on an Australia-wide basis.

The inquiry was based on both case studies and an examination of the types of industrial mechanisms that assist or detract from the achievement of equal pay for women and men. The pay equity task force identified that a range of factors contribute to gender earnings differentials. These include the fact that women have less access to overtime, over-award payments, allowances, bonuses and other employment benefits; that occupations in industries in Australia are very segregated so that women and men seldom work in the same areas; that women have limited access to training; and that workplace practices often restrict employment and advancement prospects for workers with family responsibilities, usually women.

There was much more in this lecture, but I will hasten to the conclusion. Professor Hunter says that the current industrial legislation before this House and before the



commonwealth parliament represents a great threat to the earnings of women workers; that the removal of the scrutiny mechanisms of the Industrial Relations Commission, the removal of award protection and the difficulty of involving unions in the process will further weaken women's earning capacity and potential.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Tonight I want to highlight a few of the functions that I have been to recently in my electorate. The first occurred at Kadina last Sunday, the Walk for the Cure. I was very pleased to have been invited for the second year in a row not only to open the formal occasion but also to walk. For those unfamiliar with it, Walk for the Cure is a walk that seeks to raise funds for juvenile diabetes. Many of us are unaware of the extent of juvenile diabetes in our society and the harmful effects that it can have on our young people, especially as they get a little older. The Walk for the Cure is there to raise money to seek to find a cure for juvenile diabetes.

It was quite something to speak with some of those who have children with juvenile diabetes, and in one case with a young teenage girl who has had it for quite some years, and to see the way she is coping with her diabetes. So far as I was concerned, she looked as normal and natural a young lass as any, but it is quite obvious that she has to forgo many of the foods that other people take for granted, has to watch her diet very carefully and certainly must make sure that she does not overdo things and fall victim to some of the negative consequences of juvenile diabetes, including heart disease, kidney problems and even blindness. All those are somewhat debilitating diseases and, in the case of heart and kidney disease, can lead to an early death.

But modern medicine has helped enormously, so many of these young people now lead (outwardly at least) a very normal type of life. I want to thank everyone who has been involved with the Walk for the Cure at Kadina over the past couple of years. I believe that last year they raised in excess of \$10 000 from seeking sponsorship, and Australiawide some \$1.53 million was raised. Some thousand organisations or groups were involved in fundraising through Walk for the Cure to raise that \$1.53 million. That is no mean feat and is a credit to all involved. Sunday was absolutely perfect from the point of view of taking a walk. It was approximately a five kilometre track, and I suggest that everyone who participated in that walk enjoyed doing their bit to raise money for a very worthy cause.

A week or so ago I had the opportunity to be present at a show that I found absolutely fantastic, the Gang Show 1999. The Gang Show is put on by the Scouts and Guides of South Australia and has been held traditionally in the Scott Theatre in July. This was held in October at Maitland, a special one night performance, and I believe that for all intents and purposes was identical to the performance they gave in the Scott Theatre. I saw a similar show probably 15 years ago at Salisbury, although it was not the actual Gang Show, and I was most impressed then. But these young girls and boys need to be congratulated for putting on a first rate show. The show they put on at Maitland was entitled *The Show from Oz*, and of course it was based around an Australian theme. As the director says in his opening remarks in the program:

Welcome to the 39th Adelaide Gang Show. Our *Show from Oz* this year has been an interesting experience for all concerned. The theme of Australia began to filter through our 250-strong team of Guides and Scouts, and we realised that our great country provided us with enough material to write 20 shows. In fact, the hard part was selecting the items. As the production, technical and administration teams have worked together over the last 30 weeks, a sense of national pride has slowly grown with everyone involved. I hope that as you leave our show we have stirred a little of that national pride, and we look forward to entertaining you again next year at our 40th show.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, it was a most entertaining show and one at which I was delighted to be present, and I would say that everyone in attendance felt exactly the same. They were first rate performers. I can only say to members of this House and anyone party to the comments that I am making tonight that, if you have the chance to see a Gang Show put on by the Scouts and Guides, please take advantage of it. Some of the items on the night included, understandably, *Advance Australia Fair*; *Girt by the Sea*; *Aussie Nasties*; *Last Resort Island Musical*; *Aussie Icons*; *Footy Time*; a Coober Pedy skit; a multicultural skit; a Melbourne Cup skit; an Aussie barbecue; an outback scene; an Australian dance; *Mad Dogs and Emus*; and *Aussie Rock*, and some of the classics from the past were highlighted there. These included *Help is on its Way*, *Eagle Rock*, *Shout* and *You're the Voice*. Whether you were a young person or a slightly older person you just about felt like getting up in the aisles and dancing to some of these tunes. All in all, it was an evening that I will not forget. The good news is that the Chief Commissioner (Mr Bruce Mackie), who was also present, indicated that it is his intention to return to Maitland next year. I think that is their only country show. Certainly, Yorke Peninsula will be very lucky to have that show again. To all concerned with that, particularly John Koenders and members of the Yorke Peninsula Scout Group, as well as the sponsors, I want to say a sincere thank you.

The last thing I want to highlight relates to a Country Fire Service field day held at Yorketown Sunday week ago. Whilst I have been to many CFS days, this was the first field day that I had been to. It was coordinated by the Southern Yorke group, and I want to compliment everyone involved in the organisation of that day. It was anticipated that some 28 appliances and over 200 CFS personnel would take part. I was not able to be there for the whole day, but I was able to see some of the particular venues set up to test the skills of the CFS volunteers. In one case they had to seek to get their whole group through a tangled mess of ropes, and it was very difficult to fit one person through and certainly required a team effort to eventually get the whole group through.

In another case, a deserted shed on one of the farming properties was a mock setup for a chemical spill and subsequent explosion with toxic smoke, and it was fascinating to see the way the CFS went about rescuing a person supposedly injured in there, and the techniques that they use. There were many other stands set up to test their ingenuity and skills and, all in all, I would like to congratulate the Southern Yorke group on organising an excellent day. There is a lot happening in the electorate of Goyder, and I am pleased to have highlighted three of those happenings this evening.

Motion carried.

At 9.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 21 October at 10.30 a.m.