

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 27 September 1983

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A****Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before going too deeply into proceedings today I believe it would be desirable if we could get some idea of how long we expect the examination of each vote to take. Also, the Chair intends to proceed along the lines that have been adopted in previous years, that is, I will ask the Leader to ask questions of the Minister, and then I will ask a Government member, and so on, alternatively. The Chair has no intentions of allowing any member to lapse into a second reading debate, because we are dealing with Estimates.

I believe from the Premier's point of view it is desirable that all questions be directed to him. If he wishes an officer to answer, that is his prerogative. Members who are outside the Committee will be recognised by the Chair only after it seems that the in-depth examination of the vote is coming to a conclusion, and that will be at the consent of Opposition members. Having said that, I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition would like to clarify his position: does the Leader wish to make any particular observation?

**Mr OLSEN:** No, it is not the intention of the Opposition to make detailed observations but to seek factual information about the vote being examined. We will be questioning the financial details behind the Estimates. We believe it will be difficult to nominate times for the examination of a vote, because we do not know just how it will be replied to. We will need to make an assessment as the day goes on.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Mr Chairman, do you intend to ask the Minister being questioned to make a statement or overview of his departmental activities during the previous 12 months? We have followed that pattern in the past.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the Premier wish to make a broad statement of his Department's work during the past 12 months? He is quite at liberty to do so in the same way as I asked the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, I think I take the same view as the Leader, that the purpose of the Committee is to ascertain information on the matters that the Committee wishes to raise. Various details in the programme performance papers set out the aims, objectives, and so on, that can be questioned, but I do not intend to make a general statement at the outset.

---

 Legislative Council, \$369 000
**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.  
Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The percentage increase for the Legislative Council for 1983 is 6 per cent, in comparison with that of 1982-83, which was about 16 per cent. For the financial year preceding that, 1981-82, there was a 25 per cent increase. Why is there a reduction this year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That amount reflects the generally anticipated increase in costs, wage levels, and so on for the coming year. Both the Commonwealth Government figures and our own anticipate an increase of about 7 per cent or so. Those estimates are made on the basis that if those predictions are met that will be the order of the increase that we can expect. There is a reduction in the item 'Terminal leave payments', which affects the overall figure.

**Mr HAMILTON:** In regard to overspending, in 1976-77 the Legislative Council was allocated \$29 998, compared to the figure of \$42 598. There seems to be hardly any real increase. The research service was introduced into the library in 1976-77, and in terms of expenditure that was only holding the fort. Also, there is the question of the doubling of the Parliamentary research staff. I understand that that review has been going on for two years, and that there has been no real increase in that area.

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

---

 House of Assembly, \$763 000
**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.  
Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer to the amount of \$20 000 allocated for payments to Public Accounts Committee consultants. Can the Premier explain how that \$20 000 will be spent?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That relates to a request from the Public Accounts Committee last financial year relating to part of a study that the committee is doing into the transport area. The committee thought that it could not do the appropriate studies from within its own resources. It also believed that rather than having the information provided as an internal exercise, by the Highways Department in this case, it would be better to have a separate and independent consultant. Hence, the establishment of that line and the provision of \$20 000. I wrote to the Chairman of the committee on 21 June advising him that the Government would be putting such an amount into the Budget. It does not actually represent a net increment to the payments to consultants, because that amount has been found from within

the general transport payments to consultants line by means of transfer. However, because it is a special committee study, it is better to show it here.

**Mr OLSEN:** It is, therefore, not related in any way to the Labor Party's policy of increasing the powers of the Public Accounts Committee. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the powers of the Public Accounts Committee and, if so, in what direction?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** At this stage that matter has not been considered. To quite an extent we are in the hands of the committee and its recommendations. It could be argued that it represents an increase in the effective powers of the committee, because by means of this consultancy it will be able to better direct its inquiry in this area. Perhaps the experience of that exercise can be used in future, but at this stage there is no further action contemplated.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the \$20 000, you have given the background and the purpose of it and I fully appreciate that we are dealing with estimates, not with final results. There has been a problem associated with several Governments, not only this State Government, of consultancies blowing out to the point that the proposed figure is minuscule against the final result. Does the Government place any particular restriction on the upper limit or nature of consultancies in respect of this issue and, if so, what is that limit? Also, is it intended that any amount, for example not expended in the transport area (which is the prime area of action) be subsequently transferred to another consultancy inquiry? One could ask, the letter of intent having been put forward in June, it now being the end of September, whether the committee has called for tenders or has appointed any particular consultancy and, if so, what are the terms of that appointment and the limitations placed upon the final aspects of that consultancy?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not have that information; the question would better be directed to the committee because it is in charge of the operation. We were asked to provide an amount, and a particular research study proposal was costed and the committee has, through this line, been provided with the funds. As to the nature of the exercise it is undertaking, that is in the hands of the committee and not under the control of the Government. You could perhaps refer it to one of your members represented on that committee in relation to those details and its progress.

On the general question of consultancies, our view would be that if the resources are readily available in Government, if the particular skills and experience necessary for a study are already present in the public sector, that should be the first recourse. In the past I have been critical, both in and out of Government, of a tendency sometimes to hire consultants to do a job that could just as readily be done within the service. Indeed, the consultancy often consists of consultants collecting information, and having studies done, which are then packaged and rewritten into a consultant's report.

The consultant's report has really not advanced the state of knowledge very much at all; it has been more a collating exercise. On the other hand, some useful jobs can be done by consultants for Government, and there are ones where it is not possible to use our own resources. So, that is the general rule. We would first look to whether the study can be done from within our own resources. The method we have adopted, for instance, into studies into public sector finance and studies into Government management operations have been done by using existing Public Service resources, and usually adding someone to the study group from the private sector, not as a consultant, but simply to provide a different point of view.

For instance, Mr Scammell has been involved in the study into public sector financing, Mr Graham Spurling is involved

in the study into Government operations. That, again, is an example of the way in which a special perspective from the private sector can be tapped using the services of these experts who are very often only too ready to assist the Government in that way. Then, of course, there is the formal consultancy for a fee. Members will find that, in many of the lines for the various departments, in their programmes, provision is made for such consultancies. A tight rein is kept on them and they are used only where other methods are seen to be inadequate.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I note the invitation from the Premier for members to approach the committee for that information. If, however, the committee found itself inhibited by the rules under which it functions, as the Premier is the Minister ultimately responsible for the raising of the line, I reserve the right to come back to him and seek his assistance to get the detail which I believe is necessarily information that should be in the possession of the Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair points out that, if some detailed information is required, or if the Minister—in this case, the Premier—decided that he may not be able to give an answer at this point, the information when provided should be in a form suitable to be inserted in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The Opposition would appreciate that.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to the House of Assembly voted expenditure of some 12 per cent—\$763 000. However, the actual expenditure proposed is only 2.2 per cent. What is the difference between those two figures?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There are two items: first, the item we have just been discussing (the Public Accounts Committee consultancy); secondly, the overseas visit of the Leader of the Opposition. Those amounts are shown in the lines this year but were not in the lines last year, as they are one-off expenditures.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I come back to the report being prepared through a consultant for the Public Accounts Committee. It is an exception and a somewhat new practice for Parliamentary committees to take on outside consultants. Will the Premier (as he is funding the item) approach the Chairman of the committee and ask that the full consultancy report be made public or tabled in the House? I realise that the P.A.C. reports to the House but there is no guarantee that the consultancy report will be made available. On behalf of the Parliament and as the Premier is funding the item, I ask that the report be made public.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The request is noted, but the matter is in the hands of the committee. I do not want to interfere with a Parliamentary committee in that way. It is up to it, in the course of reporting to the House, whether it releases the consultancy report. If so, that is fine.

**Mr BAKER:** As a preliminary explanation, I would expect that, if (and perhaps the Premier can confirm this) the same manpower resources are donated to each line, we would see approximately a 4 per cent lift in those items to cover the average wage in 1982-83, compared with what we are starting with in 1983-84, with the rest being taken up by contingencies. I am referring to salaries and wages and related payments to the Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms, which have in fact increased by \$5, according to the estimate. I would estimate that that is a 4 per cent cut in the resources available and I also note that the actual payments for 1982-83 were somewhat higher than those actually voted. Can the Premier explain what the overrun related to in 1982-83 and how he intends to hold existing resources and cut down on those resources for 1983-84?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Remember that provision for wage and salary increases that occur during the year is contained in round sum allowances.

**Mr BAKER:** I estimate about 4 per cent being the maintenance item.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The amount was greater in 1982-83 under that heading due to salary increases which were granted during the year and which applied for a much longer period of the year than had been budgeted in 1982-83. There was also the temporary employment of one additional messenger to cover the extended sick leave of one officer, and an additional typist-clerk was employed for part of the year. The estimate for 1983-84 is based on the salary levels required.

**Mr BAKER:** So we are envisaging that we will not need any temporary assistance during 1983-84, even though we look like increasing our Parliamentary sitting days?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Obviously, unless a contingency such as long-term ill health to one of the staff occurs, there will be no need to provide additional assistance.

**Mr OLSEN:** I note the Premier's response in relation to the consultant's report for the Public Accounts Committee and his wish not to usurp the role and functions of the committee. However, by the same token it will be the Opposition's intention to ensure that consultancies such as these and reports obtained are not used through a Committee system somehow to usurp the role and proper place of Parliament, that is, consultants reporting to the Parliament on the information paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia. Does the Premier agree with the view expressed by the Ombudsman that he (the Ombudsman) is in a much better position than the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee to gauge the effect of a particular Government body? I refer to the Ombudsman's Report, wherein he states:

The role of the Public Accounts Committee subjects many such bodies to scrutiny; however, the emphasis of the Public Accounts Committee is necessarily a financial one and I believe that I am in a much better position to gauge the effectiveness of a particular body and whether, in fact, it is exceeding, or attempting to exceed its bounds.

Does the Premier agree with that statement and, if so, what action does he intend to take?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Not entirely: I think that the general thrust of what the Ombudsman is saying is that the Public Accounts Committee (and I think that he is right in saying this) has an emphasis on the financial efficiency and financial ramifications of the areas it studies and, in doing that, goes beyond the Auditor-General, who is looking at, if one likes, the accounting probity and correct expenditure of moneys. So, the Public Accounts Committee is a stage further than that. What the Ombudsman is talking about is a general overview of a particular administrative action or activity and in some cases he would certainly be in a better position to judge that, because he is investigating by way of complaint a particular case, and in the course of that investigation it may throw up practices which could be corrected. So, I guess that my answer is that in part I would agree with him, but not totally.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will there be any Government action on that section with which you agree? Do you intend to take any action in relation to it?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That presupposes a problem, and I am not sure what the problem is.

**Mr OLSEN:** I thought you acknowledged that you agreed with part of the report and that you did not agree with part of it. That being the case, are you going to take any action with that section with which you agree?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There is no action required. The Ombudsman is saying that there are certain matters that, by way of investigation of complaints, can in fact in the course of his report or dealing with it throw up things that can be looked at by the Government, and in some cases

this would not be discovered by the P.A.C. because of its particular brief. That is fine. I do not see that as a problem. I think that is a comment by the Ombudsman on his role, and that is fair enough.

**Mr OLSEN:** Since members of Parliament must supply a list of their pecuniary interests by the end of this week, does the Government intend to require, as is A.L.P. policy, that journalists reporting Parliamentary proceedings should reveal publicly their business and financial affairs and those of their immediate families?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I think it would be desirable, but there is no legal requirement on them to do so.

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

Parliamentary Library, \$290 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.  
Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.  
Mr H. Coxon, Parliamentary Librarian.

**Mr OLSEN:** In regard to the Library expenditure, I assume that the allocation of \$8 000 is to cover the recently purchased I.B.M. personal computer. I think it ought to be said that the Library should be commended for introducing that new service. I am informed that Australian Public Affairs Communication Service packages have been purchased with provision for extending to other data base facilities. With regular updating, retrieval of information will be of great assistance to members and I think that ought to be said in prefacing a question in relation to that line of \$8 000. Has the Government plans to further expand the computer facility to include retrieval of other data, such as information provided by the A.B.S. in both tabular and graphics, for the benefit of members?

**Mr Coxon:** The particular data the Leader of the Opposition is asking about is available on a system organised by I.P. Sharp. I am presently negotiating with that company to access data they make available. They supply a whole lot of numeric data, not only A.B.S. data but also CANSTAT data (Statistics Canada), the International Monetary Fund and a whole range of other statistical data bases.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the figure of \$8 000 enable you to access that information?

**Mr Coxon:** The \$8 000 covers the cost of the computer. Additional costs are obviously involved in accessing data bases, most of which will be involved in connect time. The I.P. Sharp data base is set in Canada, which means we have to use telecommunication links to Canada in order to access the data, which is expensive. In some cases data bases

require you to pay rental. That is not the case with I.P. Sharp. Looking forward to other data bases, that is a matter we will have to bear in mind when costing these services.

**Mr OLSEN:** In view of the facts that the \$8 000 covers only the purchase of the computer, and a further extension of the service for which the Library is negotiating, will the Government enable the Library to access this further information? Will funds be made available for that service?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** An allowance has been made in the administrative expenses and sundries line of \$3 000 to cover those running costs and maintenance.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I note that the voted expenditure for the Library is \$290 000, which represents a 24.5 per cent increase. However, included in that amount is a terminal leave payment of \$24 000. Therefore, the actual increase, excluding that amount, is some \$33 000 or 14.2 per cent. Similarly, the increase in actual expenditure for this year includes a terminal leave payment of \$24 000, so that increase is only \$13 529 or 5.4 per cent. In regard to overspending, I note that there has been an increase of some 8.4 per cent.

As most members would be aware, I am concerned about what is happening within the Library area, particularly since the introduction in 1976 of the research services. Figures supplied to me indicate that at the moment there is only a holding of the amount spent in that area. I question why there has not been an increase in the Library staff, taking into account the review that has been going on for some two years. Also, can the Premier say what happens when a member of the Library research staff is on annual leave, sick leave or long service leave? How do members requiring the use of those services cope when only one research staff member is available? Finally, what is the attitude of the research staff regarding the interpretation of other languages? I understand that members' entitlements as regards the interpretation of documents are not clear.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I shall deal with the first part of the question which could be summarised in terms of resources that are to be made available to the Library. We are aware of the demand from members for extra research assistance, and the Speaker has formally raised that matter with me. The Government is certainly looking at the situation. The matter has also been raised recently in the columns of the press in a fairly controversial and, I suggest, incorrect article. Bearing in mind the current major constraints in terms of resources that apply, the Government will be reviewing the situation and a request from the Library Committee through the Speaker. As to what we can do and how quickly we can do it, I am afraid I cannot say at this stage.

I have to make that sort of general comment about the research facilities: we are aware of the increasing demands being placed on those facilities, which in turn has raised a need for extra resources. We will be looking at that matter and attempting to do something about it. I shall ask the Librarian to comment on the matter in regard to the interpretation of documents.

**Mr Coxon:** The Library research staff do not necessarily have language qualifications. If members of the staff are seeking access to information which is in a language with which they are not familiar, obviously they are in a difficult situation and cannot interpret that information. It is possible now to get some sort of translation. Commercial services are expensive. The Library does not have people with skills at a sufficient level to cope with a lot of technical material, and this ultimately means an additional cost to the Library. The Library is operating under severe financial constraints: every item must be looked at, and this is one area where we have to consider carefully each item. I think in the past we have used the resources of the Ethnic Affairs Commission

for getting translations free of charge. However, the Commission is now seeking payment from the Library even for those services, so we are being squeezed in that regard.

**Mr HAMILTON:** How many requests from members have been received by the Library in the past 12 months for interpreting documents?

**Mr Coxon:** I do not have the data with me, but I will obtain that information for the member.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Also, I seek information about the cost to the Library in the past 12 months of document translation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I take this opportunity to seek information from the Government concerning its long-term appreciation of its financial commitments. In regard to the Library, I note that there is a terminal leave payment of \$24 000, although that is understandable owing to the fact that the former Librarian has recently retired. Regarding certain provisions: last year, for example, \$26 599 was the actual payment within the Legislative Council vote, and there is no corresponding provision this year, whilst under the House of Assembly vote \$956 was paid out last year, with no provision for a corresponding amount this year. For the Library, \$24 000 is provided this year as against an actual payment of \$777 last year.

I appreciate that sometimes a terminal leave payment is not positively known beforehand, but in industry generally a considerable amount of work is done not only to anticipate long service and recreation leave debts likely to be incurred but also to anticipate the possibility of the impact that terminal leave payments may have on the economy of an organisation. In this case I question the impact that such payments could have on the State Budget. The Premier might like to take this opportunity to refer to any attitude that the Government is developing on this matter, so that Budgets in the future might contain some further provision in this regard. I recognise that such provision would not be finite, but there could be some indication given from past experience, having regard to the ages of people within various departments and any effect that this might have on the end of year balance of various budgets.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Certainly an attempt is made, department by department, to anticipate retirements and the need for terminal leave payments. In the line now before us, there has been some expenditure over the anticipated figure, simply because at the time the Budget was prepared no resignations or retirements were anticipated. Such a situation can occur for a number of reasons, and the matter is likely to be less predictable these days where retirements can be taken earlier than they were in the past, when it was usual to go to 65, which was the cut-off age. Most people expected to work to that age unless illness intervened. Currently, it is possible to retire early from the Public Service, and many people take advantage of that. But that decision can be made within the course of a year, and there is a much wider span of time in which that decision can be made. The estimate that is made is only as good as the information provided from the personnel sections of the various departments. An attempt is made to make a realistic estimate, but it is not an easy job.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Has an assessment been made over the past four or five years of the relative terminal leave payment component as against the total of annual salaries and wages? It is a research job which one could look at in relation to this set of documents and others which have been presented to the Parliament. If it is an issue which has already been resolved and there is some document paper relating to it, I would welcome its tabling or its being made available.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will attempt to find out if we have that information available for the member.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I notice in the overspending that there is an increase of \$19 471, and in the Library area 8.4 per cent. Book inflation in 1981-82 was .2 of 1 per cent, and in 1982-83 there was an increase in book inflation of 29.9 per cent. Similarly, periodicals inflation in 1981-82 involved a 9.3 per cent increase, as against a 25.4 per cent increase for 1982-83. What effect is this having on the Library?

**Mr Coxon:** Those facts are rather disturbing. It has resulted in the Library spending a much smaller proportion of its budget on book materials. A few years ago the Library would spend 50 per cent of the sums available for administration expenses, etc., on book materials. By 1981-82 it was down to about 25 per cent, and this year I expect it to be less than that. Not only are book prices rising but also subscriptions for serials are rising, and there have been considerable increases in binding costs as a result of the policy of the Government Printer. These are all combining, (not only inflationary factors on book prices, but these other pressures on the Library budget) to mean that there will be further reductions in the book budget.

**Mr HAMILTON:** What sort of increase would you be looking at in the number of books normally purchased each year? Have you any indication, or can you give some rough indication to the Committee?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Librarian is searching out that information. It is worth commenting that the stocks held in the Library do not represent the resources available to the Library, in terms of both books and periodicals. The Library's network has been expanded enormously in recent years. The Government put quite massive inputs into libraries in South Australia when the scheme was started in about 1977 (the previous Liberal Government also continued with that programme) and those resources on an interchange and loan basis are available to members through the Parliamentary Library. It is true that much of the rising demand on the services of the Library are related to clipping services and things of that nature which has helped to keep up the flow of information.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to the Library for the assistance I have received ever since I came to this place in 1979.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The member for Albert Park's question about resources has opened up another area of resources on which the Librarian may be able to make comment. Every publication printed in this State should reside in the Library. I believe that you believe that that matter is not being fulfilled. Is there to be any concerted attempt to improve the resources available to the Library by the people in this State who have a responsibility to our Library?

**Mr Coxon:** Yes, it is a benefit to the Library that it is a deposit Library but it is also a problem for the Library in that, with the very small staff that it has, it is quite a large job to contact the whole range of people involved (very often small publishers who do not realise their obligations under the Act) to get them to deposit their materials. So, it is a two-way thing because, although we do save on the cost of materials, there is quite an important labour cost to the Library trying to chase up these items. The question has been raised in another place about the Library not receiving on deposit annual reports of companies. There have been negotiations with the Corporate Affairs Commission and the State Library to try to work out a concerted approach to improve the deposit of those items. It is a standing problem for the Library, and we look forward at some stage for someone with a specific responsibility in the Library being able to catch up with those sorts of items.

**Mr TRAINER:** On the same line with respect to Library facilities, it would appear to me that members of this Parliament are singularly ill equipped in a sense of access to

records of what is conveyed by the electronic media as distinct from what is conveyed by the print media. There are excellent press records in the Library, and there is the clipping service mentioned earlier, as well as bound copies of the *Advertiser* and all the other collections of print material, particularly that which appears in the daily papers. There is a contrast between that and the facilities that are available with respect to the electronic media, radio and television.

As a result of recent alterations in policy on the part of the House of Assembly, the television coverage of proceedings in this Chamber is probably way ahead of any other Parliament in Australia and yet, at the same time, we are way behind in providing the opportunity for members to have access to see what goes to air as a result of the television coverage of these proceedings. Very few of us would have the opportunity, even during the evening tea break, to see what goes to air on channels 7, 9 and 10, the A.B.C. news, or on *Nationwide* later in the evening. It would probably be greatly appreciated by members through the Parliamentary Library to have some recording or playback facilities available to give them the opportunity to keep up with these current affairs and television news programmes. What consideration is being given to improvements in that regard?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The question of resources, I guess is a starting point.

**Mr Coxon:** Talking to members, I know that there is quite a demand for that type of service. The Library Committee is aware of the demand. A subcommittee of the Library Committee is presently investigating the requirements of such a service, and I expect that fairly shortly that subcommittee will report to the Library Committee and make some recommendations. It would be a matter of the resources becoming available for that service.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Members may recall that in the 1970s a media-monitoring service was established that was able to provide just such material and, indeed, that material was made available to the Leader of the Opposition and members here. However, the previous Liberal Government dismantled that unit. We have not the resources to reassemble it on that basis, so there certainly has been a dearth of such material, and we recognise that.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If the record may be corrected, the Opposition was not particularly worried about the media-monitoring organisation, had the facilities been made equally available to the Government and the Opposition. However, the time delay (about a week) between it becoming available to the Opposition and being made available to the Government complete with critique, was deemed to be an unfavourable difference that could not be tolerated.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There were criticisms of that.

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

Joint House Committee, \$406 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.  
Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I note with much interest, having been elected to the Joint House Committee, that from 1976-77 the voted amount was a 183.9 per cent increase in expenditure and the actual increase was 155.2 per cent up to 1983-84. That seems a remarkable increase over a period of seven years.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There has been a change. The expenditure was greater than the amount budgeted for for several reasons. First, salary increases were granted during the year and, in the case of caretakers, they were backdated. The retrospectivity meant a major payment in the last financial year that had not been anticipated. There are also payments for overtime, such payments being variable from estimates in any year. Casual staff payments were also substantially higher than expected. I am told that that was due primarily to the fact that substantially more leave of all types was taken by staff in 1982-83 than in 1981-82. In estimating the proposed expenditure in 1983-84, we are basing it on expenditure for 1982-83 and making adjustments for those amounts not seen as recurrent, namely, retrospective wage increases. Hence the figure at which we have arrived.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am concerned, as I have been for many years, at the practice of accruing annual leave over a period. Has the Government redressed the problem, particularly where there is outstanding annual leave and could additional staff be employed to cut down on overtime?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Public Service requirements apply to the taking of leave. If leave is not taken when due, there has to be good reasons for it and dispensation has to be granted. The Clerk advises me that those general principles are adopted in relation to Parliamentary staff, but the problem arises with the times of sittings, particularly the length of time as it involves overtime, as they are hard to predict in advance. Sittings of Parliament are intangible. Even if one could ascertain the number of sitting days in a year, extra days can be added as well as extra sitting times. There are tremendous variations in the time Parliament sits. It creates a problem in trying to anticipate how many persons we will need, and when and whether they should take their leave.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare examination of the vote completed, and proceed to the vote for the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

**Mr OLSEN:** On a point of order, I refer to the amount of \$660 000 for the Electoral Department.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair points out to the committee that, according to the programme, the vote 'Electoral Department' will be before Estimates Committee B this Thursday. If there has been any misunderstanding, the Chair points out that there has been a mistake.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am not questioning the programme but rather asking whether it is the intention to accept any questions on that line. I accept that that was the programme laid out, and it is not questioned.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have already pointed out the position to the member for Mallee. I cannot allow any questions on that line.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works,  
\$60 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.  
Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Does the Government intend to amend the Public Works Standing Committee Act? The former Government had draft legislation prepared. My assessment is that the Act (and, therefore, the role of the committee) could be significantly improved, particularly if that committee was given the right to inspect projects once work is actually commenced. At present, the Act requires it to approve the allocation of funds for the project. If it could carry out a post-mortem on how effectively the project proceeded and whether or not it was meeting the needs of the community, the effectiveness and role of the committee, as well as what we get back, would be greatly enhanced. Does the Government intend to amend that legislation and, if so, when will it be introduced?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Government has no plans to amend the Act at present. The Joint Select Committee, which is looking at the ways in which our various Parliamentary committees operate, has that as part of its brief. It may form part of the recommendations that will arise under its deliberations.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Does the Premier envisage that the precedent which is now being set in relation to another standing committee, namely, the Public Accounts Committee, is likely to be sought to be extended to the Public Works Standing Committee? If so, what would be the Government's attitude on that matter? The member for Davenport indicated that there had been some review for some period on reports to the Parliament. The suggestion has been that not only should the Public Works Standing Committee consider the works to be undertaken but also assess them at a later stage, and give the Parliament an indication of the amount of overrun or underrun.

If that were to be the normal course, the amount of money required for the conduct of the committee will be inadequate, as it will need not only further research and clerical staff but also there will be the distinct possibility of an outside source such as a consultancy being used. If that is in vogue, I could imagine that the Government will be asked to address the likelihood of this committee having the same opportunity.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It has not arisen yet, and I think it is unlikely as I see the task of the Public Works Standing Committee as being somewhat different to the Public Accounts Committee in the nature of its inquiry and investigations as well as the sort of support and assistance it

needs. That can obviously be something that the Select Committee could well include in its brief.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** As the Premier has now included a specific allocation of funds for the Housing Trust in the State Budget (not previously included as such), does he recall the part of his speech where he referred to that item in the Budget? Does he agree that this means that the allocation of funds to the Housing Trust now comes under the Public Works Standing Committee jurisdiction of the Act?

Previously, it has been excluded because there has been no specific vote of funds by this Parliament, but now that there is a vote, I understand that it needs to be included. In addition, with the central fund-raising body, considering that at least part of that is included, does he see other building projects carried on by statutory authorities which previously have raised their own funds but which are now having that money raised by Government and whose figures in some cases at least would be mentioned in the Budget and required approval in a line of the Budget, now being brought under the Act?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** At this stage we do not envisage any change to the present practice.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It is what the Act requires, though.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Obviously.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It is not what the Government would like to see, but it is what the Act requires, and I ask the Premier to consider the matter and come back with a detailed assessment because I believe that now he has brought the housing figures into the State Budget, it is a requirement that it be approved by the Public Works Standing Committee.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, it must be over a certain sum of money, of course.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** It is half a million dollars.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not know what the result will be.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote 'Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$60 000' completed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$2 995 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby

Mr S.J. Baker

The Hon. D.C. Brown

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr K.C. Hamilton

Mr J.W. Olsen

Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Mr A.M. Schulze, Accountant, Legislature.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We have been fortunate for a long time in relation to the standard of *Hansard* that has been available to the Parliament and the people of South Australia. Suggestions have been made from time to time in relation to its presentation, and they include such matters

as providing a time of starting and finishing, and showing the subject matter at the head of the page so that those who use *Hansard* sparingly but are looking for some specific interest area may be more easily able to pick up the trend of the debate or the position of the debate in *Hansard*. Has the Government given any thought to any changes? Can the Premier indicate whether there is any Government attitude to perhaps some minor additional expenditure that would be incurred, as that additional expenditure would need to be weighed against the increased value of the document to the public?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Perhaps this would be a matter for the Presiding Officers to consider, and the member's query could be referred to them.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I accept that invitation, so long as the Premier recognises that, if it were to be implemented with the approval of presiding officers, there is likely to be an excess warrant required at the end of the year, so that it really does need a Government input as well as a presiding officers' input in relation to the end result.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I accept that, but I guess that the first stage is to ascertain what is possible and desirable at *Hansard* level.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Following up that previous question, not so much the introduction of the time line, but would not the introduction of running heads for separate subjects considerably increase the cost of *Hansard*?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess that it could in that it would require much editing and, bearing in mind that *Hansard* is produced rapidly (and that is, of course, the essence of it so that it is available to members as soon as possible), it may even slow down the process. However, obviously those implications would have to be studied, but I think that that is a valid point.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My first point refers to the printing and publishing of *Hansard*, \$985 000. Word processors have been adopted now by *Hansard*. How effective has their application been, is it likely to lead now to a reduction in the actual long-term printing costs of *Hansard*, and (and I realise that the Premier will not have detailed information) could the Premier ask *Hansard* to prepare a report for Parliament? It is important, because I recall at one stage as Minister looking at the introduction of this system of word processing along with others in other Government departments. It is important that the Government and Parliament have some feedback on how effective is the introduction of word processing, whether the cost savings talked about are actually achieved, what other advantages are achieved, and what problems are perceived by those who are now implementing the schemes. If we are now to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year on processors (which I think we should, frankly, where it is effective and efficient to do so), then I think that we should carefully assess the changes that occur.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That question can be referred to *Hansard* to ascertain whether it can provide some information to the member.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My second question relates to Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and an allocation of \$15 000 and \$4 500. Does that include a special allocation to send a member of Parliament to the Mount Eliza Australian Administrative Staff College? Before the Premier came into this place, I attended as a sponsored person under the C.P.A. in 1976, I think, and certainly the Hon. Miss Levy from another place has attended. I reported to Parliament, and I know that the then Premier (The Hon. D.A. Dunstan) agreed that someone should attend that staff college at least every other year, and I think that it would be of enormous value to members of Parliament if they could attend. Would the Premier ensure that that practice be

continued? It has in fact already fallen well behind what was originally planned.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Of course there have been some considerable improvements in relation to study tours and the ability of members to avail themselves of that sort of study and exposure to courses. The member would also be aware that, while his experience was one from which he obviously derived benefit and reported accordingly, in the case of the Hon. Miss Levy who went to a subsequent course, she was not so convinced of the value of it for members of Parliament, although she said that there were certain advantages in terms of personal development to be gained from it.

The structure of the course and its nature was probably not of as great a value. Now faced with that conflict of information from those members who had availed themselves of it, the C.P.A. has been discussing the issue. That discussion has not been finalised and, while it is continuing, no provision has been made for a place at one of these schools. As to the outcome of that discussion, I think it will require to be further considered by the C.P.A. executives.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I acknowledge the fact that, for me, there was plenty of room for improvement, and therefore perhaps I received some benefit from the course. However, I again endorse the course and from my knowledge, people who attended from outside of Parliament in a private capacity certainly have received much benefit, including those people from the trade union movement.

**Mr TRAINER:** In relation to members' insurance, I notice there is no allocation this year. Is that because it has been transferred to another line that has not been indicated in the Estimates of Payments?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes. The Government is now covering the risk.

**Mr Mitchell:** There has been a change in the basis for the members' insurance policy as a result of which Cabinet decided to cover its own risk rather than to insure with an outside insurer.

**Mr BAKER:** Should the Incidental Expenses line appear under the line for Commonwealth Parliamentary Association rather than in a separate line? Otherwise, I would assume it would be included in the Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries line.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes.

**Mr BAKER:** For Parliamentary Building—fuel and light, rates cleaning, etc., the amount set aside is about 25 per cent above the 1982-83 expenditure and over 30 per cent above the 1982-83 anticipated expenditure. Can the Premier explain the massive escalation in this particular item.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The major change relates to the addition of an amount to cover the cost of airconditioning maintenance. This was previously paid out of the Legislature, Miscellaneous line, Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, that is now taken into account in this line. It has been transferred to where it should more properly go, and that is in the Parliamentary Building maintenance area.

**Mr LEWIS:** Does the line Parliamentary Building—fuel and light, rates cleaning etc. include an allocation of funds necessary to make the inadequate office space now used by the member for Mallee more habitable than is now the case? It is impossible to hear when I am speaking on the telephone, let alone when I want to speak to my secretary because of water coming through the 6in. galvanised pipes inside the office. On hot days the stale air comes up from the basement into the middle of the office. Would it be possible to use remnants of the carpet that are fitted on the floor to cover almost bare concrete so that the facilities might be more in keeping with what other executives would have in their offices?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I was not aware of this sub-standard accommodation about which the member for Mallee is talking. Perhaps he should take up the matter with the Speaker. Extra space was created by the electrician moving out, and I guess because of the nature of the electrician's job he did not require the same sort of office working conditions as does the member. I understand that the member does have his electorate office based in this building and that obviously does create some accommodation strain. Is that now the only electorate office operating from the Parliamentary building?

**Mr Mitchell:** There are two.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That obviously creates some demands. If the member would take it up with the Speaker, I do not know what can be done to alleviate his problems, but the resources are not there to do anything substantial in this financial year.

**Mr LEWIS:** I will not pursue the matter at length, but I point out I have taken the matter up with officers of Parliament and the Speaker and have been told that funds would be made available during this financial year. Perhaps I will pursue the matter with the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Public Works.

I wish to ask a question on another matter in Miscellaneous under the line of publications. Amongst those publications are the election results relating to previous elections or any election as it arises. I am concerned that those results do not give what I regard as vital information and what I have been trying to determine myself from other sources only to discover yesterday the Commonwealth Electoral Office made an announcement about that kind of information. I am referring to the information about the numbers of people who are eligible to vote but do not take the opportunity to do so for one reason or another.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair believes that this question is not in this particular line and it would be more appropriately handled in the line related to the Electoral Department. I cannot allow the member to pursue that particular line of questioning.

**Mr LEWIS:** If printed material for members of Parliament is to contain that information then surely the expenditure allocated for this purpose ought to specify that it should.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair does not want to be difficult about this, but points out to the member for Mallee that the particular line to which he is referring relates to the question of printing, not to some information that the honourable member is now seeking. The question is out of order.

**Mr LEWIS:** If the information I am seeking is not provided by the dollars we allocate for the purpose of publishing it, then how on earth do we draw the attention—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member cannot be allowed to pursue this form of questioning. The Chair points out that the line of questioning that the honourable member is now pursuing would be more appropriate under the Electoral Department line which will come up for examination on Thursday in Committee B. The Chair cannot allow the honourable member to keep this line of questioning literally in defiance of the Chair.

**Mr LEWIS:** I ask you to intimate to me how I can ensure as a member of this place that such information is published when funds are allocated for the purpose of publishing it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has already pointed out to the honourable member that the time and place to pursue the line of questioning that the honourable member is now pursuing is under the line Electoral Department, which will be examined in Committee B on Thursday. I suggest that the honourable member wait until Thursday, when he certainly can pursue in Committee B what he is trying to



pursue here. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

State Governor's Establishment, \$364 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B. Guerin, Director, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Mr E.E. Kageler, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Members would be appreciative of the fact that long before his death Sir Edward Hayward indicated that he had hoped that it might be possible to relocate Government House to a property known as Carrick Hill, at Springfield. Subsequent discussions indicated that perhaps there was a greater breadth of involvement that might apply as far as Carrick Hill was concerned. Indeed, the deed to the property, which is an extremely generous benefaction to the State by Sir Edward, provides that Carrick Hill can be used as a home for the Governor, as a museum, an art gallery, or a botanic garden. The State Government is empowered to accept the gift for any of those purposes and I understand that the gift is now available to the Government. Can the Premier say whether the Government has made any final decisions about the use to which this magnificent property will be put? Further to that, is there to be a relocation of any of the facilities associated with the State Governor's present establishment, and, if so, what would be the alternative use of Government House? I would say very quickly that the Opposition does not foresee the seat of the Governor shifting from its present site, which is across the road. However, we would like some information concerning the Government's intention in this matter.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Carrick Hill bequest, which was secured by an Act of this Parliament, as the member indicated does indicate four possible uses. In 1974 a committee was established which went into this whole question in some depth and looked at the various alternatives. Obviously, following that exercise no further action was taken because Sir Edward was in residence, and until his recent death the question of future use of Carrick Hill in any definite terms did not arise. However, we have now reactivated a small committee within the Government and have used the previous report as a base (in other words, they did not have to start again from scratch) to look at various possibilities involved. It will probably be some time before the committee is in a position to report.

In the meantime, of those four stipulated uses, the option that it be used as an alternative residence for the Governor or for a State Governor's establishment has been ruled out. That use was ruled out in the 1974 report, and the reasons

for doing so then are still valid today. In part, they relate to the size of the residence and the possibility of its being used for State dinners, receptions—the sort of thing the Governor must do in the course of his duties. Also, the matter of security problems was addressed in regard to its use as a Governor's residence. The overall conclusion of that earlier inquiry was that the property would require very considerable modification, probably to the detriment of the house, to make it suitable for a Governor's residence. I see no reason to doubt those findings or to reconsider them in the current situation. So, of the available options, that is one which we will not be actively pursuing.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I place on record the Opposition's feelings for His Excellency the Governor in his most recent loss. I further fortify the fact that the Opposition believes that the service being given to the people of South Australia and the very human side of Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan coming through is of considerable value to the position that he holds in this State, and long may it reign.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 40 of the programme performance budgeting papers (the yellow book) under '1982-83 specific targets and objectives' the following statement is made:

In May 1983 a Grounds and Gardens Committee comprising representatives of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, P.B.D. and Botanic Gardens was established to make recommendations regarding capital and maintenance work at the Governor's residences.

When is that report likely to be handed down? Secondly, under the heading 'Major resource variations in 1983-84', reference is made to a provision for the completion of a portrait of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Is that portrait to be placed within the confines of Parliament House? Who is doing it, and at what cost? Finally, I note that the Governor's entitlements amount to \$97 800. Is that indexed in accordance with the Act? It represents an increase of some \$10 000. If that is so, why is that at variance with increases obtained by workers in this State who are not getting their increase?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The member has asked three questions. In relation to the capital and maintenance work at the Governor's residence, obviously that is an ongoing programme. A reassessment was made of needs, particularly in relation to some of the outbuildings, the caretaker's cottage type buildings, within the grounds, which in some instances had deteriorated, needing some modification. A general works programme has been discussed with the Governor and provided for. It does not involve any major structural modifications or changes to Government House. It is more an ongoing programme which aims to preserve the building in the best possible condition, although each Governor probably has some particular minor modifications made to suit his work style or method of operation.

On the matter of the portrait of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, that commission was entered into by the previous Government in April last year with Mr Brian Westwood, an Australian portrait painter now resident in the United States. The Queen sat for the portrait in May/June last year and the first working drawings were provided to the Government. However, there has been some considerable delay in the completion of that project. An amount of \$9 000 is allocated for that purpose under 'Miscellaneous'. The vote for 1982-83 was \$11 000, of which \$2 000 was paid to the artist as a progress payment. The balance of the payment will not be made until the portrait has been completed in accordance with the contract, which requires it to be satisfactory to the Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia.

So far, we anticipate delivery in this financial year. The artist has undertaken to complete the portrait within the

next few months. The project was conceived, I understand, from a remark that there was no portrait of the present monarch in Government House. I believe that the Duke of Edinburgh made the comment, and I think it was the previous Premier who very enthusiastically took up the suggestion that there should be a portrait. So, the portrait has been commissioned to hang in Government House. However, under the arrangement with the artist he will provide another accompanying portrait on a smaller scale which will be made available to the Art Gallery of South Australia. The total cost covers both portraits. On the question of the Governor's salary—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair has allowed the Premier to answer the question, but the Chair has a grave doubt as to whether the question has anything to do with the vote we are now dealing with which is explicit—the State Governor's establishment. I do not think the Chair should allow this line of questioning.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I come back to the point in relation to Carrick Hill and its surrounding property. The Premier realises that I have had a private conversation with him concerning this property. Being the local member of Parliament, I am particularly concerned about what the property will be used for. The Premier this afternoon has indicated that a committee has been established by the Government, and previously I asked privately to be included on that committee. I would like to formally record the point that I would again request to be included on that committee. People of Springfield and surrounding suburbs are particularly concerned as to what use that property is to be put, and whether it will blend in with existing uses and maintain the residential nature of the area. It is more than Carrick Hill house itself because the Premier would realise that it is a very substantial landholding, some of it in the hills face zone, although I think there are 25 or 30 acres outside the hills face zone. Again, I would ask, as the local member of Parliament, whether I could be included on any such committee examining the future use of Carrick Hill.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am aware of the member's interest. He did talk to me about it soon after Sir Edward Hayward's death, and I did undertake to provide him with information at the appropriate time. This committee's investigation to which I have referred is of a preliminary nature which involves in part the reassessment of the 1974 report provided to the then Government. I do not know whether it would be appropriate for the member to be on such a committee; it would be fairly unprecedented, but I will suggest to those involved in the exercise that they consult with the honourable member fairly shortly.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Could the Premier say who is on the committee and who is its Chairman?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not have the details to hand. I know that the Director of the Art Gallery is involved, along with the Acting Director of the Department for the Arts. I am not sure which of those gentlemen is chairing the exercise. Mr Holland, from the Premier's Department, who has had a long-standing interest in Carrick Hill, is also a member. I will provide the precise details to the member.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I find it interesting that the Art Gallery should be involved. I am not criticising that in any way, but I stress the fact that that is obviously looking at the building. The surrounding grounds are very extensive (as I said, I think 30 acres outside the hills face zone), and I know from a conversation I had with him that Sir Edward had a number of ideas about what that land could be used for. Obviously that is not part of any proposal for an art gallery, and I would caution the Premier that he needs to look at the broader use of the property rather than just the building. I also draw to his attention that Sir Edward Hayward was always very generous in allowing the Waite Agri-

cultural Research Institute to use that part of the property in the Hills, and there may need to be some consultation with the Waite Agricultural Research Institute as to whether or not it might be feasible for it to take over that part of the property.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** These broader issues will be addressed. The member is quite right; we should not look just at the buildings but at the grounds and surrounding areas, and that 1974 study included considerable assessment of that aspect. The Botanic Gardens has done work on it and obviously its input will be required in this current exercise, so I can assure him that it will be looked at in totality and done thoroughly.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Mr Chairman, as you disallowed my question on the Governor's salary, I would seek to know from you where I can ask that question later on during the Estimates Committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The part of the Estimates that the honourable member is seeking appears to be under 'Salaries and allowances'.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is pursuant to the Constitution, and the easiest thing might be, as it comes under the Special Acts detailed at page 8, to provide the honourable member with that information. I do not have it to hand. I have to obtain it from the Treasury and I will give him a written response.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps if the honourable member asks a question we can work out from the Chair whether or not it is in order.

**Mr HAMILTON:** To reiterate what I said, is the figure of \$97 800 in accordance with the various Acts? Is that increase of \$10 600 indexed within the Act and, if so, why is it that the Governor receives an indexed amount, whereas workers in this State have had to wait for an increase? The Premier has given me an undertaking to provide me with that information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair will call the Premier. However, it is a bit of a difficult area to reply.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I would simply say it is provided under the Special Acts. I would have to obtain the information in writing for the member, and will do so.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any other questions? If not, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Premier and Cabinet, \$3 742 000

**Acting Chairperson:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby

**Members:**

Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B. Guerin, Director, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Mr E.E. Kageler, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the vote open for examination.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It has been revealed in the information made available to the members that the personnel number in the Premier's office has increased from 14 to 16. Can the Premier advise (it is not, I suggest, completely clear from the information) the job functions carried out by the additional two staff members, whether the additional staff members are employed under the Public Service Act, or whether they are Ministerial appointments? If the additional staff members are Ministerial appointments, would the Premier advise the names of those persons and their salary levels?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** On my present staff establishment I have an inquiry officer, not provided for by the previous Government, and also a special assistant, who works for the Deputy Premier and me on certain research projects. That is Mr Melvin. It is worth noting in this context that, although there is a complement of two extra officers, as the member notes, the overall salary bill is little higher than that of the previous Government because the levels at which my overall staff are structured are not at the same levels as the previous Government had. There is a difference in loadings, and so on. I have adopted the same principle as I have allowed for the Leader of the Opposition, namely, to provide for staffing within an allocated budget amount in broad terms. There is some discretion in how much we pay. Someone like the Hon. C.R. Story, employed by the previous Premier, was paid the top Ministerial officer rate with a 25 per cent loading. The loadings paid to my staff do not reflect the same sort of levels, which has meant that, in terms of a total budget, there is the ability to employ extra persons.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I believe the Premier mentioned the name of a person employed. I did not catch the name.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Mr D. Melvin.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Are the additional staff members employed under the Public Service Act or are they Ministerial appointments?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** They are Ministerial appointments. Their rates are attached to Public Service rates.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If the additional staff members are Ministerial appointments, will the Premier advise the names of those persons as well as their salary levels? Whilst answering that point, could he indicate whether the person assisting the Deputy Premier and the Premier is shown totally on the complement of the Premier or as a percentage?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, the salary is shown totally on my line. I will supply in writing the details that the honourable member requests. A number of my Ministerial staff are seconded officers from the Public Service whilst being employed in the Premier's Office as such. They are outside the Public Service Act but are seconded from the Public Service. In terms of the overall increment of staff, there are about half a dozen public servants in substantive positions.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In providing the detail that the Premier has offered, it would be appreciated if the full detail of individuals and their scope of operation was made available. It has been noted that there is a change of name and change of purpose within the activity of the Premier and Cabinet, more particularly because of the composition of a number of Cabinet committees rather than the manner in which the previous Administration functioned. Is the action the Premier has taken now final in its implementation or what additional action does he intend to take? Some information was given in the yellow book by way of projection based on figures for the financial year 1983-84, which is now almost a third of the way through this being the end of September. Can the Premier indicate any fine

tuning, the need for which may have become apparent in regard to the implementation of his aims? What changes, if any, are in contemplation?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The major changes have all been effected. It is fair to say that, bearing in mind that they have been in place only for some months, they are working well and there is no real cause for any major review. The details of those changes are contained in the book and I do not want to go through them. In general terms, the chief differences between the previous Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the current operation involve the transfer of the State Development function into the newly consolidated State Development Department and the reorganisation of the Cabinet Office, which involves the dismantling and reorganisation of the research unit or division present under the previous Government into a Cabinet Office support.

The only areas in which further changes are possible (although of a minor nature) is in the inter-governmental relations and co-ordination programme and possibly also in the publicity and information function. The head of that section, Mr Joe Parks, resigned recently to take up a position in New South Wales. That vacancy has given us cause to reassess that area also. With minor modifications in those two areas, the shape of the department is now established, and it will be a year or so before its effectiveness needs reviewing.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I refer to the Cabinet Office with an allocation of \$400 000 and with 10 people employed in that area. Will the Premier outline the procedure in terms of how that office operates? Does the Cabinet Office have access to Cabinet dockets before they go to Cabinet? Do they write a critique or comment on each docket before it is considered by Cabinet? In what other work are they heavily involved? I recall two or three people being involved in helping to administer Cabinet, but I fail to understand how one could occupy 10 people in that area.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I also recall that the Hon. R. Story was required to sit in Cabinet holding the hands of the various Cabinet Ministers through the term of the previous Government. We have reverted to the practice of having only Cabinet Ministers present at Cabinet discussions unless they wish to invite someone for specific information although that has not arisen yet in terms of Cabinet, even though it does frequently occur with Cabinet committees.

I am also aware that under the previous Government Cabinet meetings used to begin at some time in the morning and, after a fairly salubrious lunch, go on well into the late afternoon and early evening. We have reverted again to the practice of efficiently conducting Cabinet meetings between about 2.15 p.m. and 5 p.m., unless there are some special matters, and that has been a pattern which I believe has worked quite effectively. We have also confined our lunch to some sandwiches and a few small pies and pasties, so I do not know what savings have been effected there.

However, more seriously, in terms of the Cabinet office, its chief task is to service the Cabinet through the three Cabinet Committees that have been established, and in this respect our method of organising Cabinet differs quite markedly from that of the previous Government. We have committees which comprise some six to nine Ministers with particular portfolio interests. For instance, the Economic and Expenditure Committee deals with Treasury and economic development matters; the second one is the Physical Resources Committee and, thirdly, the Human Resources Committee. Those broad groupings, which I think I have outlined previously to this House, look at the longer-term considerations, deal with specific problems that are better dealt with by a group of Ministers rather than Cabinet as a whole, and ultimately refer their recommendations to Cabinet.

The Cabinet office is very actively involved in that Cabinet Committee level process. Its particular job is to service those Committees, to ensure that documentation is provided; to co-ordinate the inputs from the various departments which may be making presentations or recommendations; and doing the work of refining and developing, on instruction from the Cabinet Committees, anything that arises out of those committee considerations. As far as the Cabinet itself and its decision making process is concerned, the same pattern that applied previously still occurs, namely, the consideration of submissions which are presented to Cabinet and formally dealt with.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I remind the Premier of the first question I asked in a series of questions, and I thank him for the information he has provided, although I am not quite sure that it is entirely accurate in relation to some of the assertions at least as far as the former Government is concerned. Does the staff of the Cabinet office scrutinise Cabinet submissions or read those submissions before they are presented to Cabinet and, in addition, does it prepare any report on them?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Included in the complement of 10 are the clerk assistants to Cabinet, in other words, various staff who process the dockets and submissions which go into Cabinet. In terms of advice on individual submissions, that is very much a matter that is at the Premier's discretion and, as regards getting comments or advice as necessary, I go to whoever is the appropriate source.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** So, in terms of, for instance, the financial impact or the cost of the particular Cabinet submission, how it would be administered or, in fact, regarding any specific policy matter, it could well be that the Cabinet submission is referred to that Cabinet office and it would prepare a statement. Can the Premier indicate whether it is a similar procedure to that which applied under the Dunstan Government?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Any submission which comes to Cabinet should have included in it the financial manpower and other consequences that arise out of a decision being made, and that information would be included in the submission in consultation with the appropriate departments. If for some reason that information is not included in the Cabinet submission as such, or if Cabinet decides that further information is necessary, comments would be sought from appropriate departments. If it is a financial matter, obviously the Treasurer would be asked to comment on these things.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** There is no one person or group of people outside the actual Ministers who go through and scrutinise every Cabinet submission?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is at the discretion and under the control of the Premier as to who scrutinises and under what basis.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I appreciate that it is at the Premier's discretion. I am merely asking does it occur?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not prepared to explain how I exercise my discretion. I simply say that that is the way it is done.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** What happens regarding an individual submission?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Premier, as the Chairman (if you like) of Cabinet, has to be aware of the implications of any submission that comes before the Cabinet, and I take advice as appropriate.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I take it from that that the answer is 'Yes'.

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Premier say whether he can isolate the salary of the Agent-General from the Trade Commissioner, what expenses he may personally have, and what are the numbers and classifications of his staff?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Agent-General's salary is provided pursuant to the Agent-General Act, the details of which are on page 8 of the line estimates, and \$60 631 is provided; but, of course, the expenses of the Agent-General go well beyond that. Salaries for the Agent-General's office proposed this year amount to \$222 000. That is a reduction on the actual amount of 1982-83, partly because of various mechanical matters rather than a change in staffing levels (that is, there was an additional pay on the previous year, a higher duty payment and a variation in the exchange rate). The overall complement of the Agent-General's office is being maintained at present. There are 13 persons employed. That covers the full complement from the Agent-General to the secretarial assistants in the Agent-General's office. The Agent-General is reviewing his staffing needs and requirements at the moment, and that may further reduce in the coming financial year. That is all in the context of an overall review, which is under way of Government overseas representation.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Following the most recent statement by the Premier, mention is made of attempts to further streamline the operations of the Agent-General's office or South Australia House with possible reductions in some of the less important activities. It is also indicated on page 61 of the documents that employment levels will increase from 5.9 to 9.8 full-time equivalents. There appears to be considerable inconsistency in the two approaches. If one is to streamline and reduce and yet increase from 5.9 to 9.8, there must be some information which can be made available to the Committee. I acknowledge that there is a brief mention of a closer liaison with the United Kingdom and Europe, and from the Premier's own statement I am aware that the Agent-General, along with Mr Smith of the Development Branch, is actively undertaking interviews in Europe relative to the submarine project. Can the Premier explain this apparent inconsistency, and will he outline what he sees as being the Agent-General's role in negotiations for the submarine project, whether all of it or at least a major part of it be for South Australia?

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

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** One question related to the question of resources in the Agent-General's Office because in the programme papers it looks as though there is an increase in numbers which cuts across the statement I made earlier that staff is being maintained at 13 and might be reduced in this coming year. The figure of 13 bears no relationship to the 9.8 that is shown in the programme although, if it is added to the category of provision of assistance to South Australian citizens visiting the United Kingdom, 9.8 and 2.4 equal 12.2, which is not quite 13 but is the average employment over a full year. It represents a staff complement of 13, which is average. The increase remarked on earlier is simply the result of a transfer. It previously appeared in the provision of co-ordination of State promotion activities and the co-ordination of the activities of agencies and development projects in the State Development Office under the previous Government.

The State Development Office is now incorporated with the Department of State Development but those positions in the Agent-General's Office have been transferred under the general heading 'Provision of services to Government agencies' through the office of Agent-General into his line. It does not represent an increment: it represents a transfer of function, an allocation within the programme. It points up one of the problems we have with programme budgeting whereby, if there is an administrative reorganisation, there has to be somewhere to put the various bodies, and that

may change from year to year, which makes it a little difficult to interpret the papers.

In relation to the ancillary matter mentioned by the member for Light involving the submarine project, the Agent-General is part of that delegation which comprises Mr Smith and a representative of the steering group of the Chamber of Commerce. The Agent-General did a lot of the preparatory work and has been very valuable in establishing contacts and acting as our man on the spot, as it were, in relation to this submarine project. The tendency of the office of the Agent-General has been increasingly over the years to make it more trade oriented and to act more as a point of contact in a promotional position in terms of general State development rather than it being a functional, ceremonial type of office. Mr Rundle's brief sees him performing that sort of function, and his background in the private sector in South Australia and as former President of the Chamber I think gives him good qualifications in that area.

In part, and despite rumours that Mr Rundle was going to be recalled on the change of Government, after I had discussed with Mr Rundle the priorities of the Government and the general way in which it can see him operating, I have no problem in seeing Mr Rundle continuing in his role as Agent-General.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Is the Premier able to indicate when the contract of employment for Mr Rundle expires? Has the Premier, any other Minister of the Government or senior Government officer had any recent discussions with the Agent-General about the tenure of his office and, if not, going one step further, is it the intention of the Government that the present Agent-General complete the full term of his initial appointment, which I believed was for five years? I was happy to hear the Premier indicate the Agent-General's value in the present negotiations relating to the submarine project. Many people from the business sector have mentioned to me the great value they see of the 'new breed' Agent-General and in that group I put Mr Scriven who, along with Mr Rundle, has had a direct involvement with industry and therefore has perhaps a value rather different from someone who has come from the Public Service. In saying that, I am in no way disparaging the work that has been done by public servants from the State over a long period, but it does give a breadth of knowledge which is of value in the work that has to be undertaken for the State, recognising that it is a delicate position not only to represent the Government but also to give advice to business and commerce as the man on the spot.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Mr Rundle was appointed by the previous Government in 1980 for a five-year term, which I think expires in 1985. His future will be decided at the appropriate time, and now is not the appropriate time. As I have indicated, we are also reviewing the whole question of the effectiveness of our representation overseas and the deployment of resources. It has been commented on often in the past that in terms of resources we put infinitely more into maintaining an Agent-General's Office in London than we put into representations in various other parts of the world and perhaps the time has come to look at that. Mr Rundle himself has been actively reviewing that situation in the time he has been in London, and he has already provided at least one major report to me on it.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I notice on page 60 that one of the roles of the Agent-General is attendance at tourist promotions sponsored by the Federal Government and the South Australian Department of Tourism. This afternoon I had the pleasure, with many of my Parliamentary colleagues, to go to the Townhouse for the launching of the promotion of Tourism in South Australia Week. All those who attended the luncheon received booklets about the promotion. From that booklet I can understand the important role of the

Agent-General in London. It is stated that between 350 000 and 400 000 South Australians are employed directly or indirectly as a result of tourism, so it is indeed an important function.

Whilst discussing tourism and its importance I would draw to the attention of my colleagues the important role the Agent-General in London plays in looking after South Australians. However, many South Australians visiting London do not advise the Agent-General of their presence in England. When I was talking recently to the Agent-General, he told me about some of the difficulties his office has in locating South Australians who do not contact his office when they arrive in London. This is particularly important when his office is asked to locate someone because of the death of a member of that person's family. It makes it difficult for the Agent-General if South Australians do not contact the office when they are in London. Perhaps the Government could publicise this aspect of the Agent-General's work.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess it is worth pointing out that the primary role of providing support and assistance to nationals overseas rests with the Australian Government through its Embassies and High Commissions. It has certainly been true that in recent years, particularly in London, the services provided by Australia House have been drastically reduced. In a sense that has put a greater burden on the Agent-General for South Australia. Whether and to what extent that gap can be filled by the South Australian Government through the Agent-General's Office is something that we must constantly keep under review because, if we were placed in a position of having to provide all those back-up resources, the vital role that the Agent-General should be playing in terms of industrial development, investment opportunities and tourism, as mentioned by the member, will be curtailed, as he will be flat out receiving South Australian visitors. So, there must be some balance in that area. I would certainly support the Federal Government's providing greater assistance than it does at the moment to Australian visitors to London which would take some of the pressure off South Australia House.

**Mr BAKER:** I would like to pre-empt my question with the observation that, having discounted the lines for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in regard to changes in function between that department and State development, overseas representation, and a couple of other items, one finds that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has received a boost in funds of some 33.6 per cent, which is quite extraordinary, for maintaining existing functions, or for the continuation of functions that were carried out by the previous Government. It amazes me that during times of economic stringency the Premier would allocate that department an increase of funds of this nature. I refer to just one of the items that has contributed to this massive escalation, namely, the Cabinet Office allocation of \$368 000. I refer to page 43 of the Programme Estimates, which indicates that 14.4 persons are employed in that area. I realise that one or two have come from other areas. In reply to a previous question the Premier indicated that three committees operate in that area. Which portfolios are covered under those areas, and what expenditure relates to physical and human resources?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I shall forward the honourable member a copy of the list in writing. As to the introductory remarks made by the honourable member, they are totally erroneous. In fact, as page 5 of the document discloses, there has been an increase in expenditure in the area referred to of 12.6 per cent on actual expenditure over 1982-83, and in fact that is related primarily to the increased expenditure on the Jubilee 150 secretariat. Of course, that expenditure will increase as we lead up to the jubilee. Far from there

being some overall expansion in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, in fact we have pruned back its function and have made it considerably leaner. Also we have seconded staff to ensure that we are getting access to resources within the Public Service which in turn will go back to various departments. It is not good enough the honourable member's saying as a throw-away line that most of them come from other areas. The procedure is part of a very conscious method of ensuring that there is a wide experience of the sort of policy details dealt with in a central department such as the Department of the Premier and Cabinet among line department managers in the Public Service. In fact, I feel that one of the Government's best achievements in structural reorganisation has been that which it has managed to achieve in the Premier's Department in making it the lean type of department that it should be.

**Mr BAKER:** I asked about the portfolios covered under each item. My next question was to ask the Premier which people are actually servicing those committees, and how many of them are new appointees who were not previously in the Premier's Department.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Each committee has a secretary. The Secretary of the Economic and Expenditure Committee is the Director of the Premier's Department, Mr Guerin, who was not a member of the Premier's Department prior to being appointed Director. He was attached to the Public Service Board and was Chairman of the Data Processing Board. Mr Guerin's salary and position have not been replaced, so there is no net increment by virtue of the fact that Mr Guerin has become Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Secretary of the Physical Resources and Development Committee is Mr John Collins, who is also head of the Cabinet Office. He was head of the former Research Branch in the Premier's Department under the former Government. The Secretary of the Human Resources Committee is Mr Dennis Ryan, who was seconded from the Public Service Board. The other members of the Cabinet Office do not have delineated duties: they work on a range of projects relating to all of these committees.

**Mr BAKER:** Is it fair to suggest that each one of those people was not in the Premier's Department previously? Of the remaining complement of 10 (there are three bodies involved here) I presume that there are seven. How many others in that complement came from outside the Premier's Department, and how many have been appointed since the new Government took office?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The clerical officers are the same or equivalent, and they are included in the 10. There were nine persons employed in the Research Branch in addition, and within the current Cabinet Office three of those people are currently employed. One who was in the Research Branch is now in the Inter-Government Relations Branch. So, that is a total of four still within the Premier's Department structure.

**Mr BAKER:** So, there are three—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member has had three calls. I think I ought to call the Leader of the Opposition. If the honourable member wishes to continue after that he will be quite entitled to do so.

**Mr OLSEN:** I preface my question to the Premier by saying that I noted at lunch-time that Parliament House is about the only building in Adelaide that does not have the Australian flag flying at the moment. As there has been a resurgence of national pride recently, perhaps we could get the Australian flag flying on Parliament House today. I am taking up the Prime Minister's point by referring to our national pride and spirit, demonstrating our support for *Australia II*, which won the America's Cup this morning.

The programme papers reveal that following the last State election the Government abolished the deregulation unit.

How many officers are now involved in work associated with deregulation projects, and what legislative measures, if any, does the Government plan to take in regard to the work initiated by the former Government in review and rationalising Acts, regulations, and administrative procedures so that the cost of Government controls can be minimised?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Government took the decision (I think this matter has already been covered by a question raised in the House previously) that, far from aiding the process of deregulation, the existence of the deregulation unit was allowing departments and other bodies to pass the buck of responsibility for deregulatory activity on to the unit, when in fact responsibility should reside within the bodies concerned.

The Government received a full report on deregulation activities that included a number of on-going projects, and the task of co-ordinating those activities within the various departments is in the hands of an individual officer in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet who reports regularly on the progress that is being made. Meanwhile, on-going work is being done in the departments where responsibility resides, and that means that more officers are probably being engaged in this process than when it was hived-off into a unit which, while it might have had some propaganda value for the previous Government, in terms of effectiveness it was fairly limited when it began to get into the serious work because it did not have that access to departmental decision-making that is crucial in any effective deregulation. So, the programme is continuing with some success on a project basis within departments co-ordinated centrally from the Cabinet office.

**Mr OLSEN:** Mention is made of completion during 1982-83 of a review of city-based Government vehicle usage (I refer to yellow book page 48). Will the Premier elaborate on the findings of that review?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** This comes under my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, in his capacity as Minister in charge of the Service and Supply Department in which a car pool arrangement is being established, and detailed questions on that would be better directed to the Minister who is in charge of implementing action arising out of that review.

**Mr OLSEN:** Recognising that the Minister for Environment and Planning will answer further questions, can I take it from the Premier's response that the Government is in favour of car pooling?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, we are working on rationalising the use of Government vehicles. The question of whether we will follow the car-pool idea as originally conceived, I would have to refer to my colleague.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier advise the Committee the names of officers employed in the Premier's economic unit, including salaries payable to those officers, and also whether all officers are employed under the Public Service Act?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will supply that information in written form to the Leader.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My question relates to the line 'Review of Government Management and Operations.' There is a new provision there for a body set up in May of this year and, according to the programme performance budgeting, this body was a consolidation of what was taken from the Public Service Board and Treasury. Yet, if one turns to page 22 of the Estimates under the Public Service Board one sees 'Programme 4—Organisation and Management of Government Departments and Agencies'. From what I can see the names are almost identical, except that there appears to be in the Premier's Department a body to review what is being carried on in the Public Service Board. Is this simply a super-spy body, more or less set up to keep an eye

on the Public Service Board? Who occupies the positions, and what exactly is the role of that group?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In general terms this group has been established to improve efficiency in the overall arrangement of Government departments. Obviously it works in closely with the Board, as members of the unit come from the Public Service Board. It has been under the general direction of the Director, and perhaps I could ask Mr Guerin to respond further.

**Mr Guerin:** The review of Government management and operations is an overall arrangement under which a variety of changes have been made under this Government. One of the reviewing and re-organising activities that took place was the establishment of the Department of State Development and similar changes in departmental arrangements. Subsequently, this year the review of Government's financial management arrangement under the chairmanship of the Under Treasurer was established with some outside representation, including Mr Bob Thomas, Chief Executor of the A.I.D.C. in the Canberra-based Development Bank, and Mr Scanlon, Chief Executive of Fauldings, and they are looking at the more financially-based management questions within the Public Service and the Government generally.

The review of Public Service management is dealing with the less financially-based matters, and also has some outside representation on it, such as Mr Graham Spurling, Managing Director of Mitsubishi. The unit in the Premier's Department is essentially a servicing unit to those reviews, and all the personnel have been drawn from other departments and until the change in this financial year their salaries were actually provided under other Budget lines. It is true that to some extent this unit is considering the operations of the Public Service Board, because that is one of the terms of reference of the general review of Public Service management. It is some time since the personnel and management function within the Public Service has been reviewed, and that is one of the tasks of this group. The Public Service Board itself is continuing on its review activities as a normal part of Government. Other review activities are taking place elsewhere: for example, in Treasury and in individual departments studying their own activities, but we have not identified any direct duplication. The only previous reference to super-spy that I have come across was in Mr Colquhoun's column in the *Advertiser*.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I understand that Mr Scriven, former Director of the Premier's Department, acted as personal adviser to the Premier. I was not sure, based on the programme performance budget, where he fitted into the staff layout or organisational chart on page 1. Could the Premier indicate where he fits into that? Will he be replaced in the Premier's office now that he has been appointed Director of Lands; and who will undertake his functions if he is not to be replaced?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Mr Scriven was appointed as what I think was called 'Consultant to the Premier' in April this year with two major tasks to hand. The primary one was to be in charge of the overall inquiry into the bushfire disasters, and he and Brigadier Lewis from the Australian Army have conducted a thorough investigation based around all agencies' responses to the disasters, and so on.

I would expect that report to be finalised and presented to the Government within a matter of weeks, or certainly interim recommendations from the report will be received. That was a major task undertaken by Mr Scriven. Also, Mr Scriven, in conjunction with Mr Smith (Director of State Development), but with Mr Scriven taking the primary role, since the time of his appointment has been working on a study and report on SAGRIC, the overseas agricultural company the Government has established. That report has been completed, and will be assessed shortly. Mr Scriven's

primary task in relation to SAGRIC and to bushfires has been virtually completed, and he has been appointed as Director of Lands, a permanent head position in the Public Service. The role and position of consultant to the Premier has been abolished, because the tasks in which Mr Scriven was involved have been completed.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** As Mr Scriven was involved in considering emergency provisions for bushfires, can the Premier indicate whether the Government will proceed with the construction of the State Emergency Centre and, if so, when will work start on that centre? What type of facilities will be included, where will it be built, and what will be the estimated cost? If it is not to be built, why is not the Government going to proceed with what seems to be an essential service?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is one of the matters on which Mr Scriven is reporting to the Government. When we have studied his report, we will have answers to those questions.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** When will the report be ready?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Within the next few weeks. I cannot give a precise date, but most of the work on the report has been completed.

**Mr OLSEN:** The proposed expenditure for inter-government relations this year is \$200 000, and includes a reallocation of funds amounting to \$83 000 resulting from the transfer of some functions previously undertaken by the research branch. I also note that employment numbers have increased disproportionately from 2.5 to six full-time equivalents. Can the Premier say what are the classified levels of those employed in the unit, and elaborate on the job functions of the unit?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Government places some priority on this area. In fact, it places increasing priority, if one looks at developments at the national level with the changed policies of the new Federal Government and a number of programmes being offered to the States, namely, the motor vehicle industry assistance plan, the steel plan, and a number of I.S.E. inquiries, both general and particular. The role of the I.G.R.B. has expanded substantially. Resources have been found essentially by redeployment. There was a nucleus of staff involved in that interdepartmental relations area under the previous Government. One officer in I.G.R.B. at present came from the former research branch upon its disbandment. It is not an increment in total resources being applied overall, but there is certainly an increased emphasis being given. As I said earlier, the matter is still under review. I do not know whether it is a question of more resources or reorganisation, but it is a very important part of effective State Government activity in relation to the Federal Government and Federal programmes and also in relation to the general co-ordination of our responses.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the branch be involved in discussions with the New South Wales Government relating to natural gas prices?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Not necessarily. The matter of gas pricing is being handled within the Department of Mines and Energy, although in consultation with Treasury, as it has financial implications, and in consultation with the Attorney-General's Department because of legal ramifications for anything done in that area. Because of its nature and history, that matter is not being handled as an inter-governmental relations exercise. The primary thrust of I.G.R.B. is directed to the Federal Government and Federal matters, although liaison with other States is an important part of the process, but not its primary purpose.

**Mr OLSEN:** From the Premier's response, rationalising gas prices within two weeks (the time scale laid down by the Premier) will not be achieved. Will the work of the branch include contact with other States to seek alternatives

to pay-roll tax? The Premier mentioned that it has been principally related to activities with the Federal Government but, in the pay-roll tax area, would it be the work of the branch in liaison with other States? A.L.P. policy in this State is that a Labor Government will negotiate with all State Governments and the Federal Government with a view to the abolition of pay-roll tax and its possible replacement by increased Australian Government transfers to the States or with new State taxes.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That matter is being taken up with other States and at the national level. We hope it can be encompassed as part of the working party established following the Premiers' Conference to study the rationalisation of revenue raising between State and Federal Governments. There is a general consensus that, in time, some alternative to pay-roll tax should be found. The I.G.R.B. has an important role to play in co-ordinating submissions for that sort of exercise. The head of the branch (the Chief Project Officer) is usually represented at the Premiers' Conference and in other related areas.

**Mr BAKER:** In regard to the 150th anniversary celebrations, I note that the number of persons employed will increase from six last year to seven this year. I also note that \$434 000 was spent, and this financial year \$1.3 million is to be spent on the project. Has the Premier any details of what the \$434 000 was spent on, as I am unaware of any grants being given at this stage to any bodies for programmes for the 150th anniversary.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Some specific projects have been announced already, but allocations have not been determined at this stage. For instance, the Commonwealth has made available a sum and part of that has been earmarked for the maritime museum project at Port Adelaide and also for the historic town of Burra project. An amount was made available for the refurbishing and restoration of the old gum tree at Glenelg. There have been limited areas of expenditure commitment. The *Falje* is another project involving restoration. Money has been made available to assist in the development of submissions in certain areas; for instance, the Grand Prix project is getting some limited funding, around \$1 000, for developing our brief in an attempt to gain that. It is expenditure of that nature. The expenditure for major projects will obviously develop the closer we get to 1986, but we are working on the timetable provided by the Jubilee Committee.

**Mr BAKER:** I refer to the equal opportunity for women item on page 20 which shows an expansion in that area from 11.9 to 13.6 persons and an increase in funding from \$355 000 to \$409 000. I also note that on page 22 there is in fact a diminution in the equal opportunity anti-discrimination line. Is there now an intention by the Premier to take discrimination against women from the equal opportunity item into the women's area specifically as would appear here?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No. Let us first deal with the increase in staffing that is described on page 19 in the major resource variation. It relates to the appointment of an Aboriginal worker at the Womens Information Switchboard, and she has taken up her position. Incidentally, that appointment was provided for in the Budget, but an appointment had not been made until the start of this financial year, and some component of that relates to clerical assistance within the unit.

In terms of the general equal opportunity area, there is no intention of transferring it from one area to another. The major resource variations there outlined involved a reduction in relation to programming expenditure because of non-recurring salary costs incurred for staff replacements in 1982-83 owing to the illness of a commissioner and the absence of an officer on long service leave. Of course, that

will be picked up, and remember that those figures are averages over a year, so they go up and down in terms of actual numbers. In fact, there has been a maintenance of the employment level in that area.

**Mr BAKER:** I refer to the State Disaster Planning Control and Relief on page 25. Does the Premier intend to give a fully audited statement to the House of all moneys received through voluntary donations and spent on behalf of the citizens of South Australia in relation to the bushfire moneys received?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Of course, the appeal was administered by a specially established committee involving a range of representatives, including media, business, and other interests, and it operated successfully. It had its wind-up meeting a few weeks ago, and at that meeting was determined the final disbursement of funds, part of which involves holding a reserve amount (and I think that we are probably approaching the time that it will be spent) in case of any last minute problems suffered by bushfire victims.

It had been the experience that some people realised what their needs were or had some special difficulties only some months after the disaster was over. Therefore, a small amount was held in reserve to look after those contingencies, but basically the work of the unit and the committee has been completed, and the committee has had its last meeting. All the accounts were audited on a progressive basis as the amounts came in and were receipted, and disbursements made. It has been a progressive audit. The total sum raised was about \$11 million, which has been fully accounted for.

**Mr BAKER:** Will the Premier be giving a statement to the House?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I did not intend to do so. There was a statement issued by the committee detailing arrangements that had been made, and there was also a special letter of thanks signed by me, the Lord Mayor, and the Chairman of channel 9 that was published in the daily press.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** My question relates to the position of the Ombudsman. I notice that page 17 details major resource variations in 1982-83 and 1983-84, and the Ombudsman refers to the fact that the variation in programme expenditure relates to an increase in staffing resources during 1983-84. In addition, provision has been made for the Ombudsman to attend the International Conference of Ombudsmen to be held in Sweden. That cross fertilization is an advantage to the State in the long term, and one would not question it. However, the statement that there is to be an increase in staff would suggest that some new programme is contemplated. The Minister of Community Welfare today announced an initiative that will involve the Ombudsman and his office, but there is no clear indication that that is the initiative that is tied up with this statement, more so because it has been introduced much earlier than had been suggested.

At the same time that we are considering this office, I would be pleased to know whether the increase in work is perhaps related to a determination by the Government to proceed to increase the powers of the office as has been requested by the Ombudsman over a period, particularly in relation to clause 18 of the Act, which he states is inadequate for a proper servicing of the community. The Premier may be able to tie those various matters together in one answer.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In relation to the International Conference, Mr Bakewell will deliver a paper as part of the programme of speakers; that is certainly an honour for him and for South Australia, and that gives an added reason for his attending the conference. In relation to staffing, the extra provision is basically to create the position of Deputy Ombudsman, but the exact timing has not yet been determined.



I do not know what representations the Ombudsman made to the former Government, but he certainly made representations to me as Premier that the load had increased considerably. That would be partly in consequence of Mr Bakewell's admiral publicising of the role of the Ombudsman, and I agreed that we would monitor the situation and ascertain what were the needs. However, if it became apparent that further assistance was needed to the Ombudsman's office, then that was a fair priority for the Government to accept. As it happened, following the change of Government there was a reduction in the number of complaints being handled, and one can study some of the statistics from the Ombudsman's Report.

I do not know whether that is because of the splendid way in which the new Government handles itself administratively, or whether it is simply because a new Government has come into office and people possibly tend to seek out the Ministry and Public Service. However, the difference is not worth considering. The important point for this discussion is that the Ombudsman and I again discussed the matter and agreed that there was no call at the time for a Deputy Ombudsman or that type of position to be created. It is likely that the need could arise in the 1983-84 financial year and, accordingly, some provision has been made.

Whilst I am sure that amendments to the Act will assist the Ombudsman in the efficient discharge of his duty, I am not sure that they will necessarily create a greater workload. It could well be argued that it may allow the Ombudsman to settle some matters somewhat more rapidly by way of the formal complaint procedure if he is able to exercise some of those powers. However, that remains to be seen, and it is not expected that there will be a major increase in workload arising out of that. I think that it is the case that people generally are becoming more aware of their rights and the present holder of the office is certainly an activist in many areas, and that is a good thing. The Government stands ready to assist with the resources as they are necessary.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** The political point the Premier made was not worth making anyway. He has completely evaded the reference to the extension of the services of the Ombudsman by the alteration to the Act. I would like him to take up that point and also go back to the information he has now given that there is likely to be a Deputy Ombudsman. This might suggest that there is a particular division of the office which would warrant a Deputy Ombudsman, along with an Ombudsman, rather than perhaps a senior staff member who would be a senior investigations officer. I may be wrong but it is not infrequent when someone takes on the title of Deputy Director (or Deputy Ombudsman in this case), it is because of some totally new initiative or some division of responsibility, and I would appreciate any information the Premier could give.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is related more to a general increase in the work and matters handled by the Ombudsman than to any specific extension of powers. Certainly there have been areas to which the Ombudsman has referred which might come within his purview, but no final decisions have been made in relation to that except as in the case mentioned by the member for Light, where the Minister of Community Welfare has asked the Ombudsman to play a fairly active role in relation to some of the welfare complaints areas.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I notice that the Premier is still evading an answer to the other question.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I did cover section 18 (1) amendments, and I said I did not think that it would increase the work load. The member will recall my making the point that in fact, on the contrary, it might allow the Ombudsman to settle some of the cases that go on to formal complaint with greater dispatch. I do not think that that amendment

to the Act which the Government has indicated it will make will affect the need for resources of the Ombudsman.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Could the Premier indicate whether the Government sees the role of the Ombudsman as a Royal Commissioner under certain circumstances? That office has been used in the past for that purpose. There was some question at that time whether that was in the best long-term interests of the Ombudsman's office that the incumbent should become as deeply involved in one particular subject as a Royal Commissioner would be. I would be interested to know whether the Premier has any view as to that position being likely to arise or whether his Government has even given consideration to the matter. If it has not, perhaps in due course the Premier might care to advise the Committee on his view on that issue.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is probably more relevant for my colleague the Attorney-General to answer. It is certainly not incompatible with the role of Ombudsman to perform this function, but we are certainly not presently contemplating it. I guess in relation to Royal Commissions that costs are a very important factor. I do not know whether the Ombudsman performing that role would result in economies, but who knows? In terms of the general policy question, we have not directed our attention to that and there is no change in contemplation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair finds itself in a grey area, because the member for Light is questioning the line of the Ombudsman. I am checking an authority on that, but there is a doubt in the Chair's mind as to whether we can link the Ombudsman with a Royal Commissioner. Although the Premier has answered the questions, the Chair has some doubts about it.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 18 of the Estimates of Payments there is reference to 'Special Adviser on Disability Unit'. The sum allocated is \$14 500 for Special Adviser, research and clerical staff, which seems a very small amount for the wages and salaries of three people. Also, what research is being carried out by that unit and what specific areas of disability is the Government looking at? Is it looking at an overall review of the disabled in the community? What can the disabled in the community, particularly those who wish to work, can look forward to from the Government? I am well aware of a number of disabled people in my district who would love to be given the opportunity to work if work could be found for them.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** If that was the provision for a full year it would be a real disability to those employed advising on it. It simply represents a part-year allocation for a unit to be established in this financial year, hence the amount. In subsequent years it will be fully funded on a full-year basis. It is anticipated that appointments will be made early in the next calendar year. To date, a major study has been done on the needs of the disabled in terms of organisation and Government assistance, which has been done through the Attorney-General's office. A Special Adviser has been seconded from the Health Commission to do that work, and various support staff has been supplied to assist with that. A detailed study report has been produced and is currently being assessed. There will obviously be further consultant type work required leading up to the appointment of the full-time Special Adviser on Disability.

The basic aim of the Government is to provide a point of contact, rather like the Women's Adviser to the Premier, to act as a sort of post box, an advocate and representative of the disabled and disabled organisations, because it is a field that is unco-ordinated: there are a lot of groups operating, divided into geographic areas or into areas of particular disabilities, each blurring into one another. They have different funding sources, and Commonwealth and State Governments are involved at different levels. Obviously within

these organisations there are various groupings of centralised agency organisations which we will encourage. Another of the initiatives that have been taken by the Government is to provide a centre of operation which will be reinforced by the appointment of the Special Adviser. Its general aim is to improve co-ordination and general delivery of assistance and advice to the disabled in the community from Government, private and other groups.

**Mr OLSEN:** As part of the inquiry into car pooling has the Government considered the fact that motor vehicles owned by the Government are often used for unjustified private purposes? At the time of the last election the former Government had before it information that unjustified private trips in Government-owned vehicles were estimated to account for about 11 per cent of all trips in Government vehicles. The cost of this unjustified use was estimated at \$130 000, and it has also been reported that at any one time 200 vehicles in the city area are idle in any given hour. Does the Government intend to take any action to cut out that practice?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess the finding made by the previous Government was not news. Whether or not the figure of 11 per cent is accurate I do not know, but certainly since coming to office we have been moving in the direction of trying to limit and eliminate any unjustified private use of Government-owned vehicles. Any complaints that are received (and many come in) are fairly rigorously checked out. I do not think there is any evidence of major misuse of Government vehicles. Often there is a misunderstanding on the part of the public in regard to function. For instance, a Government vehicle, identified as such, containing what looks like a family unit at a weekend could well be a community welfare vehicle transporting foster parents, foster children, and so on.

There are various activities which on investigation often prove not to be unjustified use. That is not to deny that there is some. Of course, a former member of the Premier's Department tells some rather good stories about the unjustified use of public vehicles (and I am sure that the Leader has been regaled with these in his time as I have in mine), which are quite amusing, but which do not support the case. I suggest that what is often considered unjustified use may well be authorised. Certainly, we are taking steps to limit that.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am pleased that the Premier would acknowledge therefore that the previous Government's decision to put Government number plates on vehicles at least enabled reporting to the Government possible misuse. I refer to a number of recommendations made to the former Administration just prior to the last election. Obviously the former Administration did not have the opportunity to give detailed consideration to them. I take it from the Premier's response that it is not the Government's intention to act on the recommendations contained in that report. In regard to pooling, has the Government given any consideration to the pooling of Government bus services?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The honourable member will note that the Government has not moved to change the decision to have Government number plates, and is not likely to. We are broadly moving in the direction of implementing those policies. The carriage of that matter is with my colleague the Minister of Transport, who has the matter in hand. I cannot comment specifically on the bus issue.

**Mr OLSEN:** Is it the Government's intention to extend the powers of the Ombudsman so that he can look into police matters specifically? In his annual report the Ombudsman stated:

My frustration in not being able to handle matters connected with the police are no secret. But until the Act which binds me

is amended I must continue to stand back from all allegations against the police.

The former Administration was moving along the lines of establishing an independent authority to consider complaints against the police. There has been no action on this matter since the election. Can the Premier advise the Committee of the Government's intentions?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is not so. Action has been taken. In the past the police have strongly opposed the power of the Ombudsman being extended in this way, and have expressed satisfaction with the method of internal investigation that has operated in this State. The Government does not intend conferring such powers on the Ombudsman. My colleague the Chief Secretary has instituted an inquiry on which the police are represented. It is fair to say that there has been a modification of views on behalf of the police, who now feel that there would be some value in having some kind of outside input into the assessment of complaints against the police. It is a complex matter that is properly within the hands of the Chief Secretary and is not really a subject for this Committee.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I refer the Premier to pages 34 and 35 of the Programme Estimates. In particular, I refer to the co-ordination of major urban development projects. I presume that this is the section under the supervision of Hugh Davies, in the Premier's Department. I would appreciate information from the Premier about three specific projects. The first is the Victor Harbor tourism development proposal. How is that proceeding, and is it now to go ahead? Secondly, I refer to 'Commissioners of Charitable Funds'. I recall that the Commissioners own land between Rundle Mall and Hindmarsh Square, a fairly sizable and valuable piece of real estate. What are the Government's intentions in terms of the use of that land, and what specific projects are being looked at there? Thirdly, I refer to the East End wholesale market. According to the Budget papers the Government is undertaking a study to provide advice on the options relating to Government involvement in any relocation proposals. What is the Government's current policy in that regard, and what is its intention in terms of the use of the East End Market, and where would the alternative market be placed?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In relation to the Victor Harbor project, the Government has taken action, as indicated in the papers, to support the consolidation of land and its transfer to local government to assist the project to go ahead. The unit involved has been drawing on the expertise developed by Mr Davies and the unit in relation to the Port Adelaide project. The Government is in a position of having gone as far down the track as it can in terms of assisting the project by these measures, and it is up to the council and the developers to reach some sort of agreement on the on-going project.

In regard to the Commissioner of Charitable Trusts Fund land, the Commissioners have called for proposals in terms of redevelopment of the site in question, and the unit is assisting them in looking at options. The decision about what will be done will depend on the proposals put to the Commissioners by developers. At this stage I am not aware of the precise nature or source of any such proposals. That matter is in the hands of the Commission which presumably will report to the Government, which will be acting in an assisting role. It is a fairly prime piece of town acre land for which there are a number of possibilities. A decision will depend on the development proposals coming through.

In regard to the East End wholesale market it is the Government's overall view that wholesale marketing should be relocated to a better and more accessible site. Discussions about alternative sites have taken place, particularly in regard to the northern part of town in the Regency Park and

Wingfield area, where there is available land. Development of State industrial land is in contemplation on the other side of Grand Junction Road, north of the Regency Park industrial estate. There are possibilities in regard to that area and a number of propositions have been formulated. A concern about this was the security of tenure for the existing wholesale market tenants. The market is owned privately; if a redevelopment occurs without adequate relocation proposals, wholesale marketing would be thrown into some form of chaos. I understand that undertakings have been given that there would be an orderly transfer in any future arrangements. Advice of a consultant has been sought by the wholesale market owners. Mr Davies and his unit have been involved in offering assistance in relation to assessing available advice and aiding the identification of any alternative sites for the market. But it is very much in the planning stage at the moment. There are no firm proposals.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before the member for Davenport asks his next question, I would ask the honourable member to refer to the line relating to it. The Chair is having some doubts about whether or not we are straying from the actual vote before the Committee.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Yes, certainly, Mr Chairman. It comes under the general staffing level of the department, and I wish to take up a further question on the same line. There is in the programme performance budget papers, under that same line, a special allocation of \$100 000 for capital purposes. Can the Premier indicate what that money would be used for?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That sum of money is the working capital or establishment capital of the unit in terms of the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. It is a rolling development fund. The sale of Government-owned land is being ploughed back into the project which helps to fund the project and the administrative cost of it. It has been a very successful exercise.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Finally (and it comes under the role of the Special Projects Unit, which is a section under the Premier's Department), could the Premier enlarge further and tell us exactly on what basis the loan is made to groups at Port Adelaide, and what interest rates are charged? Are they concessional interest rates, or normal market interest rates? On another matter, could the Premier indicate whether or not it is his intention to open up any other overseas representations besides the Agent-General's Office in London during the coming year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is an internal financing arrangement and therefore it is funded out at the current Government interest rate, whatever that might be. Assistance offered to private developers in any aspect of the project is the standard development-type assistance that is offered, although obviously there are some variations within the project itself. However, what is involved in part has been the consolidation and reorganisation of Government held land and privately held land to enable certain projects to take place: residential, business development, and so on. It is a restructuring of land holdings within the central Port Adelaide area as part of an overall project which involves both public and private sector activity.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Mr Chairman, there was a second part to that question: was it the Premier's intention to open any other overseas office on behalf of South Australia such as the Agent-General's Office?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Sorry, I missed that; that was a long way from Port Adelaide. There is a general review taking place of our overseas representation, as I mentioned. The arguments at the moment would favour a continuance of agency-type arrangements for representation as opposed to opening a full scale office which involves big costs. On

my forthcoming trip I will be making an assessment of, for instance, the effectiveness of our representation in Japan, where a number of other State Governments have established offices. The information that we have is that that is making them neither more nor less effective than we are, operating through an agency representation with Elders, as we do at present. That is not to say that that agency representation could not be improved in some aspects. It also leaves aside the question of what resources ideally we could put into it. I hope that the hospitality will not be so good in Japan that over a meal I will 'up the ante' for our overseas representation. I will be considering it on a fairly rigorous basis.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Page 15 of the yellow book, 'Organisation of the State's 150th Anniversary' under '1983-84 specific targets/objectives' states:

To implement the Jubilee 150 logo marketing strategy and to begin the Board's sponsorship drive.

What sort of response does the Government expect to receive on this thus far? Also, under 'Major resource variations 1982-83, 1983-84', the yellow book states, in part:

An amount of \$1 million has been provided for project funding in 1983-84.

Can the Premier enlighten us on what specific areas that money will be spent in? What consideration has the Jubilee 150 organisation given to promotion of the South Australian Film Corporation, which the Premier will be well aware is within my electorate? I believe it has contributed considerably to the economy of South Australia and to the benefit of Australia overall because of the huge number not only of films made there, but the generation of work both for local people and business people within that area of Adelaide.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There are three questions there. First, in relation to the promotion and the marketing strategy, the Board has advertised for a marketing officer to embark on this promotion in a major way, to sell bumper stickers, and things of this nature. That position will be funded from the sale of the various promotional goods which is expected to return a very big profit over time as part of the operations for Jubilee 150. The logo and a key poster have recently been unveiled. The logo was established 12 or more months ago, and it is shown on that very successful tie, which I understand is selling well.

The project funding for this year is divided amongst a whole range of committees. Some are ongoing projects which have already been announced, like the Old Gum Tree restoration, support for promotion of the Grand Prix I mentioned earlier, the world three-day equestrian event—certain material has been put together to aid in the attempt to secure that event. Some of these things may not come off, but one has to spend money to try to have them allocated to Australia or South Australia. We are talking here of a matter of a few thousand dollars in each case. There is a large amount of money in that \$1 million set aside for the *Falio* restoration: about \$100 000 will be spent this financial year as part of that. The Wakefield Press, now in operation developing very special publications and the Atlas of South Australia, will require about \$100 000 plus.

It is interesting that one of the first commercial type ventures the Wakefield Press embarked on was a specially bound edition of the Don Bradman biography which has returned a reasonable profit, and as a first venture of that kind it has proved very successful. In other words, the Wakefield Press, while there will be subsidised publications, also aims as part of its ongoing programme to make money on a number of other publications, which will generally provide good stimulus for not only the researchers, writers and others, but the printing industry in South Australia, because it will be done here in South Australia, either through the Government Printer or let out to private contractors, so there are large sums involved there.

The rest are small amounts which have been provided to a whole range of committees: the Sporting Committee, the Festivals Committee, the Protocol Committee, the family religious communities, history and conservation, Aboriginal, commerce and industry, and local government. All of these committees have preliminary work to be done and they are given allocations which add up to quite a considerable sum of money when one goes through the various committees.

So, it is a rolling activity with expenditure increasing as we go through the year. Into next financial year it will continue to increase and reach a peak in 1986. As major projects come before the committee, they will be referred to Cabinet for special approval. In terms of their ongoing work and minor project areas, the various subcommittees of the Jubilee Board are in action. We see the South Australian Film Corporation playing a major role in the jubilee and its celebrations. I am unsure of any specific projects that the Jubilee Board has in mind, although we expect the S.A.F.C. to be involved in the preparation of promotional material as appropriate.

The Government is looking at a proposal for a film expo which would allow the South Australian Film Corporation a shop window to display its expertise and wares in the years leading up to the jubilee. An interesting aspect in looking at the S.A.F.C. is that it is not deriving increasing income from making its facilities and expertise available. Those studios are working on a number of major projects on a hire basis from private entrepreneurial film makers, and we are trying to encourage that. Its work load is not dependent on either the Government film budget (which has been substantially increased as it represents the bread and butter for a lot of local film makers and the S.A.F.C.) or the feature work that the S.A.F.C. itself specifically undertakes. There was a recent example of that, namely, *The Fire and the Stone* children's film, which ought to be very successful. That was a joint venture of the S.A.F.C. and the Children's Television Foundation. We have a situation where an independent film maker will hire S.A.F.C. facilities for some type of shooting for a feature film, and that is proving good business for the Corporation. Things are looking good in that area, and it is certainly a very good facility to have within the member's electorate.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I refer to page 15 of the 1982-83 specific target objectives, showing a Commonwealth Government grant of \$2 million negotiated after agreement on the four suggested proposals. One was the restoration of Fort Glanville which, the Premier would be aware, is now within my electorate. I am very interested in knowing whether that project has been completed. If not, what additional moneys are to be spent and over what period? What is that likely to entail? Lastly, is it the Government's intention in the near future to set up a museum, apart from the expo of which the Premier spoke, at the South Australian Film Corporation's premises?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I cannot produce the detail to be spent on the Fort Glanville project as it is one that has been earmarked apart from the grant of Commonwealth moneys, but I will certainly supply that information to the honourable member. It should be a good project. I am impressed by the work done on a largely voluntary basis on the restoration of Fort Glanville and its continued use in putting on shows on a voluntary basis by people who have restored guns, uniforms, etc. So far it is an unexplored tourist attraction, as not many people know about it.

In relation to the film museum, we are currently looking at the expo concept to incorporate film museum materials in association with the performing arts collection, which has a separate establishment at the moment. The favourite location would be somewhere in the City of Adelaide rather than at Hendon. It may be that, as part of a visit to the

film expo museum, guided tours could be arranged to Hendon using it as the drop-off point. Rather than trying to attract people down there (which may cause problems in terms of Hendon being an ongoing film-making operation) it is better to locate it in the city where many more people will come through and show an interest in the project.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I know that the Premier is going to Japan some time this week. Does he intend to take any promotional material for the Jubilee 150 celebrations in South Australia and, if not, will he consider so doing?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Indeed. In international terms there are target markets, and we would like Japan to be one of those for the jubilee.

**Mr BAKER:** I refer to the legislation and regulation review on page 47, where we see that the function has been transferred to the Executive and Cabinet item on page 45. Low and behold, I cannot see any reference to it. On page 46 we see that the funding for 1983-84 includes programmes for support to Executive Council and Cabinet. I looked under the section for Executive Council and Cabinet but could see no reference to it. Has the Premier decided not to review legislation and regulations in order to improve the legislative functions of Government, as there is no such reference in that item?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I have explained what we are doing and refer the honourable member to page 43, where he will see under the heading 'Policy and research support for the Premier and Cabinet' the subheading 'Monitor and co-ordinate deregulation activities—Monitor implementation of approved activities, Forward regular reports to Premier'. That is where the amount is contained.

**Mr BAKER:** The next item was on page 53, where we have a programme statement 'Co-ordination of publicity for Government agencies'. Three bodies are set down there and have been transferred from the State Development Office with an expenditure of \$303 000. In the actual lines themselves we have new items for publications, functions, etc., amounting to \$189 000 and operating expenses of \$30 000. Nowhere in the programme functions does it give the body concerned (the State Promotion Office) the authority to produce booklets of any sort. We have a lot of co-ordination activity but nothing that indicates that they would like to produce any publications whatever. We can remember that, if the item is a straight transfer, it has gone up 25 per cent for contingencies and over 50 per cent for salaries for that item. What changes have occurred inconsistent with the Premier's practice?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No incremental amount is involved. We managed to achieve some fair savings in this area of Government expenditure without any detriment to efficiency. This was one of the two areas I mentioned right at the beginning and was still under review following Mr Parks' resignation to take up his new job in New South Wales. The rationalisation of these functions between the State Development Department and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is still being looked at, but effectively there is liaison between those two bodies in terms of promotion and promotional programmes.

There might not be specific reference to publications but, as there is the line to develop a programme of corporate publicity for the State, obviously that would include issuing publications. I guess that there has not been any short-term immediate need for a general publication, because the previous Government (if I may say so) over-provided somewhat substantially by an extraordinarily extravagant printing of the so-called *South Australia Book* very soon before the election, and it then hastily tried to give it away to school-children. Actually, Mr Max Harris has offered to sell a few for us, although he is not quite sure what price they could get. We have kept this book, and we have tried to use it by

simply pasting in a statement to the effect that there has been a change of Government and detailing the new contact points, and so on.

However, I would have thought that that experience, which involved quite a misconceived, wasteful and extravagant expenditure on the part of the former Government, would make us look very carefully at the sort of expenditure and resources we put into publications. Our view is that, as it is in the general area of State development and State promotion which is the line we are looking at, it should be targeted very specifically, and the days of the sort of broad brush jumping up and down and hoping that people will notice in general terms are over. We need a much more hard-headed approach to the promotion of the State, a much more targeted and directed approach and, therefore, such publications that are issued will be along those lines. That still means that there is probably a need for some form of general pamphlet or book on an introduction to South Australia, but exactly what nature that will be has not been determined.

**Mr BAKER:** Given that the Premier has stated that we will seriously consider what publication we should issue (we really did not have a right to issue it under that line, anyway), can the Premier say why the figure has been increased from the previous one under the State development line?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Most of it was under the State Development Office. It has been separated out.

**Mr BAKER:** It has increased quite substantially on the previous figure?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Are you referring to 1982-83?

**Mr BAKER:** Yes, I think that from memory \$146 000 was set aside for the contingency item in that regard.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The actual payment in 1982-83 was \$208 838. That appears on page 20, and it suggests that it is somewhat more than the figure that the honourable member is quoting. That relates simply to the publications and functions area.

**Mr BAKER:** That is still more than the existing line. That is the contingency item?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is right.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier enlarge on what he means by 'targeting and directing' the publications and say to whom we will target and direct those publications? As the second component of that, in relation to the Director of State Promotion, the Premier referred to Mr Parks taking up a position in New South Wales. Is it intended to replace Mr Parks as Director of State Promotion, and why cannot State development carry out those functions?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** As I mentioned, that is one of the matters subject to review, and the vacancy created by Mr Parks has probably hastened that review process. We are looking at the overall area of State promotion and at how best it may be handled in the context of all the resources available to the Government. In terms of the role of the Premier and Cabinet office, that would relate more to, if one likes, the corporate image of the State in general terms. In relation to State development, its promotional activity is very much related to the targeted approach that I was talking about, so what final deployment of resources there will be in future Budgets as between the two areas has not been finally determined. The matter certainly needs review because I think that previously a lot of money was spent uselessly.

What I mean by 'targeted approach' is simply that it is a matter of identifying the markets and the needs of those markets. If one is after investment in particular areas, then one prepares promotional material and organises functions that relate to one's needs. Let me give an example. The previous Government put some considerable reliance in

general promotional functions (I mean overseas) where everyone was invited to a big cocktail party, and good food and drink were supplied. The Premier was there giving avuncular good wishes to everyone, and South Australia was promoted as a nice place to come to and a nice place to be involved with.

Whilst I do not doubt that that created good feelings about South Australia, I suggest that it did not result in anything very tangible. However, the approach that we have adopted is to be involved in specific investment seminars where people who in effect have registered an interest in South Australia and in what it might offer are invited to attend, and they come along to find out what specific service or assistance can be provided. Some of those could be organised through the Australian Government, and we have participated in them. Others are planned: for instance, on this forthcoming trip to Japan, we have in effect laid the groundwork by organising one or two such seminars prior to my visit as Premier. In that way one is able to reduce the audience to which one talks to those who are genuinely interested and genuinely have some positive feelings about South Australia and its possibilities.

It was that sort of approach that resulted in Mr Varghese's being identified in relation to the Lightburn proposition. It was not a matter of Mr Varghese's reading a jolly advertisement or going to a cocktail party: he was actually identified because he had registered, as part of an investment programme, as someone interested in investing in Australia. The State Development officers picked that up and approached him with a specific proposition and said, 'Look, here is an enterprise going. Is that the sort of thing you are interested in?' He investigated more fully: and he was prepared to invest. It is that kind of approach which should pay dividends.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am pleased that the Premier has seen the wisdom of investment seminars such as those that the former Government implemented during 1982. I also note that he will not be having any cocktail parties on his trip overseas. I will be interested to see the programme when he returns and whether he has been to any cocktail parties whilst away for 14 days. I suggest that he might well have a few cocktail parties on his itinerary. I take it that the Premier almost acknowledges that.

On page 19 of the programme paper, it is stated that the Women's Advisory Unit will negotiate with sponsors in the wage pause job creation programme and the community employment programme to ensure the involvement of women. The unit is also to make a submission to the Review of Public Service Management related to the employment of women in the Public Service. Is it the view of the Women's Advisory Unit that in each of these cases specific quotas should be established for the employment of women?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Commonwealth and the State Governments fully support this concern that the job creation programmes provide opportunities for female employment. It has been a pattern of these programmes, probably because they have been largely structured around minor capital works activities, that far more men than women are employed on them. Insufficient attention has been paid to job opportunities for women. The Commonwealth and the State want to try to equalise that to the greatest extent possible. A study was made by the Women's Adviser to the Premier which suggested that one of the problems was that at the stage sponsors actually advised a project they were not sufficiently conscious of the need to provide jobs which would be suitable for females, and that a lot more jobs would come through involving female employment if sponsors were sensitised to that need.

I authorised the Women's Advisory Unit in conjunction with our Job Creation Scheme, in the Minister of Labour's office, to embark on a programme to attempt to get sponsors interested in female employment projects. One such exercise they undertook was to go up to Port Augusta in the Iron Triangle area. They went around and saw a whole range of people who were potential sponsors for these community employment programme schemes and talked to them about the sort of jobs that women would respond to or would be suitable for and drew their attention to the high level of female unemployment. That kind of advocacy at that level makes it more likely that sponsors will present programmes that can provide female employment than has been the case in the past. That is what is involved in that particular function of the women's unit.

The next question related to the submission to the review of Public Service management. It is part of the general role of the Equal Opportunities Unit and function of the Women's Information Switchboard to act as an advocate for women generally. It is quite appropriate that they should make submissions in these areas. I have not seen the actual statement they made. I do not think it has been prepared yet but obviously it will be aimed at reviewing and supporting greater employment of women in the public sector.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer now to the State Disaster Planning Control and Relief Programme. Five specific objectives are set down for which only \$1 000 has been allocated. In view of the natural disasters experienced by the State earlier this year, will the Premier advise whether he considers that that allocation is adequate, given the gravity of the recent disasters, and whether the review will be completed during the current financial year and, if so, will the position previously outlined be proceeded with during the current financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** This relates to the exercise that has been done by Mr Scriven and Brigadier Lewis. I have already referred to that and said that I expect the report soon. In relation to the allocation, we believe it is adequate. We are not sure what disasters we might suffer in this current financial year. I think we have had a fair share of them which might mean we could be relatively free of them for a while. Naturally, if disasters occur, the State has to stand ready to assist, whether or not there has been a specific allocation. That will always be the position.

**Mr OLSEN:** The heritage conservation programme outlines a series of objectives and goals which relate to the preservation of the State's heritage, the goals and objectives listed include preservation and administering of the residence of Sir Henry Ayers, a former Premier of South Australia; to provide within the residence offices for the National Trust of South Australia; and to ensure that the Trust mounts displays relevant to the historical significance of the building. It is stated that the operation of the restaurant is a novel method of obtaining a 'living museum' and attracts more people to the complex. One of the specific objectives outlined for 1983-84 is to handle effectively the ongoing administrative functions to ensure that Ayers House remains a significant tourist attraction.

The Committee would be aware that there is considerable speculation within the community that Ayers House will be the venue for South Australia's first casino. It has been put to me that, if this is the case, a considerable number of South Australians will be excluded from visiting the historic home. Will the Premier state the Government's attitude towards the conversion of this historic South Australian home to accommodate the operations of a casino?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess the most accurate answer is that we do not have an attitude to that particular proposal because at this stage we are not required to. As I understand it, the lessee of Ayers House has had discussions with the

National Trust and, as part of the proposal which received a bit of publicity, reached some sort of agreement as to where the Trust activities might be located, but there has been no proposition that I am aware of that has been specifically put to the Government in relation to that proposal. It would have to run the gauntlet of the Casino Supervisory Committee. Of course, if this proposal of redevelopment of that whole section including the Botanic Hotel, Botanic Chambers and Ayers House with a view to incorporating the casino in it is to be of any further consideration, submissions to that purpose would have to be put before the committee, which has an independent brief and is subject to an Act of Parliament.

I am not quite sure how this matter is going to be handled. As I say, we have not had a formal proposition put to us as a Government, and I guess the first step that a lessee would have to take if he is going to pursue seriously the proposition before the Supervisory Committee would be to ascertain whether or not the Government would consent to such a change in the use or in the terms and conditions of the lease of Ayers House. That places us in some difficulty, because since the passing of the Casino Bill I have had made clear to my Ministers (and indeed I have applied to myself) the rule that we would not be involved in any discussion with prospective operators of casinos about casinos. Obviously, a number of people are preparing submissions but it will not involve a Government decision: it will be a Supervisory Committee decision. The committee intends at this stage to make a submission and in the course of that submission it might indicate a preferred location or vicinity, but no decision has yet been made about that. I really cannot take the discussion any further except to say that I have read of this proposal but I am not in a position to indicate a Government attitude to it.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am somewhat puzzled. We have legislation which entitles the State to establish a casino. It appears from what the Premier has said that he has washed his hands completely of any decision-making process in relation to the issue of a licence for a casino. What I want to know is, in relation to getting maximum stimulus for the building industry in this State from the construction of a casino, including a convention centre, what input will the Government have? I assume from the Premier's previous answer that the Government will merely make a submission to the Supervisory Committee. Would it not have been better for the Government to establish a brief in the first instance to give some clear direction to this committee as to the advantage to be derived by the State from the issuing of a casino licence?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I refer the Leader to the Act, which in fact provides an independent role for the supervisory authority. When I referred to the Government's making a submission, as I said, our present intention is that a submission would indicate clearly what we believe would be in the best interests of the community in terms of location, the provision of stimulus to the building and construction industry, and the yielding of benefits. The Government will have an opinion to put before the supervisory authority, but the authority will make decisions and will be given an independent statutory right in the Act with which the Government cannot interfere.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am not arguing that point. I would have thought that it was important for the Government to express an attitude to the supervisory committee during the early stages and not the latter stages. The Premier said that the Government has not formulated an attitude about its submission to the authority. If the committee is established and operating and the Government has not established an attitude, it is somewhat indecisive of the Government in not expressing an attitude clearly to the supervisory com-

mittee. The Government's view should be put at the early stages and not at the latter stages, and it should not hedge its bets. There is no mention in the Budget papers of likely revenue expectations from a casino operation. Can the Premier advise whether he has been notified by Treasury of forward estimates on future income from this source? Treasury provides projections over several years in regard to such matters. Has the Government been supplied with any details about a casino operation?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In regard to the Leader's first point, the Government can make a submission only after having been invited to do so. Is the Leader suggesting that I ring up the Chairman and say, 'The Government wants an inside running on this: can you let us make a submission on the side before the commission actually calls for submissions?' The Government will be only one of the responders in regard to making a submission. That is where the matter lies. In relation to the benefits of a casino, I do not see what relevance that has to this discussion. No firm estimates have been made as to the possible financial benefit of revenue from a casino. There are a few precedents: the Wrest Point casino in Hobart is now in operation as is the casino at Launceston, and there are a couple in the Northern Territory.

**Mr OLSEN:** The committee has already asked the public to make submissions to the committee of inquiry. I would have thought that the Premier at least was aware of that. As public submissions have been called for, I do not think the Government could be considered to be getting in before the public. My reference to hedging of bets referred to the fact that I hope the Government will not sit back and wait for public pronouncements of submissions, and then at the tail end come in and support by inference one particular applicant for a casino licence. That is what I meant by hedging your bets.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** We will do whatever is appropriate in terms of policy.

**Mr HAMILTON:** In regard to issues and trends of the equal opportunity for women programme (page 19 of the Programme Estimates) I note with concern the reference to the growing number of inquiries (now exceeding 1 700 a month) that are being handled by the Women's Information Switchboard. The Government intends to assist in establishing women's health centres at Elizabeth and Port Adelaide. Do the Women's Information Switchboard and the Women's Health Service work in conjunction with each other in regard to calls coming in about child beatings, wife bashing, etc.? What is the involvement between the two?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Women's Information Switchboard acts as a receiving point for complaints, and people involved there know where to refer callers for specific assistance. For instance, if they get a telephone inquiry about a health problem, they ascertain the area and the nature of the problem and are then able to mobilise the health centre resources to make contact with the person concerned and to somehow bring them together to ensure that the right sort of service is offered. They carry a big load. The people manning the switchboard are expert in the various matters concerning Government services, and so on.

I referred to the appointment on an Aboriginal worker at the switchboard. In a sense that will provide a further resource that will probably increase the workload of the switchboard. The Aboriginal worker will not simply take telephone inquiries, but will actually get out into the community and alert members of the Aboriginal community to the existence of the switchboard and the services it can offer. That in turn will create more activity. The Women's Information Switchboard, while providing a general counselling service to people who ring up with problems, will

have as its primary task the sorting out of those problems and the referral of them to the appropriate professionals who can deal with them.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I note with interest that in the Budget increasing emphasis is being put on housing, particularly emergency housing for women. What is the demand for emergency housing for women? Does the Premier have any details about such needs specifically in metropolitan Adelaide?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will refer that question to my colleague the Minister of Housing. The Women's Information Switchboard and the Women's Advisory Unit assist in the preparation of submissions and with the general monitoring of the situation. The actual delivery of services would be done through the Housing Trust and Emergency Housing Office. I am sure those agencies would have some idea of the number involved, and I will obtain those figures from my colleague.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to the casino as outlined previously and its possible location. An indication is given at page 13 of the programme papers that there have been increasing numbers of tours of Ayers House being conducted—

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The honourable member is drawing a very long bow. I would suggest that there is nothing in these papers about the location of a casino. I have answered a few questions about Ayers House, but I do not think the debate should be broadened in the general matter of the location of the casino. The most that I know about the Ayers House position is what I have read in the newspaper, and the matter does not seem to have developed much beyond that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps the member for Light should rephrase his question.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I did point out that the second item on page 19 'Ayers House—Operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries,' is specifically referred to at page 13 of the so-called yellow book. I am interested to know whether the distinct advantage that Ayers House has as a National Museum, a 'living museum' as it has been regarded, and by the amount of money that the Government has put in and is continuing to put in, can the Government (through the Premier) say whether the benefit to the State will be from the continuance of this facility with its present functions as a restaurant, museum, and headquarters of the National Trust, or does the Government support the proposal to establish a casino at Ayers House?

It is as simple as that. The Premier has indicated in answer to questions by the Leader that the Government will make its submission towards the end when it will go to the highest bidder. I might be said to be cynical when I said it has gone to the highest bidder, but that is the clear inference that can be drawn, and if the Government is to support a casino, I am interested to know whether this living museum, which is Ayers House, will have the support of the Government for a purpose other than that for which it is now being used.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the Committee that there are some grave doubts in the Chairman's mind as to whether the actual line of Ayers House has anything more than the question of operating costs, and so forth, with which we are dealing. I do not think I can allow the member for Light to continue in this vein. I suggest to the Premier that anything to do with the possibility of the siting of a casino has nothing to do with this particular line.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, I think I have covered the question to the extent to which it was in order, and I have nothing to add. I accept your ruling.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Does the Premier believe that the \$13 000 made available for Ayers House will be spent at Ayers House in its present form?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I would guess so: that is what it has been provided for.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is not too sure whether the member for Light is being facetious or not.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Inquiring.

**Mr BAKER:** One of the difficulties I have had, along with members on this side of the House, is sorting out those items which have changed their complexion, where they have moved part resources from one area to another. Certainly the estimates as laid down in the yellow book do not specify those portions that have been moved so one can get an overall picture. My estimate was that there was a 33.6 per cent increase in the real Budget allocation to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. I have now been told that this is somewhat less than that. The great difficulty I have is that I cannot tell because I do not know which components have been transferred elsewhere. I prefer to believe my figure of 33.6 per cent. Will there be any attempt by the Premier to enlighten us in the next set of Budget Estimates as to those parts of these Budget items that are transferred? It is impossible to draw a real conclusion as to what is happening to the real Budget items, and it would assist everyone concerned to have that information available.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Many of the problems could be solved if our lines were organised on a programme basis: only a few departments have done that so far. Where the departments have done this, one has a much closer correlation between the yellow book and the lines as printed. I agree with the honourable member, having suffered under the system myself for two or three years, that it is difficult to try to reconcile in some areas the lines as printed and the yellow book programme component, where the two are not organised on the same basis. Therefore, in trying to assess where resources have moved and what has happened to Budget items, it does become fairly difficult. I can only say that we intend to try to move to a programme base for the lines.

The speed and extent to which we can do it depends on the amount of resources one can put into it. It can be seen from the amount of material provided in the yellow book that there are enormous resources needed. The member may call upon his own knowledge in his former professional capacity to know just what is involved, so it is a gradual process. However, I accept that it becomes a little difficult to sort one's way through it and I can only say that where we are able to answer the questions we will. The information is embedded there somewhere: it is a matter of tracking it down.

**Mr BAKER:** The State Promotion Section takes five different lines in various parts of the booklet. I apologise to the Premier for previously suggesting the State Promotion Section and his department will receive a boost: he probably will, but I cannot exactly sort it out.

**Mr OLSEN:** Apart from the Premier's forthcoming visit to Japan, does he intend to undertake any other overseas visits this financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not see anything on the horizon. I believe that a Premier, in particular (as would the Chief Executive of any major company or organisation); should go overseas, for whatever reason, if it becomes necessary. I know my predecessor took that view, as did the Premiers before him. This trip to Japan has been organised with specific purposes in mind, as well as gathering some general information as well. I do not contemplate other visits this financial year, but if it becomes necessary to do so, I will do so, and will have to provide by way of excess.

**Mr OLSEN:** Who is accompanying the Premier on his overseas trip, and who is he seeing on this trip in relation to new and potential industries in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will be accompanied by the Director of State Development, Mr Smith; my Executive Assistant, Mr Anderson; my Press Secretary, Mr Rann; and Mr Keith Hope from the Department of State Development. The itinerary is still being finalised—although it is fairly well in place now. It covers about 33 or 34 pages, and in due course I will make the outline of that public.

**Mr OLSEN:** What new industries or areas of potential investment were identified by the advance group that the Premier sent to Japan about two or three weeks ago?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** What the Leader of the Opposition describes as an advance group was part of our overseas promotion effort. A team headed by Dr Roger Sexton made contact and followed up several contacts that had been made in terms of investment interest in South Australia, in Japan, Hong Kong, and Singapore. I am effectively following the same track and following up some of the contacts made. I do not want to preempt what may or may not happen on the trip. To use the phrase much favoured by my predecessor, the former Premier, Mr Tonkin, 'the Leader will have to contain himself.'

**Mr OLSEN:** In view of the Premier's response, and in view of Japan's stated need for increasing supplies of uranium, what contacts will be made with firms associated with the nuclear industry? In particular, will the Premier see officials from the Nuclear Energy Division of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, the Tokyo Electric Company, the Power Reactor and Nuclear Fuel Corporation, Japan Atomic Energy Commission, and C. Itoh (associated with enrichment)? Will he have talks on the possibility of establishing a uranium enrichment industry in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** From memory I am seeing C. Itoh, but it is not a uranium selling or nuclear voyage on my part—quite the contrary. I believe there are many other things on which emphasis should be laid. In particular, I am interested in manufacturing and development in those areas in South Australia where our greatest employment loss and problems are arising at the moment. The Roxby Downs/Olympic Downs copper-uranium project is being marketed, presumably by the joint venturers. I am sure they are capable of doing that with their own contacts. I do not know whether they have any Japanese interests at this stage, but I am not concerned with making South Australia a uranium province or nuclear energy centre. I am not pursuing that issue in Japan, as I do not think it is relevant to our economic future.

**Mr OLSEN:** It is interesting that the Premier has drawn an inconsistency, namely, that the joint venturers ought to market the uranium cycle but he wants to intervene in the manufacturing industry. He is prepared to have talks and to intervene on behalf of the Government in the manufacturing industry, but is not prepared to talk on behalf of Government in regard to the uranium industry. We see a continuation of the inconsistent line of this Government relative to the development of our State's resources. If the Premier is really talking about the future potential of South Australia, even he would have to acknowledge that the mirage in the desert has now become a possibility.

Indeed, papers tabled indicate that a significant job potential for this State can be generated. I am surprised that taxpayers' funds are being spent on a trip by the Premier—the purpose for which I agree. It is appropriate for the head of Government to be selling the State: there is no argument by me. However, to be selective and for the Premier to tell the committee that uranium is being downgraded significantly in terms of the intention of his inquiries in Japan,



surprises me. Japan's contracts expire in 1990-92, and the projected potential for sales (and their needs) will grow by 70 per cent by that time. It seems that the policy committee of the A.L.P. has the Premier well and truly directed in his programme. That concerns me for South Australia's sake.

I presume, with the Premier leaving only two days from now, that it is almost too late to rearrange some of those appointments to include the Tokyo Electric Company (which will have great energy needs, particularly from the uranium industry); the Power Reactor and Nuclear Fuel Corporation; and the Nuclear Energy Division of the Ministry of International Trade and Energy. From my talks with them, there is no doubt in my mind that there will be significant demand that this State can supply. I would have hoped that the Premier was prepared to acquaint himself with the extent of that demand in Japan and with what potential spin-off there can be for South Australia as a result of identifying clearly what that demand is.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has allowed the Leader to go very wide. However, the Chair is gaining the impression that the Leader is now leaning heavily on the good graces and great P.R. that the Chair has with this Committee. I wonder whether we should come back to the line. The Chair points out to the Premier that, in the opinion of the Chair, we have heard a second reading debate on uranium rather than anything to do with the line. I do not know whether the Premier wishes to make any remarks on the question, but that is the way the Chair feels about the matter.

**Mr OLSEN:** With respect, Sir, you have cast an aspersion in saying that I embarked on a second reading speech. There is a line relating to the Premier's overseas visit, which it is appropriate to the head of Government to take. My comments were related to the programme the Premier was undertaking relative to the expenditure of taxpayers' funds in South Australia. Surely there is no more fundamental matter on which the Opposition ought to be entitled to question the Premier.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair does not agree with the remarks of the Leader. The Chair allowed the Leader to go as far as he did because, at one time, he was linking his remarks with the proposed overseas trip by the Premier. He then ventured into what the Chair considered to be an outright second reading debate on uranium. The Chair has no intention to allow that to continue. Does the Premier wish to answer?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I appreciate your ruling, Mr Chairman, and I accept it. I do not wish to get into a tedious debate with the Leader on uranium. I have stated our policy—it is quite clear. A worthwhile and extremely productive itinerary is organised for me in terms of promotional opportunities in South Australia that I will be following up on the trip. The Leader is certainly entitled to ask about that, and I responded to him.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I previously asked a question about the Disability Unit. I refer to page 23, where mention is made of pensioners discrimination on the grounds of sex, marital status, disability, and promoting equality of opportunity. The Premier may recall my question about a constituent in my district who, despite numerous attempts to promote himself by going back to university after he was injured, has once again tried to obtain work. A position was brought to his attention last Friday, and I understand that he applied for the job this week. He has been advised that he was unsuccessful because he had not worked for some time, and therefore lacked work experience. I find this outrageous, to say the least.

Despite numerous attempts by my constituent to obtain gainful employment, and after returning to university to gain a couple of degrees, he is still unsuccessful. Could the Premier ascertain whether there have been other instances

of such discrimination? What is the Government's attitude to such issues? I will be bringing the matter to the Premier's attention by way of correspondence when I have full details. I spoke to my secretary a quarter of an hour ago, but was alarmed to hear the response. It must be frustrating for people who have a disability to be told details of what I have just related to the committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is delving into a second reading speech on the matter.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In general terms, it is true that, in a period of economic recession, the disabled tend to be an early victim in terms of work opportunity and employment. My Government is certainly putting great priority on that area. The previous Labor Government in the late 1970s took a leading role on a national basis in establishing in the public sector, both through legislation and through specific programmes, opportunities for disabled people amongst others to gain public information and education.

However, a lot of those programmes of course had severe setbacks due to the economic recession. I can recall that in 1976, in another capacity, together with the then Minister of Labour (the present Minister of Labour), I did some intensive study into the rights of disabled persons to employment and possible legislative and other remedies. So, that is something that is certainly a priority of the Government and I hope that we will be able to do something about it in the coming year.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Under which Minister's responsibility does the Casino Act come? Is it the Premier's responsibility?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is mine, but it is not relevant to these lines.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I challenge that reply, because I presume that someone is now paying the Authority and paying for advertisements that have appeared in the daily papers. I ask the Premier, as he has responsibility for the Act (and even if there is no money for the Authority, that does not matter), how many different submissions for a casino have been put to him personally?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair must be adamant about this. We are dealing with certain lines of expenditure or proposed expenditure. There is no line to which the honourable member can refer that deals with expenditure on a casino.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Yes, I can, Mr Chairman. I am referring to the salary line of the Premier, because I think that we pay him, and he is the Minister responsible for the Casino Act. Therefore, I ask whether the Premier is aware of submissions on the casino—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will not permit the member for Davenport to use such a line and then in some trumped up way link it with expenditure on a casino for which no line has been provided. The line to which the honourable member is referring has nothing to do with expenditure on a casino.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am trying to clarify the situation. Who is paying for the Casino Supervisory Authority?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It may assist you, Mr Chairman, and perhaps the honourable member, if I say that it is in my role as Treasurer, not as Premier, that this Act is committed to me. Therefore, it may come up later.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Unfortunately, we looked at the programme performance budget papers and the Casino Bill is not listed under the responsibility of the Premier, the Attorney-General, the Treasurer or anyone else. That is why I seek the information. There is obviously a deficiency in the preparation of the documents, but we will take it up with the Treasurer.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Again, there is no line under this proposed expenditure that could be linked with the provision

of a casino. Until there is such a line, the Chair cannot allow a debate on a proposed expenditure that does not exist.

**Mr BAKER:** Relating to an earlier question about the officers assisting Cabinet, can the Premier outline which Cabinet documents must go through one of these committees and be sighted by the bodies of that particular office?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, I cannot.

**Mr BAKER:** Can the Premier assist by saying that he does consider appointments to the Public Service? Do they go through that machinery as well?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not prepared to talk about Cabinet submissions and the business of Cabinet. Indeed, the convention is that that is not discussed in a public sense, so I do not see the point in the honourable member's questions. In any case, I do not intend to answer questions along those lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I think that the time has come when the Chair should revert to what was said when we started this procedure: honourable members have the right to seek information on certain lines. In the past ten minutes we have certainly strayed away from that situation, and I ask honourable members to come back to particular lines and seek information on them.

**Mr BAKER:** Certainly. As a point of clarification, I was referring to one particular line and the programme statement associated with it. I seek further information on that line in trying to understand the role of that particular office. We have been unable to clarify it. Another item of clarification relates to the major urban development projects under the Special Projects Unit. Is it the Premier's intention to show that as a capital item as a matter of policy? It would seem that we have an off-setting revenue item from fees from another source. It seems quite unusual that salaries normally associated with public servants should be shown as a capital item in the Budget. I would like that clarified. A figure of \$100 000 was set down and a number of bodies were put down in that Unit. I wonder whether there is a change of policy.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair does not want to be difficult. However, we are now talking about something that is not even in front of us.

**Mr BAKER:** It is, Sir.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What the honourable member is talking about comes under the line 'Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$100 000' which will be dealt with shortly, so we are straying far from what is before us.

**Mr OLSEN:** Did the Government make any financial contribution to the visit to Adelaide last week of consumer advocate Ralph Nader, to use his services as a consultant on consumer matters? I refer to page 19, line 5. Documents that I have indicate that the Federal Government made some contribution to the cost of Mr Nader's visit, and approaches were made to the Victorian Government to finance a visit to Melbourne for Mr Nader on consumer training sessions. The documents indicate that the arrangements made for funding Mr Nader's visit involved a provision of funds by Government Departments and some of these funds ultimately will be passed on to the A.L.P. I refer to a letter from Mr Charles Wright, the organiser of the Nader visit, part of which states:

As you will have noticed I am conducting these tours under the banner of Charles Wright and Associates because that's the way it was done in the past and also because the Government is paying for a section of Mr Nader's time and possibly Professor Galbraith's and of course the Government cannot give any money to the Labor Party.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not aware of any contribution.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the provision of \$10 000 as payment for consultants include work to establish an inquiry into

media ownership and, if not, when will such an inquiry be held? I raise the question because the A.L.P. Convention in 1981 stated that the Labor Party would establish an inquiry into media ownership in South Australia, the terms of reference including questions such as compulsory declaration of commercial interests, the possibility of a media ownership review board, public trusts and ownership of the media.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is just a general contingency item. There has been no specific purpose for which it is earmarked. The need may arise for something specific during the financial year.

**Mr OLSEN:** Is it the Government's intention to undertake such an inquiry in accordance with its platform?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Not at present.

**Mr OLSEN:** Can the Premier detail the breakdown of the amount proposed for contingencies for the Cabinet Office, \$14 000?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There is nothing exceptional, just the normal contingencies matters—minor equipment, computer processing, insurance, workers compensation, taxis, telephones, travel expenses arising out of attendances at conferences, etc.

**Mr OLSEN:** Can the Premier detail the proposed expenditure of \$12 000 for the operating expenses of the Economics Unit?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is the same.

**Mr OLSEN:** What equipment was purchased last year for \$13 108?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is a micro-computer which actually is proving a very valuable tool for the Economics Unit. It enables it to produce graphs which are used as part of our Economic Information Bulletin. It has greatly speeded up the analysis of Bureau of Statistics and other statistics that are handled by the Unit.

**Mr OLSEN:** In view of the fact that it will produce print-outs of that nature, does the Premier intend to make them available to the Opposition, to the Auditor-General, or to the general public, for that matter?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** All the key indicators and work done by the Unit is published on a regular basis in the Economic Information Bulletin, which I think it is generally agreed is proving a very valuable information service, and that is certainly readily available to the Opposition.

**Mr OLSEN:** A sum of \$461 000 has been allocated to agencies through the office of the Agent-General. It is revealed at page 5 of the yellow book that the programme now incorporates services related to attracting potential investment and developing trade opportunities for South Australia. Will the Premier reveal to the Committee the Government strategy in relation to that expenditure?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I thought I had dealt with that question. For instance, I referred to the fact that the Agent-General is currently part of the delegation that is pursuing the submarine project. From time to time the Agent-General attends trade fairs and other promotional activities, gives addresses at Chambers of Commerce, and so on, and material is often needed for that or assistance with expenses. The programme details are provided on pages 60 and 61 of various other services that he provides, which include arrangements of itineraries for visiting Ministers and officials; attendance at tourist promotions; recruitment of specialist staff on behalf of South Australian companies (it is often requested that the Agent-General should interview someone on the spot, and where possible he can assist); payment of superannuation to South Australian public servants living in the United Kingdom (this is simply a processing function of the office); processing of absentee votes for South Australian elections; and service to agricultural teams in the Middle East.

**Mr OLSEN:** There is an amount of \$2 500 provided for the visit of the Agent-General's son to the United Kingdom. Will the Premier detail why the Agent-General's son has been provided with a ticket to London and why the allocation for Mr Rundle's visit to South Australia in 1982-83 was overspent by \$9 000? Is there an explanation for that?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That was provided under the agreement the former Government signed with the Agent-General. That was one of the conditions embodied in the agreement which this Government has honoured.

**Mr OLSEN:** That is the \$2 500?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That is for the visit of the son of the Agent-General. It was the payment of the air fare for the son to visit the family in the United Kingdom, in conformity with the agreement entered into by the previous Government with the Agent-General.

**Mr OLSEN:** And the over-expenditure?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Under the terms of Mr Rundle's appointment (again, we inherited this agreement), which was negotiated between him and the former Premier, it was agreed that the Government would pay first-class return air fare travel London-Adelaide-London for Mr Rundle, his wife and his daughter once every two years during the appointment. The outlay depends on the cost of the first-class air fares for those three persons. The tickets have to be paid for at the prevailing rates.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The Leader of the Opposition appears to have put his foot in it. I would like to know what the specific arrangements were, why this type of agreement, was it a handout to the Agent-General in London for services rendered in the past? If that is the case, then I believe that the taxpayers of South Australia have been taken for a ride. If the Premier has not the information available I would like him to provide it to the Parliament and to this Committee. If we are to reach the situation where Governments or political Parties are giving big handouts for people who help in election campaigns—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair has already pointed out several times that it is not going to allow honourable members on either side of the Committee to enter into a debate. That is what the honourable member is doing. He is not seeking information; he is debating. I do not know whether the Premier wishes to make any reply but I point out even to the Premier that the Chair is not going to allow the Committee members to enter into a debate.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not wish to comment on the value judgments, if you like, contained in the statement. I simply state the facts that the Agent-General is appointed in terms of the Agent-General's Act on a contract which is negotiated by the Government of the day. I do not think there are standard provisions necessarily, although in the case of previous appointments, such as Mr Max Scriven and Mr John White, who were public servants, I imagine that they would take up the appointment on the basis of prevailing Public Service conditions and would expect to see them carried out. In the case of Mr Rundle, who was appointed from the private sector, a special contract in terms of the Act was drawn up between him and the Government. It had some special features, one of which was payment once during the term of the Agent-General's five-year appointment for his son to visit him in the United Kingdom. That is provided for this year and that amount of \$2 500 I imagine would be a return business-class ticket.

In the case of the Agent-General's own appointment, there is provision that he should be provided with first-class return air travel to London-Adelaide-London for him, his wife and daughter once every two years during the appointment. The first occasion was in December last year, which is why that amount appears there. The cost of the air fares was \$17 494 and accommodation and other expenses was

\$3 516. As I say, the amount could not be budgeted for in advance because the tickets are bought at the prevailing cost at the time travel is undertaken. That was the contract entered into by Premier Tonkin, presumably with the approval of Cabinet, and Mr Rundle. The Government is honouring the terms of that contract.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Premier say whether this is the normal type of contractual arrangement, and on how many other occasions has this type of contract been entered into?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I would say that the arrangements are unusual, partly because Mr Rundle came from the private sector to the job. In itself that is unusual, but not unprecedented, I might add. I have not looked back to see under what terms and conditions previous Agents-General were appointed. I did not think it was terribly relevant. The fact is that Mr Rundle has a contract with the Government, and that contract is being honoured.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would appreciate it if the Premier could make available to the House details of the contract relating to the late Mr Ray Taylor and the Hon. Mr Milne, in another place, suitably indicating the persons who were signatories to the documents and the particular benefits which derived.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I rule the seeking of that information completely out of order. We have entered into a debate not relevant to the lines before us. If the member for Light wishes to pursue that point, he is quite at liberty to do so in another area rather than in this Committee.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I seek your guidance, Mr Chairman. Where else in the documents before us are details relating to the Agent-General and the terms of his appointment? I acknowledge that the request made to the Premier relates to the past. The questions from the member for Albert Park sought information about the current situation and, so that the matter can be seen in its proper perspective, I am simply asking that information be provided to enable a comparison of similar circumstances to be made. But I do not want to pursue the matter further: I think that the Premier will fulfil his obligation if that information is available.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am not happy with the type of questioning being undertaken at present. The Chair is still of the opinion that the lines before us have nothing to do with the past expenditure of any Government. The honourable member is seeking information from the Premier about something that has happened on some other occasion, whereas the lines before the Committee deal with proposed expenditure.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I have no argument with that, other than to say that the amount which has been spent this year has been questioned as against what might have been spent in the past, and I sought some perspective in the matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair recognises that point, but again I would refer to what has been said previously.

**Mr OLSEN:** Expenditure proposed for 1983 on co-ordination for publicity for Government agencies is \$303 000. It is stated at page 5 of the yellow book that funds will be provided for the South Australian Economic Report and a number of other publications and activities. Can the Premier give details of the other publications and activities set down for this year? Will he also give details about the number of subscriptions paid to date for the Economic Report?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The major expense will be for a revamping of the so-called *South Australia Book*. For the first 12 months of the present Government's operation we have used that book with a paste-over insert, detailing the fact that the Government has changed. It is not because I have any great antipathy to the features of the former

Premier but because it was appropriate to advise people that the Government had changed. Even though we had on our hands thousands and thousands of these useless books, we have tried to make the best use of them. Provision has been made in this line for a Japanese version of that book, a reprint type version. Also, the line covers the Government services directory which is produced periodically and which is a very useful publication. Unfortunately it dates fairly rapidly, but it is worth producing and I think that people find it valuable.

The Economic Report to which I referred earlier is also covered by that line. The Government is aiming to make that a subscriber publication; it will depend on what sort of response we get. In a way I suppose that that response will determine whether or not business, in particular, finds it useful. However the Government hopes to recoup at least some of the costs of its publication through a subscriber system, which I think would meet with the approval of the Opposition.

**Mr OLSEN:** What subscriptions have been received to date for the Economic Report?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am unable to say at this stage; there have been only two issues of the report. The first issue indicated that we would be calling up subscriptions; the second one set that out as a formal proposition. In fact, the third will be the last one that is issued on a free list basis. We believe that people will have been given sufficient opportunity to determine whether or not they find the publication valuable enough to subscribe to it. The third publication is due to be issued shortly, and the major subscription response will relate to that; we will assess that after it has been published.

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

---

Premier, Miscellaneous, \$2 071 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B. Guerin, Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr E.E. Kageler, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare open the examination of the vote.

**Mr OLSEN:** No allocation was made this year for the Royal Show Pavilion. Is there any reason for that?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It must come somewhere else—yes, the Police Department handled that this year.

**Mr OLSEN:** The allocation for the Japan wine and food promotion was underspent by \$24 000. A notation at the

bottom of the page indicates that that expenditure line has been transferred to the Department of State Development. Will the Premier say why the 1982-83 allocation is underspent, as there appears to be no definitive reference regarding this programme under State development to the amount allocated to this venture during 1983-84? Will the Premier advise the Government's proposed initiatives for that programme?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Government supported this on a \$1 for \$2 basis for 1982-83. There was private sponsorship received of \$72 000, and the Government responded with \$36 000; that was the basis of the arrangement. That \$60 000 was an estimate based around a maximum expected private sector sponsorship of about \$120 000. The amount actually spent related to that \$1 for \$2 subsidy.

**Mr OLSEN:** I presume, therefore, that it did not involve the cancellation of any specific food and wine promotions in Japan in this last financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, that was the budgeted amount. There were some promotions that the Government was not prepared to support, one particularly involving the Hilton Hotel, which concerning our assessment suggested that there was not much point in proceeding. It relates to a change in direction with promotion. We believe that there is a limited role for these types of general promotions. Incidentally, I confess to the Leader that I think there are a few cocktail parties included in my trip itinerary; I have checked it out. In the present case, our belief is that that particular promotion, for instance, was one that should not be seen as a priority; it should be substituted for a different type of promotion. It is not to say that we have abandoned the concept of food and wine promotions, but we believe that the private sector should play a much bigger part in it.

**Mr OLSEN:** The wine and food promotion in Japan is a very valuable aid to our wine industry, and access to our share of the market is rather minimal. It may be expanded with proper marketing potential. What plans has the Premier incorporated in his trip to Japan to look at the potential for promoting South Australian wine and food products during the course of this trip to Japan.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Certainly I will be looking at that. What is needed in this area is evaluation. There is some disagreement among those who participated as to its direct economic value. In that situation the Government would be irresponsible to go into it in a big way. There will be a couple of promotional activities on this forthcoming tour, and certainly I will have an opportunity to speak to those involved about their market and economic evaluation, and be able to get a better idea. There was, I think it is fair to say, a lack of hard data in relation to some of the promotions which the former Premier embarked on so enthusiastically.

**Mr HAMILTON:** The 'It's our State, mate' campaign was voted \$25 000 but actual payments were about \$55 000, which seems to be in excess of 100 per cent of the allocation made available to the campaign. Whilst I am not knocking the need for that sort of campaign, I wonder why there is such a large increase on the amount voted.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess that this is an example of enthusiasm on the part of the previous Government. It was decided during the course of the first half of the financial year to increase the allocation for that campaign to support a particular programme being undertaken. Our Government still supports the campaign. It has a number of benefits attached to it, and it has good corporate support. The most important aspect of it is the extent of free time provided on television, radio, and so on, by the media. While that commitment remains, it is obviously a useful thing to be involved with.

However, again I would suggest that it is a campaign that should be subjected to pretty close evaluation at all stages.

To an extent there has been a lack of market research and real evaluation of the various stages of the campaign. Certainly, the first phase which started in about 1980 in many cases missed its target completely. There was a major re-evaluation of the campaign, and a more targeted approach was adopted. It is improving, and the Government does not want to curb the enthusiasm or commitment of those involved in it. In fact, the campaign would have liked its support maintained at the actual level of 1982-83, or even increased. We decided on \$45 000 as a reasonable amount at this stage. If over time it is demonstrated that there is value in upping that support a bit, we will probably find the means to do so. However, at the moment we believe that that is a fair level of support, looking at the total programme the campaign hopes to run this current financial year.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** There was an allocation of \$100 000 for the Sir Thomas Playford Memorial Trust last year. I see that no money was spent last year, but that there is an allocation of \$100 000 this year. Can the Premier indicate why the funds were not spent last year, and whether the purpose of the Trust will now be clearly established and operating this year, and what has caused the delay so far?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** At the time the Government came to office the Trust itself had not been established. An interim Trust had been formed but no Trust deeds or other arrangements had been set in place. The Trust was more a concept than a reality at that stage, and the Government on coming to office reviewed the Trust, its purposes, and suggested aims, because we in effect picked it up. Having done that, we determined, first, that it was well worth continuing; and, secondly, that there should be some expansion of its aims. It was being confined more to a rural type of promotion; and, as we felt that it ought to have a high technology emphasis as well, in terms of the projects it might look at, discussion occurred with the trustees around that. The formal establishment of the Trust and the drawing of the Trust deeds has in fact only been completed.

The other piece of advice that we received was that, following the bushfire disaster, it was not the appropriate time to launch the public appeal for funds, which is a vital component of the Trust. The State Government contribution of \$100 000 is, in fact, part of the seeding money of the public appeal which will be conducted, and until the trustees feel the time has come to launch that appeal, which has to be properly planned, the \$100 000 will not become payable. A conscious decision was made to defer the move into the market place on the part of the Trust until we had absorbed the bushfire appeal and other economic problems. I think the trustees would see themselves embarking on some form of campaign in the first half of the next calendar year, at which stage the Government grant would become payable.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Will the Premier supply details on the Trust deeds now approved and provide written material on how he sees the scholarship now operating? It was my clear understanding, from discussions in Cabinet and with the former Premier, that it was to cover the manufacturing industry. If ever there was an outstanding individual in South Australian manufacturing industry, it was Sir Thomas Playford. I recall that it was to involve members of the trade union movement. The Premier, on several occasions, raised that point with me.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, I will make that information available.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I note an allocation of \$228 000 this year, compared with an allocation of \$227 000 last year for the Royal Commission involving Edward Charles Splatt. As the Royal Commission seems to be proceeding, I would not like to reflect on it and will not attempt to do so. However, does the Premier believe that that allocation will

be sufficient, as all indications are that that Royal Commission will proceed for many months yet. I know that a person expects to spend a fair part of the current financial year providing advice for one of the parties.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The cost of Royal Commissions, unfortunately, is not within the control of Government. It depends, as the member has stated, basically on the time the Commission takes because, every day it is in session, the meter is ticking over. On present indications, this figure was the best estimate at the time the Budget papers were prepared, but present indications are that the expenditure will exceed the \$228 000 allocated: I cannot indicate to what degree but I hope it will be to the smallest degree possible. No doubt exists that, the longer the Committee sits, the greater the cost will be, as Royal Commissions are very expensive undertakings.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer to page 15 of the programme papers, where reference is made to a new Executive Director for the State's 150th anniversary and to the creation of a new position of Director of Promotions and Community Liaison. I understand that the former Director, John Mitchell, now occupies a new position of Director of Promotions and Community Liaison. Will the Premier explain the change in Mr Mitchell's position?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Mr Mitchell was the first Executive Officer. His functions included a whole range of support activities for the Jubilee 150. As we get nearer the day, the administration becomes more complex and the Secretariat is dividing its functions. Mr Mitchell's primary skills and role in the Jubilee 150 is in the promotions area. That is where his expertise lies—in promotions and community liaison. It was his desire to get out of the administrative role as soon as possible: with the appointment of Mr George Mulvaney, that has proved possible. He has come from the private sector on contract to the Jubilee 150 Board and is in charge of the administration as Executive Director. Mr Mitchell is now able to concentrate full time on the promotions and community liaison work, which is a growing part of the job.

**Mr OLSEN:** Is Mr Mulvaney's appointment an annual or term contract?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I believe it is a term contract for three years.

**Mr BAKER:** Will the Premier advise the cost of the Royal visit last financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It was \$21 600.

**Mr BAKER:** I refer to the item shown as 'Australian Bicentennial Authority, South Australian Council'. Is that a reimbursement item by the Commonwealth or an amount which the State has to bear?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** We have undertaken, along with other States, to share some of the costs of the bicentennial operations. This represents the first payment of that. It is envisaged that we will be making an annual contribution. It has definite spin-offs to the State because the bicentennial committee locally is working in well with the Jubilee 150 Board. We envisage our Jubilee 150 activities in part being a springboard to participation in the 1988 bicentennial celebrations. That is our agreed contribution to the operating expenses.

**Mr BAKER:** Will the Premier explain what the Working Women's Centre is, what is its function and what the reason was for the increased vote from \$43 000 in 1982-83 to \$80 000 for 1983-84? I have not heard of that centre: perhaps the Premier could enlighten me.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am surprised, in view of the honourable member's previous occupation, that he is unaware of this body. It is part of the equal opportunity area, and has been in operation for some time. Reference is made to it on page 19 of the programme paper. It acts as an

advisory body, particularly for women in the work force, and its services are used by a number of companies. It advises on the factory floor in relation to problems women might have in employment. Its services and operations have been very successful. Part of the increased payments shown there for the Working Women's Centre during 1982-83 relates to salary increases and a restructure of salaries to relate them to Public Service grades. The previous grant was on an *ad hoc* basis in relation to remuneration, and there was an inquiry by the Public Service Board, which advised on the restructuring of its salaries. The grant had to be increased to meet rental and other operating expenses.

We now have a realistic assessment, and the \$80 000 represents the full-year effect of those changes. Also, we had a clerical support officer employed under the provisions of the special youth employment training programme. That officer now becomes fully responsible for the Working Women's Centre, and provision is made for the increase in that area. It provides it with a viable staff establishment and with properly assessed rates of pay. The Government believes that it is playing an important function, and its services are availed of not only within the union movement but also by industry generally.

**Mr BAKER:** Why does not this body appear under the Department of Labour, as it seems to be an industrial *quasi* advisory organisation? The only other information is one line in regard to the Working Women's Centre. I have not caught up with it. If it is an advisory unit with a two-way flow, why is it not associated with the Department of Labour?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is run by a management committee—it is not an arm or department of Government. It can attract funding support from areas apart from Government and is being encouraged to get private sector support for its activities. It is not part of any departmental structure but is an activity supported by this Government as, indeed, it was supported by the previous Government in the cause of equal opportunity for women. That is its primary aim. That function comes within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet—hence its location here. The Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department is a member of the board of management and therefore provides a link with Government. It is a convenient administrative arm for it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the grants for the 1986 projects, the Premier would appreciate that the lead time for staging a number of these events is quite long and, therefore, it is quite important that the organisations which are seeking inclusion in the programme would want to know whether they have been or will be funded, or whether they have been or will be guaranteed funding. Is the Premier able to indicate whether any organisations are still wondering about their position? A number of them, for example, the equestrian event, may well be still requiring final approval from a world federation. However, are those that have an ongoing programming input to proceed all advised to proceed, or are there still areas where organisations are awaiting the imprimatur of Government?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There are still many proposals being assessed, and that will be so up until 1986, although there are no major ones. Those that require forward planning and earlier financial commitment obviously have priority over a number of those that can wait. It may be that project proponents would like to get very early approval, but I think that the Jubilee 150 Board quite rightly is giving approvals only as they are necessary, having made a judgment that this particular function will take place in 1986. It then assesses its immediate needs, and at that stage funding can commence. Therefore, to an extent the allocation (and one can see that it is rounded to \$1 million) is a best guess. The total commitment is there and the Board has looked at a way of structuring the outgoings leading through to 1986.

However, it is a fairly rule of thumb basis at this stage. The Budget is prepared on expected expenditure this financial year: that may or may not be achieved. However, the total commitment remains, and if we do not spend through that total of \$1 million this year, that will be taken into account when looking at the 1984-85 programme.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would appreciate a list of those activities which have been given support and those which have not, and those which are still in consideration. I appreciate that there may be some degree of sensitivity and, if there is a degree of sensitivity, I would accept the information on a private basis. I would not want the position to arise where we start to have public argument in relation to the pros and cons, because I believe that the people responsible for this programming have done an excellent job and are trying to get it in the proper perspective and balance. However, from time to time members are confronted by people who claim not to know where they are going and have a need for urgent assistance and advice. I believe that this is an area where members could use discretion to the ultimate advantage.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I think that the Board would certainly be open to any approach from a member. If a specific project is raised, one could check out its status, and there is no problem there. It would be a mammoth task to try to compile a list of projects assessed and projects rejected through all the various subcommittees of the Board. I think that we can supply information on those major projects that have been approved at this stage. However, in relation to the whole range of events, and so on, it would be a very large task indeed, and I do not think that the resources put into that would be warranted. However, certainly if members come across projects and a group says, 'We have had this application in and we have not heard anything,' I think that the member should definitely raise it. I point out that the Government and Opposition are represented on the Board: in the case of the Government, by Mr Hopgood; and, in the case of the Opposition, by Mr Arnold. That also provides one with an opportunity to have input to the Board at that level as well. Therefore, I will see what I can do for the honourable member.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** To assist the Premier, I believe that a bench-mark of \$5 000 would not be an unreasonable point.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Most of the approved expenditure at this stage and that budgeted for relates to preparation for particular events such as sporting events, and things of that nature. In terms of projects and events that will take place in 1986, there is obviously a very large list of them which are unlikely to receive approval until much closer to the date of the jubilee.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If I can clarify that, the eventual commitment is in excess of \$5 000, which is not what they might get this year.

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

Works and Services—Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$100 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby

Mr S.J. Baker

The Hon. D.C. Brown

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr B. Guerin, Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr E.E. Kageler, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member for Mitcham had a question at one time.

**Mr BAKER:** I think that the member for Davenport and I have already asked a question on the matter to which we will probably get a reply. The question stands. We were ruled out of order. The question relates to the fact that in this situation we have an allocation of funds as against a capital item for salaries and wages associated with an ongoing function of Government. The question that the member for Davenport asked related to the funding procedures, and I asked the further question: is it a change of policy that a normal administrative function should be transferred into a capital expenditure item?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, it is not normal. It is of the nature of this particular project where a rolling fund is established and the costs of the project are being recovered against the income generated from that project. This is the appropriate way to handle that method of dealing with a project; it is not usual but suitable for this one and, indeed, probably has application in other areas as well.

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

Public Service Board, \$5 385 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier and Treasurer.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr D.J. Mercer, Chairman, Public Service Board.  
Mr A. Strickland, Commissioner, Public Service Board.  
Mr J. Betts, Director, Public Service Board.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There is an amendment to page 68 of the yellow book, which states, under the heading 'Agency Overview' and the subheading 'Programme—Staffing of the Public Service':

The expected increase in expenditure of \$246 000 (or 19.5 per cent) is mainly attributable to the allocation of a sum of \$150 000 for the employment of up to 100 school-leavers in the early part of 1984.

That should read '300 school-leavers'.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier say, in reference to that figure of up to 300 school-leavers, why there is so much flexibility in relation to that programme and why it has been necessary to make a special allocation for this purpose? Is it the Government's intention to adopt a quota system for Public Service recruitment based on age rather than merit?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Government had become concerned at the age profile of the Public Service. Youth unemployment generally in the community is at a much higher level than that of other sectors of the work force. The Board carried out a detailed study of the age structure in the Public Service, and its major findings were that the number of people under age 20 in the Public Service was declining and that there was a corresponding increase in the number of mature age people employed. Recruitment seemed to concentrate on that mature-age sector. This picture differed quite markedly from the corresponding age profile which generally applied to other Public Services in Australia and seemed to be cutting across general experience.

There are a number of reasons for this ageing of the Public Service, one of which relates, in part, to the decline in population growth and the general ageing of the community as a whole in South Australia. It also relates to new employment opportunities and to where those opportunities are being opened up. Clearly, opportunities were occurring in areas where special skills or experience were needed rather than at the base-grade employment level. That, in itself, was discriminating against the school-leaver and the young employee.

It was felt that there was a social obligation on the part of the Public Service as an employer to ensure that a range of employment opportunity was offered to the community, particularly where there was such a high level of youth unemployment, and that if the Public Service as a major employer in the State had employment practices that were discriminating against this particular sector then obviously some revision needed to take place. In light of that information the Board reviewed its employment policies. An annual school-leaver recruitment programme conducted by the Public Service to assist young people has been going on for some time. However, it is not meeting the requirements of young people, or of the Public Service. Only 67 school-leavers out of a planned target of 100 had been placed from the 1982 programme as at the end of May, repeating a pattern of earlier years.

The school-leaver programme places young people in full-time long-term positions only. Part-time and limited-term employment was not part of the programme, and that closed up opportunities for them. There was the preference for experienced recruits in departments to which I have already referred, and the better quality school leaver applicants in areas of high demand were already in employment by the time the Public Service special programme came forward. All this suggested that a special emphasis was needed if we were going to increase the proportion of youth employment in the Public Service.

The Board's assessment was that there was a capacity to recruit 300 young people in this financial year. That is over half the anticipated figure for base-grade clerical recruits for the year, so one can see that we are not talking about a total allocation of these positions to the young sector. It is, perhaps, just trying to redress the balance in terms of proportion of population to employment need. If we were simply going to wait for school-leavers to come forward, or for the existing programme to do this, they were not going to be employed, so a specific strategy was devised in an attempt to employ a targeted 300 young persons. This is being done in three strategies: first, to emphasise youth

employment in meeting departments' day-to-day recruitment needs. That means looking at applications and, where they are clearly applicable to young people, giving them some sort of priority in filling those vacancies. About 150 jobs for young people could be made available on that basis.

Then there is the SYETP scheme, which could be availed of by the Public Service. This scheme is directed specifically at young people, and we believe that about 50 young people could be employed under the scheme, which leads to permanent employment. It was suggested that to find another 100 jobs a special supernumerary scheme in conjunction with school-leaver programmes could be developed which would actually pick up good quality young school-leavers and provide them with the opportunity to enter Public Service employment. That scheme is under way.

There are costs involved in setting up that scheme which are covered in the line in the Budget referred to in the programme. There are administrative expenses in setting up the programmes and providing additional allocations to departments to assist them in respect of these recruitments. Hence, we arrive at the net cost shown. This scheme was approved by Cabinet in July and is now being undertaken. The Chairman, or Mr Strickland, may be able to comment on the progress to date in meeting its targets.

**Mr Strickland:** An advertisement was placed in the *Advertiser* the month before last to which we received an enormous response, in excess of 2 000 applications. Those applications are being processed at the moment, and we expect the first 100 school-leavers to be employed in departments in the early part of the coming year. The rest will be employed progressively during the rest of the financial year.

**Mr OLSEN:** In regard to the increase in the allocation of funds from \$150 000 to \$249 000, representing a 19½ per cent increase, I take it that that money is not for the purpose of payment of salaries at all but for defraying the costs of employing these people, and that that is the salary component of employing up to 300 school leavers in this programme, as covered in normal budget lines.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, it is being provided to departments for the purpose of employing those people.

**Mr OLSEN:** So the amount of \$150 000 does not relate specifically to the salary component of employment. That is what I am trying to establish.

**Mr Strickland:** A small section does. For the supernumerary part of it we have provided funds to departments so that they will give priority to young people during the early stage of the year. One of the problems with this matter in the past was that departments tended to look at school leavers after they had filled most of the positions available, which meant that we had great difficulty in getting school leavers in. So, part of the cost referred to relates to employing supernumeraries. Therefore, it represents a mixture of administrative and salary costs.

**Mr OLSEN:** During the 1982-83 year, advertising of vacant positions in the press and expenses for applications for positions incurred an overspending of some \$87 000. Can the Premier explain the reason for the excess and the reason for the budgeted figure of \$132 000 for this year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Overspending did not occur. The 1982-83 Budget contemplated recruitment being paid for by departments; that it would revert to a departmental base. Consequently, only a minimal amount was provided in the Public Service Board allocation for this purpose. Meanwhile, nothing was provided in departmental allocations—a sorry tale that we found in far too many other areas. The 1982-83 Budget had as one of its features cut-backs in the public sector facilitated by simply not providing resources. How that was to be achieved and what programmes or areas were to be cut was never quite delineated in the Budget documents. The matter to which I have referred was a good example

of that. Recruitment advertising simply disappeared, and it meant that departments were funded for only one quarter for advertising and related expenses. Expenditure had dropped out of the Budget, and someone had to pick up the cost. In any event, the Board had to do that, and hence provision had to be made. That was the reason for the over-expenditure. It was over-expenditure only to the extent of meeting a function which we presume was to have been carried out by the previous Government. It may be that the previous Government felt that there was to be absolutely no recruitment advertising in 1982-83. I cannot believe that, but the Budget documents effectively revealed that no provision had been made for that and provision had to be made from supplementary funds.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The Chairman of the Public Service Board used to provide to the Budget Review Committee of the previous Government an excellent report each month on staffing levels in each department. There was a detailed staffing budget for each department for the full year, and we were given details as to whether each department was running according to budget or over budget. I ask the Premier whether the same excellent detailed information is provided to the present Government.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** As was the case with the former Government, the general staffing levels in the public sector are monitored on a regular basis. That is the only way that one can assess trends in meeting employment targets over time. I think I mentioned in the course of the Budget debate that there is a regular review taking place now on a monthly basis on the Budget process which marries in both financial allocations and manpower requirements. Obviously, we are not far enough into the financial year to really gauge the effectiveness of that, but the idea of it is to provide a kind of early warning system as to where there are problems, particular pressures on a department, or over-expenditure for whatever reason. It is only by that means that we can keep tabs on the Budget.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I appreciate the need for that. I was a member of the previous Government's Budget Review Committee. We found that that was a problem back in 1980, which is why the Chairman was asked to prepare a monthly report which went hand-in-hand with the monthly reports from Treasury. I think that that is why the previous Government was able to control its Budget situation very well. I am delighted that the reports are still being prepared and sent to the Premier. I ask that they be made available to at least the Leader of the Opposition, and perhaps to other members of the House, because I think that this Parliament deserves to have that type of monthly detailed information on Public Service employment.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I would not like to comment on what the Parliament deserves to have. The previous Government did not see fit to provide such information. I can understand that there would be some reasons why a Government would not supply this information. Already the Leader of the Opposition has demonstrated the problems arising in analysing such data when he attempted to compare employment levels in November with employment levels as at 30 June, drawing from that comparison a conclusion that there had been some massive expansion of employment. That was completely wrong. Figures are subject to misinterpretation if one does not understand them. Equally, the figures are subject to misinterpretation as between departments. Certain figures are being made available.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The more information one has the more accurate can be the assessment of what is going on in the Public Service. I think it is incredible that the Premier should talk down to this Committee on such a matter and say that such information should not be made



available because members of Parliament might be unable to handle it.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am simply drawing attention to the fact that even one with a very rudimentary knowledge of the use of statistics should not make an error such as that made by the Leader. Nevertheless, it indicated to me that figures can be misrepresented and abused. I would hope that members of the Opposition do not intend to do that with them. I shall see if some information can be supplied, but I would like to assess the situation in part because I think to provide information that could be used in a misleading way is probably more damaging and less productive than providing no information at all. Certainly, my inclination, as I think the Government has demonstrated in terms of economic indicators, is to provide information where possible.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I point out to the Premier that there are three members of the Opposition present at the moment who have had two years experience in analysing and interpreting such figures, and I am sure that we would have no difficulty in continuing to do so, if the Premier is prepared to release the figures.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I note the comment, but the Opposition has displayed no evidence of any kind of learning process having occurred during those three years.

**Mr BAKER:** Will the Premier provide at a later date a break-down of that \$150 000 into its various components and how it is to be spent on the school-leaver recruitment programme? Where will these funds be made available?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** We will see what we can do.

**Mr BAKER:** In reply to a question the Premier mentioned that inadequate provision had been made for advertising in previous Budgets. I think that on reading the Auditor-General's Report it can be found that in fact there was a massive escalation in advertising vacant positions in the press, etc. It amazes me (and I would suspect that it all happened after 6 November 1982) that, in fact, \$92 000 was spent in 1981-82, when the market was far more buoyant. In 1982-83, when one could have put up a sign outside the door advertising positions vacant and got a fairly adequate response \$132 000 was spent on advertising positions and, in fact, the Government has allocated that same amount to be spent this year for that purpose. I submit to the Premier that perhaps this is an area at which he should have a good look if he is thinking of cutting down on costs, because it is fairly evident that there has been an increase of \$40 000 (a 45 per cent increase) in the cost of advertising jobs at a time when people are looking for jobs. That is a comment that I hope the Premier will take up, and I would hope that he would not reflect on the Leader of the Opposition. If that amount were spread around a bit it would be found to take up a very small part of the budget of relevant departments. I would also like a brief explanation on the increase in the amount allocated for administrative and clerical staff of the Equal Opportunities Section. This increase is shown at page 22 of the Estimates. Payments for 1982-83 amounted to \$136 496 and proposed expenditure for 1983-84 is \$167 285.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am advised that in fact there is an extra \$30 000 which involves an extra staff position. That position is an ancillary support to do with the equal opportunity plans that the Board has developed in various departments. An officer is to be employed to oversee the equal opportunity plans on a department-by-department basis. That is the explanation for the discrepancy between the two amounts referred to.

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

[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.30 p.m.]

Treasury, \$24 319 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr R.D. Barnes, Under Treasurer.  
Mr T.A. Sheridan, Deputy Under Treasurer.  
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Premier advise the method of apportionment of wages shown under the heading 'Assistance to Home Buyers' on page 28 line 1 and the sub-heading 'Salary and wages \$8 000'. To pick up a point raised earlier, page 141 refers to advances for housing of about \$154 million. The point was made that that is a matter that ought to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee on the basis that anything costing over \$500 000 ought to be referred to that committee, and that this is a package dealing with tens of millions of dollars. That being the case, it would seem to me that it would have to go to the Public Works Standing Committee in accordance with the requiring legislation. What is that likely to do to the programme that the Government has laid down?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will refer this question to the Under Treasurer.

**Mr Barnes:** Mr Chairman, we have done a quick check on the past history of housing appropriations. If one goes back many years, one finds that there was the time before the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement when all funds for housing for the Housing Trust came from Loan Account. Because of changes over the years to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and the more recent period when the provisions were again subsumed into general Loan funds, with a special subsidy arrangement instead of into the Commonwealth State housing funds at special rates, we have no record of a reference to the Public Works Standing Committee. I do not know of any legal opinion which says that the Housing Trust programme should not go to the Public Works Standing Committee. However, it seems that over the past 30 years or so it has been taken as a succession of small jobs, and not as a public work as defined. On looking at the words of the Act one sees that it is open to certain interpretations. I will ask Mr Sheridan to comment on some preliminary advice we received from the Crown Law Department today.

**Mr Sheridan:** Mr Chairman, the advice that we have from the Crown Law Department is very much of an off-the-cuff nature, and is that the Housing Trust is a corporate body with wide powers to buy and sell property, upgrade

and build homes, to sue and be sued. Also, the housing that it builds is financed by moneys from the Commonwealth Government, moneys that it earns by way of rentals, and moneys that are provided by the State. So, in that sense, the actual buildings created are not easily identifiable in terms of either Commonwealth, State or Housing Trust money and, on that basis, the Crown Law view was that it would not be required to go to the Public Works Standing Committee. However, a written opinion on this matter can be obtained if required.

**Mr OLSEN:** I believe that this point certainly needs further clarification. I note that Mr Sheridan commented that this was an off-the-cuff response from the Crown Law Department. The definition under the Act is given as:

... any work proposed to be constructed by the Government or any person or body on behalf of the Government out of moneys to be provided by the Parliament.

Indeed, in this instance there is a specific line in the Budget papers relevant to that which will involve contracts, whether for individual units, amounting to in excess of \$500 000. That being the case, it seems to me that there is very little alternative but to proceed through the Public Works Standing Committee process. I think that it would be appropriate to have further clarification on that point as soon as is possible because there may well be a problem with the programme that the Government has laid down as a result of that requirement of the Public Works Standing Committee legislation.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is also a matter of public policy and practice, as the Under Treasurer has indicated, which goes well back in time to when this was part of the Budget lines and when such referrals were not made. Indeed, as a matter of public policy, the Act would not have intended that the Housing Trust programme be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee in this way. If that had been the concept, then no doubt appropriate amendments would have been made to the Act, so it is not just a question of the technical interpretation which will be sought but also of the sheer administrative method of tackling this matter. The housing programme as such has not been subjected to such a referral and there is probably no reason why it should have been, in terms of overriding public policy. If there is, I would be happy to hear the Opposition's arguments in favour of that happening.

**Mr OLSEN:** I note that the Minister of Housing is before the Estimates Committee on Wednesday week. Would it be possible to clarify this matter prior to the Minister of Housing appearing before the Committee?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not think that this matter is dependent on when the Minister of Housing's Estimates are before the Committee because his will be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee whether or not the Public Works Standing Committee is involved. It is really a question of interpretation, but certainly we will expedite a considered response. Our advice so far is that it is not covered and I would be surprised if the Opposition would seek to have it covered, because one of the effects of that would be simply to delay the housing construction programme and I am sure that is not its wish to do that.

**Mr OLSEN:** We are seeking clarification of this matter and I do not think that we are asking too much in so doing.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** As Minister of Public Works I looked at this matter in some detail, partly because for some time I had been involved in looking at the amendments to the Act and also because the then Opposition challenged whether or not a number of the works should have gone to the Public Works Standing Committee I refer specifically to the Law Courts building. I looked in some detail at this matter and took advice from the Crown Solicitor. The reason the Law Courts building was not required to be

referred to the Public Works Standing Committee was purely on the grounds that it did not involve a specific line in the Budget. The advice that I received, which I can recall quite distinctly, was that it did not matter whether or not it was a statutory authority; the key point was whether or not there was a line in the Budget, whether it was construction work and whether it involved a contract or overall project worth more than \$500 000. They were the criteria laid down for me at that time. I think, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, it is not that we are trying to delay this programme in any way but that there are certain statutory requirements that this Parliament has an obligation to uphold. I think that there would be outrage if this Parliament knowingly sat back and allowed work to proceed which should have gone to the Public Works Standing Committee but did not.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I think that the point the member makes about a review of the Act is probably a valid one. I am not aware of what work was being done, but no doubt that information is available to us and we will certainly have a look at it with a view to possible amendments if they become necessary. The different arrangements that are made in relation to financing public works in the 1980s are far wider and far more varied than those which were in vogue at the time the Act and the procedure were established. Perhaps it is due for review.

**Mr OLSEN:** What financial provision, if any, is made in the allocation of \$181 905 shown on page 28, line 11, of the Estimates, for the provision of financial policy advice for the inquiry into State revenue raising which the Premier promised before the last election?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** There is no specific provision made for that inquiry because it is our view that the amount can be covered from a contingency sum. I doubt whether the sorts of people who will be involved in the inquiry will be asking for large fees. There may be some travel expenses involved, but only a fairly moderate amount, so that can be provided for from contingency lines. Programme 5 does not include that particular inquiry.

**Mr OLSEN:** I think that it was on about 10 March that the Premier announced that an independent inquiry into the State's taxation base would be started soon. As we are now some six months down the track, can the Premier advise the Committee whether or not committee members have been selected and, if they have, who are the members and when does he expect the inquiry to be completed? Also, would not the report of the Committee of Inquiry into State Government Revenue Raising Measures of the Victorian Government, which ran into some 722 pages, in fact provide a good base for that committee to operate on and obviate the need for a detailed inquiry in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Dealing with the last point first, certainly the Victorian Inquiry, which was very thorough and comprehensive, would provide a very good base upon which to work. Indeed, we have had regard not only to the findings of that inquiry but also to its terms of reference when looking at the shape of our own inquiry. It will certainly be a very valuable source document. We certainly do not intend to try to cover the same ground, but there are differences between the States bases and I do not think that that inquiry obviates the need for our inquiry, as the Leader would suggest.

The terms of reference of the inquiry have been established. A number of persons to serve on the inquiry have been identified. The delay has been occasioned, first, by the need to institute revenue measures as a matter of urgency in the context of the deficit that we were running in the 1982-83 financial year and, secondly, in order to get that inquiry under way we have to nominate somebody to chair it. We thought that we had someone appropriate to do so but, unfortunately, that person was not available. As soon as that appointment can be made the inquiry will start. As I

have already said to the House, I think that it is an important exercise, not just for the findings and recommendations it may make, but because of its role in public education on State revenue raising. It will provide an opportunity for members of the public and interested groups to make submissions and, in making their submissions, to direct their attention to the problems of State revenue raising. All of this will be encompassed in the inquiry, so the exercise in itself will be useful irrespective of what findings it makes.

**Mr OLSEN:** In the paper *The South Australian Economy*, the Premier indicates the two key items contributing to Adelaide's poor inflation record over recent quarters have been petrol charges and hospital and medical charges. After assessing the impact of the 14.2 per cent increase in State taxation and in excess of 40 increases in State charges since the election, will the Premier advise the Committee of the estimated increase in the Adelaide c.p.i. for the December quarter, for the year to December 1983 and for the financial year 1983-84?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair feels that we are again delving somewhat into a grey area. To be quite frank, I find it a little difficult to tie the present line of questioning by the Leader to any particular line in the Estimates.

**Mr OLSEN:** With respect, the whole Budget is based on the premise of an expected inflation rate for the year 1983-84. Every line of the Budget papers before us relates directly to the consumer price index, as identified by the Government. For that reason, it is one of the most fundamental and basic questions that can be asked by the Committee in putting questions on Treasury lines, surely.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That may be correct on the basis that we are looking at an overall picture, but the Chair has consistently pointed out to the Committee that it is not looking at an overall picture. It is looking at a certain line. Consistently, the Chair has pointed out that it will not allow the Committee to carry on a second reading debate. The Leader must link up his remarks with a particular line.

**Mr OLSEN:** With respect, once again I did not embark on a second reading speech at all. I asked a series of questions. If the Committee does not want to take it on the overall Budget strategy, I relate it to page 29 which gives the Treasury Department total salaries of \$2 391 000. My argument is relative to that line and that vote as to the total Budget package. The whole Budget is based on a consumer price index for the year and is identified in the Premier's papers tabled before the Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair will allow the Premier to answer the question, if he so desires, but is of the opinion that the Leader is not linking up his remarks with any line. I do not know whether the Premier wishes to pursue the matter.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The question has been part of the general debate on the Budget. It has also been raised in each of the separate revenue Bills brought before the House, including the one in relation to the petrol levy which the Leader singled out. I do not think it relates to expenditure under these lines in the way he suggests. It is not meant to be a second reading debate. It is meant to be information seeking of a type that relates to these expenditures and their proposals.

**Mr OLSEN:** It would be simpler for the Premier to tell the Committee that he does not know. He was not able to tell us during the various debates on the proposals before the Parliament and, obviously, he still does not know the answer to the question. That is all he needs to say.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair would advise the Leader that it does not accept that explanation, either. Does the Leader wish to pursue any other questioning?

**Mr OLSEN:** No, Sir.

**Mr BAKER:** By way of general statement, the Treasury Department has done an extremely solid job in breaking down some items, but we finish up with securing the management of funds for State purposes as a large lump-sum item in the Budget. From previous experience with the Treasury Department, I am critical of its ability to make adequate submissions to the Commonwealth in respect of Commonwealth grants and on-going revenue. Where do we have a section which sets itself aside and concentrates on putting the case for South Australia? I presume it is under programme 6, and is not separated off.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Programme 6 refers to Commonwealth funding and, in fact, relates more specifically to SAGFA in the role of Government finances and organisation of loans. If one looks at the organisation chart of the Department, one finds that there are a number of Assistant Under-Treasurers, a Deputy Under-Treasurer, and a Commissioner for State Taxation. One of the Assistant Under-Treasurers has the role of Economic Adviser to the Commonwealth Financial Relations Commission, that is Mr Peter Emery, who came to South Australia following extensive experience in the Commonwealth Treasury.

I must pick up the member's remarks of criticism with some surprise. It is not for my officers to speak or defend themselves in this area, but I am prepared to do so on the basis of performance. The South Australian Treasury and its officers have a reputation within the Commonwealth second to none, in terms of both experience and effectiveness. That is very apparent when we come to deal with the Commonwealth Treasury in Canberra. They are hard people to deal with, in some respects. They have seen many proposals come and go over the years and many State Governments change, but there is a record of respect for the work of the South Australian Treasury, which has been borne out even in the last 12 months.

In those cases where we have had specific submissions to put (such as bushfire relief funds and, at the Premier's Conference, a special allocation to assist with State finances), the credibility of the State Government of South Australia and its submissions was absolutely crucial. Without that credibility, not only at the political level but also within the bureaucracy, we would have got a hard deal. In fact, we were able to get the assistance that we did because our work was accepted—that speaks for itself. There is no point in getting into that in this Committee. Suffice to say that relations with the Commonwealth Treasury and Commonwealth funds are an important part of Treasury activities. One need only look at this year's Budget and the way in which housing funds were treated to see the way in which our Treasury is prepared to be innovative and constructive, to the benefit of this State and to the admiration of some of their colleagues in Canberra.

**Mr BAKER:** I may sound overly critical. I understand the Department has gone through a development phase and its expertise has been lifted in recent years. The point I was trying to make is that we have a number of items here that have been broken down into small components, and we then have a large-lump sum item. We do not understand it, because the funds are not related to the previous year's performances or allocations. It is totally inconsistent that we should have a lump-sum item of \$2.4 million. In other cases we have items as low as \$8.4 million. I would have thought that Treasury, in charge of TAS and the p.p.b. programme, could have provided much better information on its own operations. I am disappointed that we have not seen more clarity in the Budget items provided by Treasury. That should be noted, as it is the major body in improving recording and the ability of other departments to respond to the Department and the Government. I record my dis-

appointment that Treasury has failed to do its own house-keeping in that regard.

I now refer to debt servicing on funds. We have a contingency item, and two items are covered. I refer to the expenses of conversions and public loans to an amount of \$6.1 million and the debt servicing of funds invested by statutory authorities to an amount of \$2.86 million. On my calculation, that makes a total of \$8.96 million. I can draw only a general comparison if I take the one Budget line that we had last year with an expenditure of \$9.64 million. I can only presume that that covers both items, even though there is no star on the statutory authority items. I understand that there has been a change in the funding arrangement. Can the Premier say what has caused the fall in the debt servicing arrangement in total from \$9.648 million (if I have it right) to \$8.96 million?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** First, I am not prepared to let the honourable member's comments go unanswered in relation to the presentation of the line Estimates in programme 6. It may be that next year programme 6 can be broken down in a more detailed fashion. However, if the honourable member looks at pages 110 and 111, he will see that the vast bulk of programme 6 relates to the State Taxation Office, and the explanation as to what is done by the State Taxation Office, how many it employs, and so on, is a fairly simple one. If he has specific questions about that, well and good, but I am not really sure what point he is making.

It is true that Commonwealth funds and State taxation are linked within this general programme head, but they can be clearly separated out from those pages of the programme Estimates. I think that the presentation of the Treasury vote this year is the clearest it has ever been and, instead of giving credit for that, the member for Mitcham wants to do a bit of nit-picking about it. In relation to the specific questions he has asked in the contingencies area, I ask the Under Treasurer whether he wishes to make some comments.

**Mr Barnes:** This is perhaps an illustration of the problems of following things through in a transition year. If we look at the two items on page 29 to which reference has just been made, that is, debt servicing on funds invested by statutory authorities, \$2.860 million appears. The following line, expenses of conversion of public loans, amounts to \$6.1 million. To get an understanding, it is necessary to look at the figures for 1982-83, and the \$6.1 million in the second line can be picked up if one looks at page 33 of the printed Estimates. In 1982-83 it was shown in the old line form. The Estimates which came before this House 12 months ago had a figure of \$6.1 million. It turned out finally that the cost was \$9.6 million (almost \$10 million).

If the Estimates were presented in the same way, the figure which would appear in the third column would be \$6.1 million. What used to be in line form in Treasurer, Miscellaneous is now part of this programme. The main explanation of the difference is that from year to year the terms and conditions of issue of loans by the Commonwealth on behalf of the States vary. Interest rates vary and the terms of issue, including discounts or perhaps premiums, vary. The overall cost to the States can come out at the same figures, so by a different combination of these things, that is, an interest rate with issues at par, the whole cost will show in a Special Acts line, because special legislation (the Public Finance Act) gives authority for those interest costs.

If markets demand a different kind of security, the Commonwealth may bring forward issues which have the same effective cost but, let us say, at a lower interest rate, but issued at a discount. The interest will again show up in Special Acts. However, this is what happened in 1982-83: there were a lot of issues at a discount. The costs of the

discount have to be met elsewhere. Last year it was under 'Treasurer, Miscellaneous.' This year, because that line has been absorbed into programmes in this transition year, we have it on page 29, without the comparable figures for 1982-83. Therefore, one needs to look at pages 29 and 33.

The other comment is that (and this is another illustration of the complexity of the matter this year) the other reference to the \$2.86 million is completely new. That did not appear before, because funds of a kind which were previously taken directly to the Housing Trust and the State Bank to support housing programmes are being taken to the Budget in 1983-84, and are part of this process of getting housing funds at concessional interest rates. If they are taken directly to the Budget, the debt services attached to them have to appear in the Budget, hence for the first time there is this \$2.86 million, which is an estimate of the cost of interest if those funds, say, through SAGFA, through S.G.I.C., through the Super Investment Trust, are taken fairly late in the year. Therefore, it is a fairly complicated picture and there are two new things in there: one, a new presentation in programme form, and the other a new method of bringing into the Budget funds from statutory authorities.

**Mr BAKER:** I think that I have grasped the principle involved there. In the Special Acts line, what would the \$3.548 million have related to in 1982-83? What line would that have been picked up in in the previous year so that it would not have been under that vote for 1982-83, but would have been when the line was changed?

**Mr Barnes:** I ask for that question to be repeated. I missed the figure.

**Mr BAKER:** In 1982-83 there was a vote for \$6.1 million on conversion and public loans. I can understand the other figures that have already been supplied. I was relating the \$9.648 million to the two new items on page 29, but the difference between \$6.1 million and \$9.648 million is \$3.548 million. Mr Barnes said that it is because of a Special Act that that has been transferred on to that line. Where did that line exchange (we could call it over-expenditure) take place?

**Mr Barnes:** If we concentrate on one line for the moment, we can follow that through. Let us put on one side completely the \$2.86 million on page 29. That is a new factor that has not applied before. If we look at the next line, expenses of conversion and public loans, which appears on pages 29 and 33, one could say that, looking at 1982-83, there was an excess on that line of just over \$3.5 million. Had the Commonwealth issued loans at exactly the same net cost to the States in terms of debt services, but had its judgment been that the market required loans with an interest rate pitched a little higher and issued at par instead of an interest rate pitched a little lower and issued at a discount, then the cost would have shown up on page 10 under Special Acts. It would have all shown up as interest and it would have been covered by the authority of the Public Finance Act.

However, the judgment by the experts on what the market was looking for was to issue different kinds of security suitable to the market and, hence, there were more securities issued at a discount and the effect of that discount fell on that line, which is described on page 33. Instead of requiring only \$6.1 million for the year, it required more than \$9.6 million, but it does not follow that there was an excess cost to the State or a blow-out. It follows from the different kind of securities issued by the Commonwealth on behalf of itself and the State.

**Mr BAKER:** What can we presume the cost would be—

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has to point out two things. The honourable member is directing his question to the officer, and the Chair has already pointed out that that is not to be the procedure. It should be directed to the Premier and, if the Premier then wishes his officers to answer, that

is fair enough. The second point that the Chair has to make is that we are again now delving into two votes because of the system that we are discussing. One is on the vote, 'Treasury', and the other is on the vote 'Miscellaneous'. I draw that to the honourable member's attention.

**Mr BAKER:** On a point of order, I left that question open so that we did not have to ask the Premier to refer to the vote to take it up. Secondly, we are actually dealing with the Treasury Department contingency item, which does have a particular vote, and I am attempting to ascertain for my own benefit what has happened with the debt situation and the way that we are financing it. If that affects other lines I think I should be able to pursue the matter.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair understands what the honourable member is getting at, but I am trying to explain to him that when the vote presently before the Committee is passed he can pursue the matter again when the Committee is considering the next vote.

**Mr Baker:** Thank you, Sir.

**Mr OLSEN:** It is stated on page 117 of the yellow book that one of the specific objectives for 1982-83 was to produce a variety of error-free reports by the deadlines established by Parliamentary, Government and departmental schedules. Historically, the Treasurer's monthly statement of the Consolidated Account has been set down for completion by the twentieth day following the last day of the previous month, with release shortly thereafter. On a number of occasions the release of that statement has been delayed by up to six weeks. On three occasions, they were not released until there was considerable agitation from my office about where the statements were. Will the Premier give reasons for the continual repeated delay in the release of that statement and say what steps will be taken to ensure that future statements are released shortly after the twentieth of the month.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not think that what the Leader is saying is correct.

**Mr OLSEN:** I can give details of the months when six weeks elapsed before the statement was received and when the Premier's office was apprised of that.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Perhaps you missed the release on those occasions.

**Mr OLSEN:** No.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The June statement would have taken about six weeks, although I am not sure of the exact time. As the June statement is the final one for the financial year it must be audited, so there is always a delay with that. In regard to the others during the year, sometimes there are delays of a week or 10 days. All I can say is that it is not our intention to delay those statements. They will be brought out. It was interesting to note some of the great budgetary reforms announced in the recent New South Wales Budget which included programme performance budgeting, the establishment of a central borrowing authority, and the production of Niemeyer statements. Perhaps the member for Mitcham might note that in relation to public financing and the way it is presented in South Australia. Certainly the Niemeyer statement is an important monitoring device. It is the Government's intention to publish it as soon as it is ready for publication.

**Mr OLSEN:** I point out to the Premier that a number of weeks had elapsed before the statements were received. I would hate to find that someone in the Premier's Department was putting them on ice for a short period.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Could the Leader supply chapter and verse of that?

**Mr OLSEN:** I can identify specific months in the course of a year when a number of weeks elapsed before they were received. I will advise the Premier of when that occurred. Page 31 of the Estimates indicates that the Government's contribution to the South Australian Superannuation Fund

will increase this year to \$53 million, as compared with the actual payment in 1982-83 of \$45.2 million. The amount voted this year represents a significant increase on previous estimates of the Government's contribution to the scheme. In a review of the scheme in 1978, the Public Actuary estimated that Government and statutory authority contributions to the scheme would not reach their present levels until 1988. The most recent review by Public Actuary, published in July 1981, also understated the cost of that scheme. In fact, there has been an over-run between the estimate and the actual cost to the Government of almost \$12 million in the period 1981 to 1984 inclusive. Can the Premier say what are the latest projections of Government contributions to the fund in regard to the next five years, and whether the Government is considering any review of the Government superannuation scheme because of the escalating costs of that scheme?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will ask the Under Treasurer to give a more detailed reply. There is a triennial actuarial assessment of the fund on which forward calculations are based. Such an assessment will be made in 1983; in fact it is being undertaken at the moment. The results will probably be some months away from finalisation. Certainly, that assessment provides the Government with a periodic opportunity to update the estimates, based on actuarial calculations. Further, there is constant review of the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and a number of modifications are under discussion at the moment. The broad outline of the scheme remains one that is in place. I do not believe there is any cause for alarm over the financial trends within it, despite public statements made by some of the Leader's colleagues, for example. However, I will ask the Under Treasurer to speak about the cost projections.

**Mr Barnes:** We did a check on this. I spoke to the Public Actuary mainly because there had been some comment in the press on this subject, and it appeared that it could well be a matter that would crop up in this Committee. It is unwise to refer back to that 1978 report, which was a preliminary report and which was done on the basis of inadequate information. The more reliable report from the Public Actuary in regard to making assessments and projections is the 1981 report, because at that time a lot more work had been done. Further evaluation had been made and basic material on the computer and programme was available to bring out the projections.

If that report were taken as the basis and run forward, the Public Actuary's calculations show that, using salary movements as the update (superannuation relates to salary and not to c.p.i.), the short-fall would be not \$12 million but \$3 million. The other point to bear in mind when looking at that is that the Public Actuary would stress that his projections are reasonably accurate in the long term, but they are subject to short-term fluctuations or to the influence of movements in the short term. In particular, the 1981 report pointed out that there could be short-term variations because of factors such as special early retirement initiatives. It is a fact that that is one of the things that has happened in recent years. I am unable to indicate the effect of that, but it was pointed out in 1981. There will be a further evaluation report made on 1983 figures.

**Mr OLSEN:** In regard to that new evaluation, will the information about that be tabled in Parliament?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, it will be made available.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I refer to the securing and management of funds for State purposes programme (page 110 of the yellow book) and to Government management and administration. A statement is made in regard to commentary on major resource variations between years 1982-83 and 1983-84. It refers to the fact that there will be 18

additional positions in the State Taxation Office and that 15 will be for inspection staff with three others.

If one goes back to page 94 referring to the agency overview, one notices that the human resources applied to the programme for securing and management of sums for State purposes are expected to increase by 11.8 average full-time equivalents, which mainly reflects a significant strengthening of the investigation branch, and presumably is part of the same figure to which I have just referred of 18 personnel. A wealth of information is provided in these books to which one cannot necessarily refer immediately.

Has the Premier a flow chart of personnel movement within the Treasury and, because State taxation is involved and a possibility of a variation to stamp duty when f.i.d. comes in, will there be a movement of personnel directly associated with State taxation who will be able to take up some of these appointments that I have just outlined? It is more a matter of redeployment—whether there is an ongoing plan of redeployment or whether there are 18-plus in one area or 11.8-plus in another. What is the ultimate in the overall area of Treasury?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** First, the Committee will recall that there is a difference between the average employment through the year and actual employment or the employment complement. The overall staffing is based around average full-time equivalents, but that rises and falls during the year for all sorts of reasons. Therefore, the figures in any one month, or the actual complement on any one day, might bear no real relationship to the average taken over a year. So, flow charts of that nature have to be constructed in order to meet manpower targets, but there is a very conscious decision to strengthen the inspectorial and other functions of the State Taxation Office, largely based around problems of tax avoidance.

I guess that the general rule of thumb is that if a case can be made out, as indeed was made out by an investigation in this area, that by employing more staff, or deploying more staff into these areas, the net gain will be very much greater than the cost of the salaries involved, and the closure of loopholes or the proper enforcement of taxes can be accomplished, then it is justified to do so. It is on that basis that the Public Service Board made an investigation in conjunction with Treasury and the State Taxation Office into what was needed, to see whether that could be justified in terms of the revenue that would be collected in consequence of employing those extra persons.

The advantage of such a programme is to control the overall tax burden. It is an unfortunate fact that the tax levies imposed both at the Federal and State level (albeit to a much greater extent at the Federal level) could probably be reduced if all those who were meant to pay their tax did so. Clearly, the closure of tax avoidance mechanisms and regular inspection of either a routine or random nature result in collecting revenue otherwise avoided, and this benefits taxpayers overall. Indeed, if all the loopholes were closed we could have a reduction of tax even on our existing tax base. Obviously, that is a Utopian situation that we will never arrive at, but certainly it is the Government's intention that, where it can be clearly demonstrated that the inspectorial staff and their effectiveness can be upgraded by putting them into the field, then it should be done.

We did some comparison work following this investigation and discovered that in terms of field staff we were way below the average in Australia and, while the productivity of our field staff in terms of their average number of inspections and number of registered taxpayers they made contact with in terms of their inspections was high, in terms of the total number of registered taxpayers they were well below the average one would expect. So, we are trying to build-up that staff which as I suggest is not a cost to the

revenue but in fact a gain to it, and would benefit the general taxpayer.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Some years ago the then Treasury was able to indicate to Parliament the cost of raising the individual tax dollar in the various areas of taxation. It was most revealing to see how much or what percentage of the individual tax dollar was absorbed in collection and various administration costs. Has consideration been given to this matter in recent times, and can the Premier comment on the relativity of the cost of raising various measures?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I do not know that we have figures on the collection cost of each of the revenue measures. The point of collection influences the cost of that collection. Some tax levies are obviously very efficient in terms of administrative effort in collection, while others require inspection returns to be lodged, and so on, which makes them more expensive. In a sense, we are constrained by the tax base on which we operate.

However, in relation to procedures, let us take this point of inspection I was talking about. In Western Australia, where they quantified the return, they found that the taxation officers could in fact make a return, just in the pay-roll tax area alone, by field inspections, amounting to something of the order of \$150 000 per annum. In other words, the cost of their salary would return a net \$150 000 per annum. In the State Taxation Office it was estimated that three existing inspectors have generated additional revenue in the order of five times the direct cost of their salaries. So, there are large sums of money involved. Obviously, there comes a point where the inspection effort begins to reduce that sort of margin, but our view is that we are well below that in terms of our State tax collection, and looking at the resources of our State Taxation Office I would say that on a comparative basis that we do far better than most.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Following that matter through, if the Premier can give any details by way of statistical record it would be appreciated. The previous exercise to which I referred indicated to both the Government and the Opposition that the massive cost of raising some tax dollars was really a deterrent to a continuance of that particular measure. I believe that a review needs to be undertaken on a regular, if not annual, basis so that the collection or administration position does not get out of hand to the extent that the recurrent account is paying for the collection of a tax which is no longer a tax but an embarrassment.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I accept that point, and it has some validity. The proposed inquiry into State Government revenue raising would have that as one of its terms of reference or objects, namely, to look at taxes in relation to the cost of their collection. Certainly, as the honourable member suggests, that does provide one with some guide as to whether or not it is a reasonable tax, by looking at that cost of collection.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Taking up the point that the member for Light has raised on tax evasion, can the Premier indicate the specific taxes which appear to be avoided? I am somewhat surprised to hear that the avoidance is so great that we need to appoint an additional 12 inspectors. Is it pay-roll tax, fuel tax or stamp duty tax? Which are the worst areas?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The stamp duties area is probably the most difficult. Pay-roll tax obviously has some problems, although I guess that those problems relate more to people on the margin of paying pay-roll tax or not paying it and, as the Government has been consistently raising the exemption level, I suppose that that has made a difference in the smaller business area, but the stamp duties area has been a continuing problem.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** During the last 12 months we have had a considerable amount of debate in this Chamber

on where the State's finances are heading and as to causes of overruns and such things. I think it has been said on a number of occasions that perhaps there should be some means of more accurate financial reporting. I am not suggesting that the Niemeyer statements each month are not an accurate reflection; but they do not give an accurate picture of the position in terms of an annual budget. I know that Treasury used to produce for the Budget Review Committee some excellent monthly documents which not only spelt out the position in terms of a balance sheet but also gave some quite good graphs and a brief statement on whether or not there appeared to be an overrun.

I wonder whether the Premier would be willing to table that information for the Opposition, or at least for the Leader of the Opposition, knowing that would be very useful and would certainly help to clear up what frankly appears to be a great deal of uncertainty as to what has happened in the last 12 months and would show when the Budget overrun actually occurred.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** No, I am not prepared to make that sort of information available. This was raised under an earlier line in relation to the Public Service Board. Obviously, monitoring of the Budget and Budget results is an important function of Government which must be undertaken. There are regular statements issued and information given. I know that the member has extolled the virtues of the Budget Review Committee which operated in the life of the previous Government and has stated how accurate its predictions, and so on, were. I cannot comment on that over the whole of the previous Government's term, but certainly that part of it with which I had occasion to come in contact, that is, within the 1982-83 financial year, at the time we came to Government, did not give me a great deal of confidence in their ability to monitor trends or provide information, so I hope we have improved that ability, and only time will tell.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I would suggest that the Premier is reluctant to provide that monthly material supplied by Treasury because he is scared that we might find out what actually goes on, and it might completely cut from under him the political ground that he has been trying to make for the last nine months regarding the position of State finances and the inadequate control of his Ministers over individual departments. Having seen those statements on a monthly basis, I know the extent of those provided to this House, particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, and it could clear up all of the uncertainty which the Premier seems to have created and which frankly was a highlight of his Budget speech, almost all of which covered that one subject.

I think the entire community is looking for more detailed information rather than just a monthly balance sheet, which we all know is inaccurate, because there are special contingencies that occur in certain months when certain commitments have to be made. We want more fact and less rhetoric, as the member for Light has said.

My final question relates to data processing, involving an allocation of \$440 000 for this year in programmes 10 and 12. Could the Premier indicate how much of that involves actual operation and how much relates to preparing and developing new systems, and are any consultancies involved in that?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Just dealing with the preliminary statement made by the honourable member, I point out that he has really highlighted the problems involved in the release of this information. I might say this Government has released far more accurate economic and other information than has ever been the case, and we intend to continue to do that. The member airily says, 'We all know the Niemeyer statement is inaccurate.' I suggest that that is

not true; we all do not know that. The statement is accurate. It is a question of what interpretation one places on it. It really highlights the problem which would arise by the release of the information, even to the Leader of the Opposition.

I am not convinced that the use of that information would be productive, because it does require considerable background knowledge, and this has certainly been brought out in the response to various information, the cross-comparison of figures, and so on, that has taken place. We will continue to provide information. I suggest that the honourable member attempt to analyse it, and we will give him some assistance in so doing. On the question of data processing, perhaps the Accountant can speak.

**Mr Wright:** Programme 10 provides for \$188 000 A.D.P. costs. The bulk of the \$188 000 is A.D.P. costs associated with the development of the new Treasury accounting system. A significant part of \$188 000 includes a recharge of the salaries of programmes provided by the Government Computing Centre, which is on loan to the Treasury Department in the development of that system. The provision under programme 12, on page 31, or \$252 000 for A.D.P. costs, covers the operation and, whilst there is some development, it is mainly just the operation and maintaining of existing centralised systems for the payment of Government accounts, and also the operation of a common accounting reporting system which provides a centralised system for financial and management accounting in Government departments. It also picks up the part-year cost of the operation of the new Treasury accounting system, which will be progressively implemented within the departments from late this calendar year. Most of the charges involve a direct payment to the Government Computing Centre for charges levied.

**Mr BAKER:** I picked up a similar item and the response received seems to be slightly counter-intuitive. On the first item, which is programme 10, we turn to page 120 of the yellow book and find that proposed expenditure on a developmental item has gone down, as has the staff number; and, on the operational line, which is programme 12, there is an increase in the staff line and a relatively small increase in the proposed recurrent expenditure item. That seems to be at odds with the explanation given. I am wondering whether there are some developmental costs associated with item 124 as against item 120. It appears to be going against the tide.

**Mr Wright:** The proposed 1983-84 allocation under the programme for development and maintenance of budgeting and accounting and reporting system is lower than the 1982-83 outcome, mainly on account of the 1982-83 figure including the purchase of a software package to facilitate the Treasury accounting system. The cost of that package was about \$188 000.

In addition, personnel currently involved with the Treasury accounting system will be transferred to programme 12 midway during the year and will take on an operational role. Whilst programme 10 covers the development of the TAS system, the operation of that system will be picked up under another programme. We are changing this year, as the development of the TAS system will be brought to fruition by the middle of this year. The operational staff who have been involved will be transferred to another area of Treasury to operate that system.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As there are no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$41 650 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr R.D. Barnes, Under Treasurer.  
Mr T.A. Sheridan, Deputy Under Treasurer.  
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer to the last line, namely, subsidy for managed houses. Will the Premier elaborate on the amount of \$300 000?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It provides for the State's share of reimbursement arrangements entered into with the Government and the Trust in respect of certain low-cost homes. The arrangements involve contributions of funds from the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust of around \$8 million; the Police Pensions Fund, which contributed around \$2 million; and the State Government Insurance Commission, which is financing about \$5 million. The purchase of blocks of houses is to be managed by the Housing Trust. The arrangement is structured in such a way as to provide an investment return to the three contributing bodies at a real interest rate of 4 per cent, so that their investment is showing a positive return. At the time these arrangements were entered into, the previous Government had submissions from the Trust and agreed to subsidise its obligations to the extent of 2½ per cent of the real interest rate. The cost of that subsidy is embodied in the \$300 000 under that line.

**Mr BAKER:** We have the same problem with the interest on trust funds and moneys. Last year the amount was \$6.12 million and we have now allocated \$6 million. Is there any reason to expect an indebtedness or that the interest payments will be lower in the forthcoming year than they were in the previous year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I believe that they will be about the same.

**Mr Wright:** The payment of interest on trust funds is at a rate approximately equal to the rate earned by Treasury on its range of investments. A number of trust fund managers choose to hold their cash at Treasury, and provision is made to meet interest costs on these funds. Interest is credited to their account half yearly. The provision in 1983-84 is fairly similar to the amount provided for and spent in 1982-83. In fact, the provision is shown under programme 6 for the securing of management of State funds. It has been done in this way because, under this programme, interest received by the Government is credited to that programme for securing management of State funds. In essence, Treasury, as part of its large-scale investments, is investing the trust funds of a number of statutory authorities and other bodies.

**Mr BAKER:** In 1982-83, for the insurance of cash, motor vehicles, etc., and transfer to Government insurance fund

for the payment of claims in respect of Government buildings, etc., we have \$1.9 million voted and \$6.076 million spent with \$2 million proposed expenditure for 1983-84. There is obviously a simple explanation, which currently eludes me. Will the Premier explain?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is simple but unfortunate and relates to the experience of school fires. Several major school fires occurred in 1982-83, and special provision had to be made for that. We made a best estimate of loss in light of information available. The four major fires included one at Gilles Plains resulting in a loss of over \$300 000. There was one at Plympton amounting to \$450 000 lost and one at Salisbury with \$750 000 lost. Another was at the Northfield High School, destroying a school block and library and sustaining a \$1.5 million loss which was a devastating experience. Urgent action is being taken in terms of upgrading surveillance procedures, and the Minister has authorised the implementation of a system of alarms. It is obviously an area in which we must get on top of the problem. Regrettably, investigations often suggest that those responsible for the fires are not aggrieved pupils but, rather, people from even outside the district. It is a kind of wanton damage which focuses on schools as unoccupied buildings ripe for vandalism. We have to make provision for it, and that is the reason for the drastic and high proposed payments.

**Mr BAKER:** Then \$2 million is probably quite inadequate in light of last year's experience.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** We certainly had a massive problem but these things tend to come in waves. One would hope that we have been through a bad experience and that there will be some reduction in the coming financial year. If so, the estimate will be realistic, coupled with the steps we are taking to improve schoolbuilding security.

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

Works and Services—State Bank of South Australia,  
\$4 000 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr R.D. Barnes, Under Treasurer.  
Mr T.A. Sheridan, Deputy Under Treasurer.  
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the vote open for examination.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I think that this area in relation to housing was basically explored on an earlier occasion. It may well be examined in another place on another occasion, and it could be passed.



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

---

Works and Services—Treasury Department,  
\$160 200 000—Examination declared completed.

---

State Development, \$14 064 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
Mr S.J. Baker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr. K.C. Hamilton  
Mr. J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Dr R. Sexton, Executive Director, Department of State Development.

Mr I. Kowalick, Executive Director, Department of State Development.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr OLSEN:** In view of the time, I will keep questioning to a minimum on the basis that we want to get on to the arts area, unless the Premier wants to come here again tomorrow for further questioning. As the Department of State Development, according to page 15 of the papers, was established on 10 March 1983, it might be more appropriate to be more specific in relation to my questions. However, there are some basic questions that I wish to ask the Premier. Part of the department's attempts to assist industrial growth, about which no mention is made, was to be the Enterprise Fund, which the Premier said last year would be an immediate initiative of this Government. When will the Enterprise Fund go ahead and from where are the funds to be obtained for the fund?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I noted the Leader of the Opposition's comments during the debates that the Enterprise Fund would never become a reality and that there was no such thing. On the contrary, some quite detailed work was set in train within some weeks of this Government coming to office and a report has been prepared which is now being subjected to Government assessment, Treasury comment and an analysis which will enable the Government to ascertain what is the best direction to go as far as this fund is concerned. I am not prepared at this stage to put any timing on it, but I can assure the Leader that it is not an area that the Government has either neglected or intends to see languish.

**Mr OLSEN:** I want some details in relation to the Enterprise Fund, which is referred to under line 13 on page 36. How can Government instrumentalities, for example S.G.I.C., recoup funds when at least some Enterprise Fund money will be loaned at concessional rates?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not sure that the Leader of the Opposition understands the criteria laid down for this fund.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer to what the Premier has announced publicly and to the documentation that he put down in his economic policy last year.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In our economic policy we outlined the way in which such a fund could operate and, in so doing, borrowed from examples of similar funds in operation overseas. In fact, the exercise that has been undertaken in some detail since our coming to office has considerably refined and developed the various models of Enterprise Funds. The exact nature of the preferred model which the Government will adopt has not yet been finally determined, but when it is suitable announcements will be made. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition will then have an opportunity to ask questions in relation to it.

**Mr OLSEN:** I do not want to pursue this matter any further because obviously no further specifics will be given in relation to it. However, I turn now to a response given by the Premier earlier today in relation to his trip to Japan and, more specifically, to the programme in Japan. In February this year the Premier was reported in the *Australian* as saying that, in effect, the State Government would use its good offices in joining with the joint venturers in seeking long-term contracts. However, when talking about his programme to the Japanese, the Premier said that it was definitely not a uranium-orientated trip at all; in fact, uranium was to be a very low-key aspect of the Premier's trip to Japan. Does that mean that he is going back on his statement reported in the *Australian* in February that the Government would assist the joint venturers in getting long-term contracts for uranium and that he is not prepared to explore, at least in some detail, those prospects in Japan over the next couple of weeks?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The answer to that is 'No'. The Government is obviously in regular contact with the joint venturers. The Minister of Mines and Energy and I keep in contact with them and we are prepared to respond to any requests or needs that they have in this respect. I am not sure that the Leader of the Opposition understands the status of the project at the moment. It is still in the feasibility stage and there is no guarantee that, having completed that stage (which it is anticipated with the construction of a pilot plant could be towards the end of 1984 and into 1985), any decision will be made on production or, indeed, that the economic climate will be conducive to such a decision. Therefore, there is still a lot of time and ground to be made up. I stand by the statement that I made in February and I think that the joint venturers will signal when they believe that Government assistance is necessary or desirable.

**Mr OLSEN:** In relation to the Riverland cannery (referred to at page 37, line 1), does the Government intend continuing to provide assistance to the cannery, how long will that assistance be maintained, and has consideration been given to closing or selling it?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I guess that what is happening there is really common knowledge, and it was widely publicised at the time that the Government made its decision earlier this year that it would continue to support the cannery for another season. It will take the opportunity during that time to mount a major exercise to see whether or not the cannery is viable in the long term, either producing the products and product mix it does at the moment or by new arrangements or new markets. That exercise is well advanced. We are very fortunate that the Director of State Development has had long experience in this area of marketing, food processing, and so on, which gives him the opportunity to chair the study group and gather together the skills that are involved. It is a difficult job. The losses experienced by the cannery over the years and the failure of redevelopment schemes in the past all make it a rescue operation that is

very difficult to mount, particularly in the current economic climate.

It is the Government's intention to go as far down the track as it can and if at the end of the day it appears that we will still be required to make massive subsidies from general revenue to keep the cannery afloat, then it will have to be closed. I think that is well understood in the Riverland, at the cannery and by the various committees looking at the matter. I guess, as in the case of the condemned man facing the gallows, that concentrates the mind remarkably. We know that the options available will be thoroughly explored and will provide the best hope for some form of survival. Although we are still optimistic, I do not underestimate the difficulty of the task.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Please correct me if I am wrong, but I think it is appropriate for me to raise under the general programme the matter of specific payments to the Establishment Payments Scheme and others. Previously this was related to the Miscellaneous line. I want to refer specifically to the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance Scheme for which last year the Government spent \$515 000, and I think \$1 million was provided. How much has been provided this year, and why did the Government not spend more? On two occasions I can specifically recall being criticised by the present Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, about the fact that we had spent less than \$1 million, although I think we spent considerably more than \$515 000. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that payments under the Establishments Payments Scheme increased last year from the previous year and that it is anticipated that they will rise further. I presume that that reflects industrial developments that occurred in this State, particularly during the period 1981-82 and in 1980. I recall that there is about a two-year drag in regard to payments under the scheme. Can the Premier indicate specifically how much will be provided this year from the Establishment Payments Scheme?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I will make a general comment and will then ask Mr Kowalick to comment specifically. It is true that I criticised the former Government about expenditure under the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance Scheme, partly because of the way in which the previous Government presented the proposal and because of a feeling that more could have been done in that area. There is no doubt that one of the biggest problems facing the local economy at present is the plight of the motor vehicle industry. The honourable member would be well aware of that and of the difficulties it poses for State Government policy, in that the industry we have in South Australia represents all the facets of that industry and any plan to support or assist it, whether by Federal Government action or general market action, has advantages and disadvantages to various sectors of that industry. In attempting to support the industry the Government has to walk a pretty difficult tightrope through that area. We are certainly very keen to encourage the use of the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance Scheme, as was the previous Government. However, like the previous Government we realise that there is no point in simply spending money if it is really not going to lead anywhere, if all it is going to do is prop up businesses that ultimately will fail. I think it is fair to say that the money has been spent well. The Government is again providing for this scheme, because any assistance we can give the industry in restructuring is a good thing. In relation to the general establishment payments area there are direct and quantifiable benefits there in terms of Government support, and naturally payments will continue and a fairly major allocation will be made. I now ask Mr Kowalick to expand on that.

**Mr Kowalick:** In the past six months 13 projects were approved under the Establishment Payments Scheme which will result in payments estimated at \$513 000. The level of

the establishment payment claims is continuing along a pattern that has been prevalent for the past two years. Of course, the Establishment Payments Scheme provides a payment after the event. There are lags in regard to some of these payments, and it is fairly difficult to predict year-by-year the exact amount to be paid out, because there may be project delays for one reason or another or the bringing forward of a project. It is very unpredictable. However, on our best estimates we would expect to expend the amount allocated in the current Budget.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** What is that amount?

**Mr Kowalick:** It will be \$1 512 000. In the case of the Motor Vehicles Board, approvals last year amounted to \$705 000. One of those was carried over into the current financial year in terms of a payment because of a slight change in the motor vehicle industry. It is very difficult to estimate payments; it depends on when the project comes up in the motor vehicle industry, which is a fairly dynamic industry. Current estimates are that payments will be very close to \$1 million this year.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** On behalf of the Design Council, I express disappointment that its allocation is being held at \$70 000 and not being increased with an inflation component. Over recent years the former Government inflated its allocation. As the Premier would realise, the previous Government established a contact with Graydon and Associates to market South Australia particularly as a high technology centre in the United States. Will the Premier indicate whether he is continuing that programme and whether he thinks it is worth while?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not sure that the member speaks on behalf of the Design Council. This year the Design Council will receive Commonwealth support, as a result partly of strong representations made by the South Australian Government at the Industry Ministers' Conference in Perth this year. The Government support for the Design Council proportionately is way above that given by any other State in Australia, and that has been recognised. In fact, we have set a very high standard of support in that area. In regard to Graydons, on coming into office the Government was confronted with that particular scheme; the member who raised this matter had a considerable input in its establishment. We made a decision, which I think is the right of any Government coming to office, and at that stage we decided that there was sufficient value in the scheme. In fact, the honourable member made some personal representations to me about it at the time it was under consideration and gave me his personal views on it, which I found valuable. We made a decision to pursue the scheme to the extent of the contract requirements at that stage.

In fulfilment of that contract Graydons went ahead with their exercise. Mr Kowalick and Mr Orr went to the United States as part of that scheme and followed up a number of the contacts that had been established by Graydons. On their return those two officers were able to make an assessment of the scheme as they saw it and to suggest some modifications that we have under review at the present time. I suppose it is better to say that it is being fine tuned, although it probably goes a little further than that. We find that there are some areas of the Graydons approach which are not quite hitting the target; there are other areas where it is very much on target. The effect of the on-the-spot assessment by our two officers has been incorporated in a review that Dr Sexton and his division of the department are conducting the moment. So it is an ongoing programme, but we can modify it at any stage.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I see that the South Australian Development Corporation, which was abandoned and then picked up by Trades and Industry has now been picked up by State Development. Will the Premier indicate whether

he believes that the \$1.9 million in outstanding loans to that Corporation will be repaid to the Government, or whether there will be substantial losses incurred? Will the Premier indicate what he sees as the future of the State Clothing Corporation in Whyalla and whether or not he thinks it can be profitable.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In relation to the outstanding loans to the S.A.D.C., our advice is that an assessment of its portfolio indicates that much of those loans is quite well secured. Indeed, payments from a number of operations (I must admit having seen schedule) date back a considerable time. It is surprising that those payments are still being made, but, in fact, payments and settlements are occurring quite frequently and our assessment is that, overall, the bulk of the money will eventually come back to the State. I believe that there are no major areas where there will be long-term default.

I turn now to the State Clothing Factory. I do not deny that there are problems here, but they relate in large part to the clear intention of the previous Government to be rid of the State Clothing Corporation come what may, first, by attempting to sell it off in the market, and then, when it was moving into the black and in fact returning good results, to starve it of long-term orders, in particular, which threatened its viability. When we came into office we found that the State Clothing Corporation, having established a reasonable trading level, was in a lot of trouble, much of which related to the fact that it had not been given the long-term orders and the certainty of orders it required to remain viable. We made a firm commitment to the State Clothing Corporation, which we believe performs a useful function. We recognise that the fact that it is established in Whyalla provides it with certain cost impositions. However, the social desirability of its establishment in Whyalla, particularly in the current climate when B.H.P. has shed large numbers of employees (it is also one of the few areas that employs women), is high. There is a cost to the State if we remove that operation from there.

Since coming to office we have taken a number of actions regarding the State Clothing Corporation. First, we have provided further capital to improve its liquidity. Secondly, long-term orders have been given to it by the Government (in fact, those orders were won by it). It has also been able to secure a fairly major contract from Australian National Railways, and we believe that, with a more vigorous marketing programme, it can probably pick up a lot more contracts. We do not want to repeat the ludicrous situation where, in the name of free enterprise and letting things out to the private sector, the previous Government let a large clothing contract to the Prisons Department of N.S.W. and left the Clothing Corporation languishing in its wake. We are committed to maintaining its viability to the greatest extent possible. I hope that it can get through this current period and emerge shortly in a sound trading position. We do not intend it to be a drain on State revenue.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote 'State Development \$14 064 000' completed.

---

Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous,  
\$4 961 000—Examination declared completed.

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** We have a change in the Committee at this stage. Mr Baker has been discharged and Mr Lewis will be his substitute.

Works and Services—Department of State Development, \$290 000; State Clothing Corporation, \$75 000—Examination declared completed.

---

Arts, \$4 571 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mrs J.E. Appleby  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr J.P. Lewis  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers**

Mr C. Winzar, Acting Director, Department for the Arts.  
Mr R. Wright, Senior Administrative Officer, Department for the Arts.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr OLSEN:** I ask the Premier whether the \$950 000 allocation shown in line 8 on page 41 for salaries provides for any new staff.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It provides for the appointment of a Deputy Director to the Art Gallery. In fact, approval for this position was given before the beginning of this financial year. The reason for the delay in the appointment is the report study being done by Mr Murray Edmonds into the management and operation of the Art Gallery. It was felt that, pending the receipt of that report, we should not proceed with the appointment of a Deputy Director, but certainly, as soon as that is finished and we have the recommendations, that will be done.

**Mr OLSEN:** Has the Minister considered adding the Botanical Gardens Board and the State Library to the area of his responsibility?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is a tempting proposition, tempting in the sense that there is considerable relationship between those institutions on what one might call the North Terrace boulevard. In fact, under the concept of the former Department of Community Development, both of those institutions were in fact part of that Department. It is also significant that, while the Botanical Gardens has moved around over the years, in the case of the Library, Art Gallery and Museum, prior to 1940 they were in fact under the one umbrella. As the Museum redevelopment project advances and we get beyond stage 1, there may well be a case for having those institutions again grouped together, but at the moment I do not think there is any necessity for it.

I point out that there are administrative arrangements in relation to what I think is called the North Terrace Muses Committee (I forget the name), but in relation to the general redevelopment in which the library participates, together with the other institutions, there is far greater co-ordination amongst those institutions than there has been in the past and I think that is a very desirable thing, but there is no intention at the moment for some umbrella-type organisation.

**Mr OLSEN:** One of the specific objectives for 1983-84 (and I refer to the yellow book at page 188), is set down to examine the feasibility of appointing an ethnic arts development officer. What would be the liaison between the Ethnic Affairs Commission staff and the proposed ethnic arts officer, if appointed?

**Mr Winzar:** There would be complete liaison between the Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Arts Development Division. It is proposed that this officer is to be established in the Arts Development Division and would relate to a committee appointed by the Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Department for the Arts.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In relation to the Museum Division, the general area of art and art development, and the statement on page 181 in relation to significant capital funds for the South Australian Museum redevelopment and funding for development of regional and minor arts and museum venue requirements in the longer term, there has been some concern expressed at the proliferation of small museums, particularly in a lot of country towns, and the maintenance of the same type of material in a number of diverse operations, all of which seek to obtain funds. Has the Government given any consideration to an over-view of museum expenditure or museum funding, such that some attempt would be made to make arrangements for classical museums relative to an area, rather than the same type of equipment and material being maintained in a large number of museums?

I am not wanting in any way to put down the efforts of a number of townships and districts in maintaining something of their heritage but, with a finite sum of money available, there must come the day when there is an approach which is in the best long-term interests of the State rather than necessarily the best consideration of the individual town or area. It is an awkward one, and I would like to know whether there is any ongoing discussion or research into ways and means of coming to grips with this overall problem.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In fact, there is more than research; there is a programme and a major effort being made in this area. The problem is a very long-term one. It has been tackled only recently in South Australia. In fact, I hark back to 1978-79, the period when I was Minister in the former Government, where in fact we established terms of reference and an inquiry into this very area which the member has pointed out. In the five years since then the situation has changed, and one of the major impetuses to change has been the establishment of the History Trust and the brief given to it in relation to regional and specialist museums. Coupled with that has been the impact of the museum awards that have been available of recent years. One of the important parts of that award scheme is the ability to make some assessment of regional and local museums, to look at their standards and judge them in an objective way. That has had a major impact I think on museum development in the regional sense.

Of course, there is nothing to prevent a person establishing a museum (in inverted commas), and setting up and displaying a collection. I do not think there is any reason to discourage that, but those museums which are going to attract funding or support in some way and which have some status in a district obviously one would hope could maintain standards or develop standards. Very excellent work is being done, particularly through the History Trust. We see on page 203 of the yellow book the programme which relates to this particular activity, the sub-programme which provides for museums accreditation and grants operated through the History Trust, the provision of advice and assistance on management techniques and financial and administrative requirements, the co-ordination of policy advice on historical matters and communications.

An amount of some \$100 000 is being provided for the development of regional museums. Major work is being done in that area. It has greater impetus with the imminence of 1986—the Jubilee year. We would hope by then to have a co-ordinated system of specialist and regional museums which will display our historical and museum heritage to the large influx of tourists and others, that we expect in that year.

**Mr OLSEN:** What will be the duties of new officers of the Museum Collections Development and Analysis, as staff numbers are increasing from 26.5 to 39.8 persons? What positions are involved in the increase from 7 to 9.5 persons in the executive management area?

**The Hon. J. C. Bannon:** First, I will respond generally to the question. The increase in resources to the museum is part of the museum redevelopment programme. That involves not only major capital expenditure but also, by the provision of new areas, involves an increasing recurrent commitment. There is a major increase in salary costs. Members may have seen, in this morning's *Advertiser* publicity on the appointment of a new Curator of Mammals to fill the vacancy of the late Mr Peter Aitken, who was well respected in this field. An appointment has now been made for that position. It also involves a Curator of Minerals and a driver/storeperson at the South Australian museum. A large part of that increase is not incremental but by way of transfer from the Department of Agriculture, where some 8.5 staff were employed on animal laboratory assessment and scientific research which is identified more as a museum than a Department of Agriculture function. They have been transferred for effective operation. So, there is not a major increment of staff embodied in this year's Budget. The 8.5 was a transfer but we accept that, in time, there has to be some increase as the museum project gets under way.

**Mr OLSEN:** Has an appointment of Director of the South Australian Museum been made or is the Acting Director still in charge?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The position has been advertised and will be advertised nationally. Until such time as it is filled, the Acting Director will remain in charge.

**Mr OLSEN:** There is no indication of when it is likely to be filled?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I would hope that it would be in the not too distant future.

**Mr OLSEN:** Referring to line 8, I ask for an explanation of the increase in salaries from \$1.237 million to \$1.539 million.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The Leader is picking up the increase to which I have just referred, which is more a transfer of staff and one or two positions for the Curator of Mammals, etc.

**Mr OLSEN:** Line 13 shows an amount of \$10 000 being provided for a redevelopment study. What study is envisaged and to what project does it refer?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is called a redevelopment study and has its origins in the Museum redevelopment—the Edwards Report and costs surrounding that. On-going redevelopment work relating to that project is provided as a contingency under that line.

**Mr OLSEN:** I refer to page 204 of the yellow book, where reference is made to the increase in capital expenditure of \$3.145 million mainly for further progress of the South Australian Museum redevelopment. What stage will be reached in the overall master plan in 1983-84, by the end of the current financial year?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** A major contract is shortly to be let as part of that stage of the redevelopment. The new Conservation Centre building will be completed under that line. There will be modifications to the Stirling Gallery and the existing building and the completion of the Natural Sciences Building as part of that stage.

**Mr LEWIS:** Could the Premier answer a question on one of the matters on which I seek information under the heading on page 189 relating to administrative and clerical staff? What has happened since 17 January in relation to the request from the Pinnaroo and Lameroo District Councils for consultation regarding the development of facilities in their respective institutes? Why have they not heard?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not sure why the honourable member has not heard, but I can assure him that there have been some consultations. I will ask Mr Winzar to provide some details, but I will merely say generally that we are certainly aware of the needs in that part of the Mallee area. In fact, we have actively tried to deploy funds in order to provide some assistance. When I was in the Riverland recently I had a discussion with Mr Gordon Johnson, whom this Government appointed to the Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust in order to try to ensure that the interests of the Mallee region were considered by the Trust which is based, of course, in the Riverland, and to see that as its primary base of operation, and I then discussed with Mr Johnson certain things that we can do. Perhaps Mr Winzar can elaborate.

**Mr Winzar:** We are presently formulating a strategy which would see funds being given to both those institutes. Lameroo and Pinnaroo certainly need some extensive upgrading. They are right on the bottom of the region covered by the Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust. Unfortunately, the theatre at Renmark, unless there was something special on, would not attract people from the Murray Mallee. They tend to graduate more towards Murray Bridge and Adelaide, so they do have special needs. The Department is very aware of those needs and through the regional arts facilities committee of the Department for the Arts and through the Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust, we are presently devising a scheme that will inject some funds into those two institutes, which will be quite timely.

**Mr LEWIS:** Is there any indication as to when that might occur, because the two district councils and members of the community whenever I visit them constantly ask me when the deputation that they trust I will present to Mr Winzar and the Premier can be introduced so that matters can be discussed? They want to know what to do with the funds which they are holding on ice to match moneys made available by the State Government, and they are not really asking for a great amount on a per capita basis.

**Mr Winzar:** I feel that there is no need for a deputation to see the Premier because he is aware of the situation about which I have kept him fully briefed. As the Premier indicated, Mr Gordon Johnson has seen the Premier and me about the matter, and it was right that he should do so as he is the Trust's representative in that area. We have devised a scheme whereby we can fund those two institutes. We have referred that scheme to Treasury for appraisal, and we are waiting for a report from Treasury so that we know which way we can go. A deputation attended the former Minister for the Arts (Hon. C.M. Hill). Deputations have seen me, and I have been to the Murray Mallee to brief the Lameroo and Pinnaroo councils. We have the entire information at hand, and it is being attended to.

**Mr LEWIS:** I feel that it is necessary for me to press more directly for an answer to that because, in a letter of 17 January from Mr Winzar to Mr Wood (the District Clerk of Pinnaroo), the penultimate sentence reads:

On my return from vacation today, I discussed the matter with the Treasury officer responsible for reporting to Cabinet, and I understand that the matter is being dealt with as quickly as possible.

To people with whom I grew up and whom I represent, 'as quickly as possible' does mean a bit quicker than nine months.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I accept that. There are a number of reasons why it has taken that time to work out the scheme that has gone to Treasury. However, I think that the honourable member can assure his constituents (as we have done) that the priority is there, and I hope that it is a matter of only weeks before I can get back to them.

**Mr OLSEN:** What is the reason for the increase from \$206 000 to \$358 000 in actual expenditure during 1982-83 for gallery and regional exhibitions assuming, of course, that that was authorised by the Department and the Minister? I refer to line 16 on page 41 (page 197 of the yellow book).

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** The increase in expenditure results from accounting of the exhibition of anatomical drawings by Leonardo da Vinci which have gone through to the Art Gallery's trust account. That exhibition was extremely successful, and it came out well ahead of budget. In turn, the Art Gallery reallocated that to a particular area of activity, namely, the gallery and regional exhibitions area. In fact, while there was an increase in the budgeted amount, that amount was offset by receipt of the proceeds of that particular exhibition. I would hope that we can have more of those pleasant experiences, because it provided quite a boost in that area of the gallery's operations.

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

---

Minister for the Arts, Miscellaneous, \$18 603 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
The Hon. B.C. Eastick  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr K.C. Hamilton  
Mr I.P. Lewis  
Mr J.W. Olsen  
Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr C. Winzar, Acting Director, Department for the Arts.  
Mr R. Wright, Senior Administrative Officer.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr OLSEN:** Why was only \$780 000 spent on the development of the South Australian Museum collection, having regard to the budgeted expenditure for 1982-83 of \$976 000 (referred to at page 184 of the yellow book)?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I cannot pick up the reason for that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps the Premier could obtain that information.

**Mr OLSEN:** Could I have an explanation of the increase from \$186 000 to \$284 000 in relation to line 1, transferred to the Museum Board?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** That relates to that transfer to the Department of Agriculture function which I have mentioned: 8.5 staff, but also the contingencies related to that.

**Mr OLSEN:** Would the Premier agree that the resource allocation indicates a gross imbalance between funds for

visual arts as compared with the performing arts, and perhaps the visual arts have received a reduction allocation? It is down to \$57 000 for 1983-84. Will the Premier undertake to investigate that trend when formulating the next Budget? That is also referred to as a point of reference (page 42, line 6; in the yellow book, page 187).

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Obviously the balance of allocation between the various arts activities is something that the Government has to watch, and these will vary from time to time. There is, of course, a basic ongoing function in relation to all the areas which will be maintained, but at different times one or other has special and specific needs. At the moment in relation to visual arts we have this exercise going on in the Art Gallery of South Australia, and we are also looking at the overall situation in the visual arts area. There has been some suggestion that a general inquiry into the visual arts in South Australia would be justified. The Government is maintaining an open mind on this. We do not believe that such an inquiry would be productive at this stage. It may tend to raise questions and expectations without resources to meet it, but overall there may well be a time at which such a particular assessment should be made. However, it is certainly something that we have very much in mind. Mr Winzar has some comments on country areas.

**Mr Winzar:** We are aware of the imbalance between the visual arts and the performing arts, and the arts development division of the Department of Arts is undertaking to assess the impact of visual arts activities in country areas which will please the Leader of the Opposition in regard to Kadina. We will assess the need for better visual arts and craft services and facilities in regional areas as well, so we might find some good exhibitions in that space in the old Ascot Theatre.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Currently, the Performing Arts Centre has an extraordinary maintenance allocation of \$40 000. What is that for? Secondly, production of Government films at the South Australian Film Corporation increased from \$232 000 to \$400 000. Is a specific programme proposed at the Film Corporation for Government films, and in what specific areas?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** In relation to the first question, the special provision of extraordinary maintenance is for the necessary replacement of an iron roof at Carclew. In relation to the production of Government films, that is a conscious policy decision by the Government to increase the allocation. The previous Government had in fact allowed that allocation to run down, and it disbanded the Government film committee. The view was that this would encourage departments to produce films and provide money from within their own lines. That experiment, if one could call it that, seemed to be a considerable failure.

All it resulted in was a down-turn in Government film production. The original concept of having a separate line and a committee to promote and stimulate film projects was to ensure that there was an on-going programme of Government film-making. That is important, of course, in relation to S.A.F.C.'s operations. It provides work for a number of people in the private sector, in the documentary area, and so on, whose skills in turn can be used on features and other work as necessary. The hope that departments would pick up from their own allocations really did not work. Particularly in a time of constraint departments are not going to embark upon new film activities when struggling to hold the line with their existing allocations, and nothing special was granted to them, so we are now moving to restore that level to the level which it was at prior to the change of Government, or which in fact persisted, I think for one year after that, which is around \$700 000. We are doing it in stages and this is the first major stage of that.

As to a specific programme, that is looked at by the Government Film Committee at various stages through the year and it assesses groups, suggests projects to the departments, and generally acts as a co-ordinator in this area.

**Mr HAMILTON:** On page 375 of the Auditor-General's Report, under 'Findings and Comments', this statement appears:

The Corporation's financial management and accounting systems were generally found to be operating satisfactorily. However, there was a number of long outstanding debtors and follow-up was inadequate.

What was the reason for that statement?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not sure. I have not had a report from the corporation on that, but it having been referred to in the Auditor-General's Report, the corporation will be required to make a specific response and indicate what corrective action will be taken. I suggest that it is probably in the nature of the number of film contracts they enter into, but there may well be lags, particularly waiting for box office returns, or whatever, over the period of release of the film. We will be getting a detailed response to the comment from the Auditor-General from the Film Corporation.

Overall, the financial performance of the Corporation has been very good indeed, and last year was a particularly difficult year for film-makers throughout Australia. The Corporation held up very well and, indeed, at the end of the year, the last six months was almost spectacularly successful for it and its programme for this year is looking equally good.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair draws the attention of the Committee to the time. I am going to call the member for Mallee, but I would ask the member for Mallee and the Premier to try to stop by 9.55 p.m. in order to allow the whole of the Committee, if members wish, to ask another question on the Department for the Arts line.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question relates to a belief that we need to retain some of the things in this State that might perhaps fall under the category of the History Trust of South Australia, on page 200. Whereas before we have tended to look at those things that are grand and significant in terms of numbers in preserving artifacts and information about life styles, we have ignored minority ethnic groups, like the Chinese who landed at Robe, and some of the unsuccessful attempts at settlement. We have also ignored the household tools, and so on. Given that we are approaching the sesquicentenary, are we addressing that need to ensure we do not lose the remnants of the material and information before it is too late. Are we making every effort to put it together, to correlate it in a fashion which will ensure that it is there for posterity under the programme, as referred to on page 200?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, there is a strong consciousness of the need to ensure the preservation and collection of this material. There is a limitation on resources, but enormous strides have been made in recent years. As I indicated to the member for Light earlier, the History Trust has done magnificent work in this area in raising the general perception of museums, their purpose in the community, and how they should be presented through various schemes of accreditation, and so on, which will continue. The programme is described on page 200 and also on page 202, where members will see the various initiatives taken to ensure that we have a museum programme which touches all parts of the State. In fact, 61 museums were inspected in 1982-83 and grants totalling \$100 000 were distributed to 36 applicants. There are benefits not just to the recipients of those grants but to the other 30 or so who did not receive a grant, because the Trust would be in a position to provide advice and future directions. In time, a number of those in turn will receive

grants. It is a very exciting programme and, although it does not get much public attention, it covers the whole State.

**Mr OLSEN:** Could the Premier advise me of the members of the current Arts Grants Advisory committee in due course?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Yes, I will supply that information.

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

---

Works and Services—Department for the Arts, \$1 000 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mrs J.E. Appleby

The Hon. D.C. Brown

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr K.C. Hamilton

Mr I.P. Lewis

Mr J.W. Olsen

Mr J.P. Trainer

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.C. Bannon, Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, and Minister for the Arts.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr C. Winzar, Acting Director, Department for the Arts.

Mr R. Wright, Senior Administrative Officer, Department for the Arts.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Premier give us a indication of what extraordinary maintenance is in relation

to this matter? Is it one project, a series of projects, or one payment in an series of payments over a number of years? What information does the Premier have?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** It is directed to one project and is a contingency provision at this stage which relates to work needing to be done on the Festival Centre Plaza. There has been some deterioration due to a water incursion in certain parts of the structure and it has to be repaired. It is the nature of the structure that that work could be extraordinarily complex, hence the allocation. It is a large contingency allocation. Currently, testing and assessment are being done to see what is necessary, so that the work can be done at minimal cost consistent with restoring that section.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Would that fund also incorporate any work which might be necessary to the car park below the plaza and, more specifically, to the basement of Parliament House, which would appear to be part and parcel of the total problem?

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** I am not aware that we have had any report on that aspect. The work here relates purely to the structure of the plaza itself. I do not think it goes into that area. The whole area is being assessed at the moment.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** As it is a water-related programme, could the whole area be considered? The Government could spend \$1 million in one place only to find a deterioration and an on-going problem in another.

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

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 28 September at 11 a.m.