

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 September 1984

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

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

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I declare the first line open for examination, there is possibly one other matter with which we might have to deal. However, I would prefer to go ahead and then refer to that matter later. I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

Legislative Council, \$461 000—Examination declared completed.

House of Assembly, \$957 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

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

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 H.F. Coxon, Parliamentary Librarian.
Mr J. Hodgetts, Acting Administrative Officer, Legislature.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

Mr HAMILTON: I see that the amount voted for the House of Assembly in 1983-84 was \$763 000, while the actual payments were \$914 970. Can the Premier say whether this is due to overtime payments? Otherwise, what is the reason for that amount?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The increased expenditure is attributable to the contingencies line. I refer the honourable member to some of the major variations. The chief increase has occurred in the general administration expenses: most of the others are largely on line. There has been some increase in accommodation allowances for overseas visits by the Leader of the Opposition as well as for expenses of Select Committees. On the administration line, the major element in the increase is for postage, stationery and printing costs. It was felt that some reduction could be made in the

line because of the cost incurred during the 1982 election and that it would have shown up in 1982-83 and therefore would not be present in 1983-84. The increased expenditure, it seems, was the result of general activity within the Parliament as far as postage is concerned and that has been reflected in 1983-84. So we believe we now have a more realistic base on which to estimate it.

Mr HAMILTON: On page 13 of the Estimates of Payments, \$20 000 was voted for the overseas visit of the Leader of the Opposition, Leader's wife (where approved) and officers, and actual payments were \$28 502. The proposed sum for 1984-85 is \$1 500. Why has that small amount been allocated? I am not having a go at the Leader of the Opposition; I want to know why only \$1 500 has been allocated as against the previous amount.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The amount was increased by \$10 000 to \$30 000 following an approach I had and an exchange of correspondence between myself and the Leader of the Opposition. It was felt that \$20 000 was not realistic in terms of the expenditure. The amount of \$1 500 for 1984-85 is a residual amount; in other words, accounts which were not paid as at 30 June will be paid this financial year and approximate that amount. However, the \$30 000 is within the approved Budget figure set at that increased amount during the course of the year.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what will be the cost of purchase of machinery and equipment, and how this will integrate with activities either within Parliament House generally or, for example, with the printing department, so that there is compatibility?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: As it involves some technical details concerning the printing and word processing areas, I invite the Clerk to speak on those matters.

Mr Mitchell: The purchase of word processing equipment is primarily for the House but we also hope it will be for the Public Accounts Committee and the Public Works Committee. In fact, one unit was bought about 10 days ago. It is not a grant from Treasury of \$30 000; it has been reduced from Legislature, Miscellaneous under printing costs, so we have to demonstrate within 12 months that we can recoup those costs. In fact, I am optimistic that we will more than recoup those costs in the first 12 months.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Premier or the Clerk indicate what brand of equipment has been taken on board?

Mr Mitchell: On advice from the Public Service Board it is an IBM personal computer with 'Multimate' and 'Symphony' software packages.

Mr BAKER: Why were the machines and equipment for printing shown against the House of Assembly line? Will it be located in the Library and used for Library purposes as well? Is there some other reason why it has been shown in the House of Assembly line?

Mr Mitchell: It is quite separate. The Library in fact has an IBM personal computer, but it is quite separate from our own. It is under the House of Assembly because it is used for the House and its Committees.

Mr INGERSON: Referring to the Public Accounts Committee and payments to consultants, there is no proposed line this year. Does that mean that the Public Accounts Committee has advised that it is not likely to have consultants, or what is the situation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The provision of consultancy services to the PAC was a one off grant—a special arrangement in relation to a study that the Committee was doing into the Highways fund. We have had no advice that that kind of special consultancy service will be needed. It is not needed in the normal course of PAC inquiries. It was just the technical and complex nature that resulted in a request for assistance to the Committee that the Government was

able to grant. The consultancy came through the Department of Transport.

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

Parliamentary Library, \$313 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

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

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 H.F. Coxon, Parliamentary Librarian.
Mr J. Hodgetts, Acting Administrative Officer, Legislature.

Mr OLSEN: Have recommendations been made by the Public Service Board in relation to reorganisation of duties in the Parliamentary Library, including reclassification of existing officers, and how many positions will be reclassified?

Mr Coxon: A report has been received from an officer of the Public Service Board by the Library Committee that involves some reorganisation of the Library, and dependent upon that reorganisation there is some possibility for changes in classification. The situation is that the Library Committee has accepted that report and I am discussing individual duty statements with members of the staff so the reorganisation has not really been finalised and will not be implemented for a little while.

Mr OLSEN: Does that reclassification reorganisation include an increase in staff numbers? Is there an additional staff member to come on board?

Mr Coxon: There is an additional base grade clerical officer this year and that position also enables some reallocation of duties which are part of the overall reorganisation.

Mr OLSEN: I presume the salary levels will be determined once the duties statement for each individual member of staff is established?

Mr Coxon: I expect them to, yes.

Mr HAMILTON: Has there been an increase in requests by back-benchers for research to be carried out by the Parliamentary Library in the past 12 months? If so, what increase has there been? Can figures be supplied as to the number of requests and the increase over the past 12 months in the number of requests by members of Parliament for subjects to be researched?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I refer the question to the Librarian, who I imagine has some statistics on this.

Mr Coxon: I think members of the Committee probably have a copy of the annual report which I prepared for the Library Committee this year. On page 15 of that report some figures are given in regard to requests received by the research service. Those figures relate to the full 12 months period of 1983, which is the basis on which the researchers previously kept figures. Henceforth they will be kept on a financial year basis. The other column of figures relates to the six-month period from January to June 1984. On comparison of those figures it probably appears as though an

overall decrease in the number of requests received by the research service has occurred. A number of factors may be responsible for that effect, including that the busier time occurs during the later part of the year when the House is in session longer. At this stage it is a bit difficult to say why that figure has fallen.

Mr HAMILTON: Recently members of the House were given the opportunity to view some ICL equipment (on-line equipment). Has the Parliamentary Library considered introducing this equipment into this Parliament and also a link-up with the Parliamentary Library in Canberra?

Mr Coxon: Yes. Last week the Library Committee invited ICL to make a presentation to the committee and to other members of Parliament. The demonstration of the capabilities of word processing as it relates to some Parliamentary publications was very interesting. This system is presently being developed by the Commonwealth Parliament. The implications for this Parliament are, of course, very interesting. While ICL has been developing these things in Canberra, we have had discussions with the Government Computing Centre about a similar kind of system for this Parliament based on South Australian *Hansard*. The Computing Centre has gone some way down the track with experiments. On Thursday morning I hope to go to Conyngham Street to see how far things have progressed, and we hope eventually to make another presentation to the Library Committee and to members of Parliament who may be interested. As the Premier will also attend that session, he might get some idea of the costs involved in that development. In regard to access to the Canberra data base, I think the Commonwealth Parliament is considering that matter at the moment. At this stage it has not allowed access to other users.

Mr HAMILTON: What is the state of the waiting list within the research section of the Parliamentary Library in regard to outstanding issues to be researched for members of this Chamber. What is the waiting period for provision of information to members?

Mr Coxon: That is a very difficult question to answer, because members may be aware that three months is a perfectly reasonable time to wait before receiving a response to some requests that are made, while other members may make a request and expect an answer that same day. At the moment how these obligations are fulfilled is rather dependent on the discretion of the research officers. However, there has been a backlog of research requests which I hope we have made some headway towards overcoming.

Mr HAMILTON: Does the waiting list for some of the requests exceed three months?

Mr Coxon: Some of those could well exceed that length of time.

Mr BAKER: I record my appreciation of the Library's services, but recognise within this Committee the difficulties that the Library system has in catering for members' requests. My colleague on the other side has already raised the question of the time that is involved. One of the mechanisms for speeding up some of those requests may be by fuller use of the IBM PC which is located in the basement of the Library. Does the Librarian intend to organise training courses for his staff in the use of the IBM PC and, further, will courses be made available to members so that they can use the IBM PC as an independent computer at their own leisure?

Mr Coxon: Yes; it has been an interesting 12 months for the Library. We got the computer only 12 or 15 months ago. At that stage, not a great deal of account was taken of the impact that the computer would have on the needs of the Library in terms of training—not only training in formal courses but also on the job training—and the need to familiarise oneself with an entirely new way of manipulating information.

As courses have come up, we have tried to make arrangements for people to attend them. This becomes a bit of a problem with a small staff, the constraints of Parliament and its sessions and the demands for service that are placed on the Library. At the same time, in some areas it is very difficult even to find training courses, particularly in the area of simple word processing courses for clerical staff. We have been looking around for some. In this current Budget the Treasurer has made available \$2 000 for staff development. Obviously, some of these costs would go towards this kind of area for training, particularly in relation to the computer.

The other question was about members being able to use the computer if they wish. Only one member—Mr Baker—has so far raised it. It is interesting to contemplate. I do not think that the Library at present has a policy on it. I do not know how many people would be interested in using it. We are finding that as more and more people use the computer we are getting towards a scheduling problem in terms of use of the machine. It is one of those things that we would perhaps have to consider, depending on demand.

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

Joint House Committee, \$529 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

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

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 J. Hodgetts, Acting Administrative Officer, Legislature.

Mr BAKER: There was an increase in the catering staff last year. What figures are available to show that that reflects an increased demand for those services?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The additional positions created were those of general hand and apprentice chef, so there are two positions there. That was in response to a general demand on the catering function. The Clerk has pointed out that a provision has been made for casual staff for the new staff refreshment room, which was to be opened on 19 May 1984. We have an extra outlet which has required servicing, of course, during the year. I think that service has been generally welcomed and used quite considerably.

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

I call on the vote for the Electoral Department. Apparently we had some trouble here. There is a line that is not supposed to be here. We will not take any notice of it but will go on to the vote for the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

Mr OLSEN: I rise on a point of order. I point out to the Committee that in a moment we will be asked to approve a budget of \$6 513 000 without the right of this Committee to question \$806 000 of that expenditure which was listed in the procedures laid down for the Estimates Committee.

It seems to me that there has to be some rearrangement of the Budget papers if it is expected that the Estimates Committee cannot ask questions on a very significant proportion of an allocation. That is really what this Committee is being asked to do.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of the Chair taking some stand to stop questioning on a particular line. The line will be dealt with under the Attorney-General's vote, so that, if I allowed questions to be put in discussions in this Committee, the line would be dealt with twice. I am simply saying that unfortunately an error has been made.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I agree with the point that the Leader of the Opposition is making. It should have been relocated. It has always appeared under the general heading of the Legislature, but we are not being asked to approve a general Legislature line. The Attorney-General's Committee will deal with the Electoral Department as it did last year. I would suggest that in future it should be relocated so that the situation is quite clear.

The CHAIRMAN: I just want to explain that the Electoral Department is being dealt with by Estimates Committee B and that I called it on in error.

Mr OLSEN: I was not attempting to dispute your ruling, Sir, which I realise is in accordance with the procedures agreed to by the Parliament for the proceedings of the Estimates Committees. That is not in question. I was drawing attention to a recurring anomaly in the lay-out of the Budget papers.

Secondly, I point out that there is only one Minister in the Parliament who can answer questions on that line and that is the Premier. I wanted to ask about the increase by 400 per cent on the allocation for by-elections. I realise that the line is being covered by another Committee, but the only Minister who can answer my question is the Premier. He is the only one who can state when the by-election will be called for the district of Elizabeth and whether the 400 per cent increase is for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow that question to proceed. I think the Premier is quite correct in suggesting that in future we should see that that anomaly does not recur.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works,
\$65 000—Examination declared completed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$3 382 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

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

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 J. Hodgetts, Acting Administrative Officer, Legislature.

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier give details about the \$1 350 paid in compensation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That was paid to the Hon. Mr DeGaris, who suffered from an accident in which he was involved.

Mr HAMILTON: My question relates to miscellaneous travelling expenses of members and former members of the Legislature and their relatives. Can the Premier advise as to what part of the actual expenditure of \$464 246 involved expenditure by former members of the Legislature and their relatives?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, we do not have a breakdown of that, but it would be minor. Of course, the reason that it is difficult to budget in this area is that under the travel arrangements we have a system that effectively operates over a three-year period. That means that expenditure is dependent very much on the time at which members are using their travel allowance. The 1984-85 estimate is purely that, and the actual payments in 1983-84 relate to the fact that a much larger number of members took advantage of the travel arrangements in that period. What that means, of course, is that in the subsequent period fewer members than we anticipate will take advantage of those arrangements, so we always get these ups and downs. The overall total will be in conformity with the general allocation that has been budgeted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: For 'Publications issued to members of the South Australian Parliament' there was a decrease last year and a fairly massive increase from \$199 490 actual payments in 1983-84 to \$304 000 in 1984-85. What additional information or publications is it intended will be distributed, and will the *Government Gazette* now be circulated to electorate offices? Demands are constantly made on members by the public for information contained in the *Gazette*, which might almost be called a hidden document in the sense of public access.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The *Government Gazette* is not a hidden document. In fact, it is very widely distributed and is readily accessible to members of Parliament. It is not intended that it be distributed to members on a free of charge basis. I am not sure what the subscription rate for the *Government Gazette* is. I will not guess that, but one can subscribe to it on the payment of a fee, just as one subscribes to *Hansard* and some other publications. The reduction in the amount allocated last year was mainly due to a lower than anticipated demand for materials such as *Hansard*. The cost of printing and making *Hansard* available on a subscription basis is in fact very high, as members would be aware. It has been very heavily subsidised in the past.

The policy that the previous Government was adopting was taken some time ago, and we have continued to try to gear the subscriptions more appropriately to actual costs, so there are periodic changes in the subscription rate. However, overall I think that it is probably true to say that with the growth of public libraries and much more accessibility in this area the demand for publications such as *Hansard* is not as high on a subscription basis as it was, and in a sense that is probably a good thing.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: With due respect, I do not think that we have yet had an answer explaining an increase of more than \$100 000 in 1984-85.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There has been a 50 per cent increase in the subscription rate for *Hansard* as part of this cost recovery basis. That is the main reason for the budgeted increase, but again it is also based on an optimistic estimate of the demand that there will be.

Mr BAKER: Has the Premier given any thought to changing the travelling arrangements for members of Parliament, particularly in respect of spouses?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, not as far as the Government is concerned. As the honourable member would know, it is

really a question of negotiations on a joint basis between the Government and the Opposition. The travel arrangements of members of Parliament is a matter of mutual agreement. If there are any propositions as to changes or amendments they are dealt with between the respective Party rooms, and I am not aware of any moves in that direction.

Mr BAKER: If that were true, I would not have asked the question. In fact, from memory, the last set of arrangements laid down were not subject to the scrutiny of both Parties before they came into force.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is not correct. If the honourable member was not advised of those changes, I am not quite sure why, because they were definitely the subject of discussion.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Although there is to be an increase in recovery for the cost of *Hansard* distributed through members, the increases the Premier referred to relative to the cost of production would suggest that his reply was more correctly related to the line above, which was not in question.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is a notional payment, because members of Parliament themselves do not have to find a payment. That is why there is a budgetary allocation. However, under the principle of programme budgeting, it is felt that these costs ought to be precisely identified, so I was really addressing myself to that increase. If there is an increase in the subscription rate, even though members themselves are not paying it, they have a right to nominate certain persons who can receive copies of *Hansard*, and the cost of that is debited against this line in the Budget; hence the reason for the increase. Also, there must be some guess as to the extent to which that will be available. Not all members avail themselves of their quota regarding free issue. It is free issue as far as members personally are concerned: it is not free issue, of course, as far as the Parliament is concerned.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: We could argue this issue backwards and forwards. However, I ask whether the Premier will at the appropriate time indicate the number of issues of *Hansard* that are made available to members of Parliament and relate that number to the total production.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will attempt to obtain that information for the honourable member.

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

State Governor's Establishment, \$450 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mrs J.E. Appleby

Mr S.J. Baker

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr K.C. Hamilton

Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Dr M.B. Hemmerling, Acting Director, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

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

Mr HAMILTON: Under 'Contingencies', page 17—'Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries'—actual payments were \$38 291 but the proposed expenditure for 1984-85 is \$82 250. Will the Premier explain the reason for this proposed large increase?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The increase is due to the premium based on claims experience. There were two claims settled recently, one a very major one which related back to the mid 1970s, when a member of the then Governor Sir Mark Oliphant's staff suffered a very nasty accident at Coober Pedy. The settlement for that accident was about \$300 000 and was only recently completed. There was another minor settlement for workers compensation during that year. That has resulted in an adjustment of the premium level to cover possible claims.

Mr HAMILTON: Page 32 of the yellow book states: Need being addressed: The Governor and his staff require support in the management of Government House, 'Anookanilla', Victor Harbor and on matters raised by the public. Can the Premier explain what that expenditure is and what purpose that place serves at Victor Harbor?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: 'Anookanilla' was acquired some years ago as a Governor's summer residence, one could term it, following the destruction of Marble Hill in the 1954-55 bushfires. That place at Victor Harbor was acquired by the State for the Governor's residence. The current Governor has suggested to the Government that he is not finding a great deal of use from those premises, and so an investigation was made into whether it might not be appropriate to dispose of the property and to provide some other facility, perhaps a grant or something of that nature, in lieu.

However, consideration of that matter has not advanced much further at this stage. There are regular ongoing maintenance costs for the property. The property is a capital asset of the State, and therefore in maintaining it we are simply preserving that asset, and quite a valuable asset it is.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Concerning the expense allowance of the Lieutenant-Governor, I recall on an earlier occasion when Sir Walter Crocker was Lieutenant-Governor asking the Premier of the day to consider raising the figure from \$1 000 as it then was. An alteration had taken so long that the Government had to raise it to \$2 000. I notice that the figure is no different for 1984-85 than it was for 1983-84. Whilst that figure might be satisfactory, I think that some consideration ought to be given to making an advancement on a regular basis rather than in large jumps, the same as there is an increase in the expenses associated with all other Government activities.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think that is an appropriate suggestion. As far as I am aware, the current Lieutenant-Governor has not made any specific request or submission on this matter. However, I accept the member for Light's suggestion that it ought to be kept under regular review and adjusted accordingly. I would not propose any change this year but would certainly undertake to look at that matter in the preparation of next year's Budget.

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

The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Dr M.B. Hemmerling, Acting Director, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

Mr OLSEN: Referring to the Estimates of Payments at page 20, line 12 (yellow book reference page 15), can the Premier advise how many publications the Wakefield Press plans to produce for the State's Jubilee 150 celebrations, the subjects of those publications, their authors and the cost of each publication?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, I cannot advise the Committee on particular publications. A programme of publications is being undertaken, but the concept of the press is to try to cover its costs or, indeed, in respect of some publications, make a profit which can be ploughed back into subsidising others. The largest project in which they are engaged at the moment is the atlas of South Australia, which will be a major publication in 1986. A whole series of programme publications is under consideration at the moment.

Mr OLSEN: Is it possible to supply the information in due course?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, certainly.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the same area, will the Premier say when a final decision will be made on whether or not Adelaide will stage the Grand Prix motor racing event next year and in 1986 and beyond, depending on agreements reached? What arrangements will be made in the event of the race being held here to minimise the dislocation of city and other traffic? An announcement by Mr Dinham today indicated that Victoria Park Racecourse would be used to that end. The yellow book states that during the past financial year the Jubilee Board carried out preliminary investigations on the staging of that motor race as a major part of the celebrations. I understand that a final decision will be made soon. Is it accurate that the Government is now taking over the organisation and co-ordination of it on the basis that it is not only for 1986 but that it spans three or four years and the Jubilee 150 Board has relinquished responsibility for it.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Jubilee 150 Board has not relinquished responsibility for it and is definitely involved. The nature of the event and the organisation required has resulted in Jubilee 150 requesting that a special committee be set up to handle it. It has involved close work and some resources from the Premier's Department. In fact, Dr Hemmerling has been involved in a key role. Negotiations are proceeding. A meeting of the international organisation will be held in October, by which time we may definitely know whether we are getting a Grand Prix and, if so, when it will start. It has always been the Government's view that the series should commence in 1986. The possibility of it commencing in 1985 arose only as a result of the suggestion by the international organisation and a provisional listing on its calendar commencing in that year. We have explained that it does cause us some problems in logistics, but, if in order to secure the Grand Prix series it is necessary for us to start in 1985, we will do so. We can get organised in that time, but our preference will still be for a series commencing in 1986. In a sense we are in their hands and we have had

Premier and Cabinet, \$7 528 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mrs J.E. Appleby

Mr S.J. Baker

to make clear that we are ready, willing and able to stage the Grand Prix in whatever period, beginning late 1985, that it is decided it will be available to us.

As to the course, no final decision has yet been made. The Victoria Park Racecourse suggestion has emerged recently and, at the moment, I stress that our application is still based on the course already publicised. It was inspected quite recently by Mr Lance Schaeffer and that course is in many respects quite appropriate. The advantage that the Victoria Park Racecourse proposition offers is in terms of grandstand availability and the vastly increased controlled public viewing access that could come about as a result of using a section of the inside part of the course. That will be very much a matter for the SAJC (which holds the lease on Victoria Park Racecourse) and the Adelaide City Council to reach some satisfactory agreement as to the way in which the course could be encompassed in that area. It would involve the track going into and out of the Victoria Park Racecourse, around in front of the grandstand area inside the existing course.

It would only interfere with the existing course in two sections and there are ways and means of ensuring that the track could be restored within a matter of weeks following that. It would have to be done each year, but the advantages are great. However, it is in the hands of the City Council and the SAJC. We need the approval of both FISA (the international organisation which stages the Grand Prix) and also FOCA (the representative of the drivers, which is the promoter of the Grand Prix) on that course. Whilst the course we presented is acceptable, it has not received formal approval at this stage. That is where we are at the moment.

Mr OLSEN: As few details have been released about the project itself, I presume the Victoria Park option is being considered to minimise traffic dislocation in the city. Is it fair to say that, if we are to use major city streets, they will have to be closed off for a number of days to allow practice prior to the event itself? If so, what measures have been taken by the Government to minimise dislocation and access for MFS and hospitals within the city region about which we are talking?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That has been looked at in some detail. The period for which closures will be necessary is quite limited. The period of the race itself and practice times will be stipulated times—in other words, they will not take up an entire day. There will also be provision for pedestrian access by means of walkways and other means of ensuring that businesses do not simply have to close on those occasions. Some careful attention is being paid to the question of access. So far no major problems have emerged in that area.

Mr OLSEN: Finally, what has been the response of the South Australian Jockey Club to the proposed use of the Victoria Park Racecourse?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The SAJC has had initial consideration of it just this week and we understand is quite in favour and supportive of it. It would certainly solve a lot of problems apart from crowd access, the city street dislocation, and so on, which would be minimised if we used it. The City Council in general has not formally considered the position.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Premier say whether the State Government will be responsible for any expenditure in relation to the Royal Commission on Maralinga, or is it completely a Commonwealth responsibility? If the State Government is involved in expenditure, under which programme is that shown?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The question really relates to programme 11, under the provision of advisory services to Government agencies. No specific allocation is noted, but, in fact, we are under obligation to identify material and

organise a State Government submission and response to the inquiry. We have one officer in the Inter-Governmental Relations Branch who is looking specifically at developing briefing papers on Maralinga. We also have a seconded officer who has been made specifically responsible for preparation and research of the State Government's case. That case will be presented by the Solicitor-General. An initial hearing of the Commission has been held in Adelaide. More detailed information and submissions will be made at a later date. We are awaiting the advice of the Commission on that. We are simply providing from within our own State resources two officers who have the responsibility to gather and collate material and help with the preparation of the case.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is it possible for members of the Committee to deal with matters programme by programme, rather than moving from one to another? I think that in that way those following the debate will be able to obtain a more rational overview of it. That will not deny members of the Committee the opportunity to ask questions and will make it easier for the Premier and the officers answering those questions.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot dictate how members of the Committee wish to proceed, although it would be sensible to proceed in an orderly manner. It may be beneficial for a member to indicate the specific line to which that member is referring prior to asking a question.

Mr HAMILTON: I am quite happy to accede to that request.

Mr BAKER: In regard to programme 1 and the Ayers House heritage conservation item, will that remain the responsibility of the Premier's Department, or should that lie within the jurisdiction of the Department of Environment and Planning?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I guess it is with the Premier's Department partly historically and also because, while it is a heritage item it is also an operating commercial restaurant on lease. The contracts are held with the Premier's Department, and as such it is convenient to have it administered by that Department. In fact, I think Mr Kageler is a member of the Ayers House Committee which overlooks Ayers House and which has responsibility for checking the accounting and preparation of its budget. While it remains under lease as a restaurant it is most appropriately dealt with in the Premier's Department.

Mr BAKER: I refer to programme 2 and the 150th anniversary.

Mr HAMILTON: Is it intended that we will complete programme 1 and then move on to programme 2, and so on? It appears that we are now dealing with programme 2 although I have further questions in regard to programme 1.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not intend to proceed line by line, but simply to open up a vote for discussion. Before asking a question members should indicate to which programme they are referring.

Mr BAKER: In regard to programme 2, the 150th anniversary, I refer to the grant to projects worth \$2.6 million. How much of that amount has been allocated to major projects, how much is going to local committees, and how much will be spent on sundry items?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In rough figures, an amount in excess of \$600 000 will be allocated to about 250 minor projects. The rest of the money, apart from \$300 000 which will be directed to general publicity and promotion of the Jubilee 150, and \$80 000 for marketing, will be divided among a series of major projects which have been recommended by the various subcommittees of Jubilee 150.

Mr BAKER: Last year \$1 million was allocated but that amount was under-spent by almost \$270 000. I also note

from the yellow book that the Commonwealth Government was very kind in providing the State with \$875 000. Has some slowing down in development of major projects occurred, and what has happened to the Commonwealth money that was set aside?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Any money paid in that is not immediately required is invested in a trust fund which obviously is then drawn on as required by the Jubilee 150 Board. It is really only a cash flow question. Obviously, the expenditure will increase as we get closer to 1986. In the Budget each year one attempts to estimate, based on the sort of cash flow that the committee expects to occur during the year. In the earlier stages probably there was less, and we have tended to over-provide because we did not want the Board to be caught short at any stage during the course of a year. I think that we will find that at the end of the day the amounts allocated will be fully expended. The Commonwealth grants were determined some time ago and the specific projects to which they were related were decided at that time, and those projects are now under way. There are two or three major projects, including the Fort Glanville restoration, the Burra historic town, and the purchase of the *Failie*, which took place earlier.

Mr BAKER: I realise that this information would not be immediately available, but can a list be provided of the major projects and their estimated costs which will be drawn from \$2.6 million and the further allocation in 1985-86, and also of the minor projects approved to date?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Certainly I can provide a list of the major projects. There are some 250 minor projects—does the honourable member really want a full list?

Mr BAKER: Many local communities want to know where they stand.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They know where they stand, because they are involved in the projects.

Mr BAKER: But the problem is that there are many projects that the people in the community want to undertake but they still do not know whether space will be provided for those projects to be undertaken. Also, they do not want to duplicate effort in similar projects in different areas. Therefore, the list would be useful.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: All right, although I am a bit concerned about tying up the Jubilee 150 Board's resources to provide lists which may not be used other than to satisfy idle curiosity.

Mr BAKER: There is a reason for asking the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member for Mitcham is to some degree working on the good nature of the Chair.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to page 20, programme 2, relating to the 150th anniversary. Has any consideration been given to the completion of the original concept plan of Parliament House? I have had many requests from students (visitors to this Parliament) who wonder why the original concept plan has not been completed. It has been put to me that it would be an ideal project for the sesquicentenary celebrations or, if that was not possible, for the bicentenary celebrations. As members would know, from showing people around the Parliament, we show people the original concept plan for this Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I have heard that suggestion raised; but I am not aware that any firm cost estimates have been put against it. It would be a pretty expensive undertaking, certainly, to reproduce the plan that was devised in the last century. Parliament House has been without a top for a good long time, so I guess we could probably put up with that being so for a good time into the future. Oddly enough, I know about this, because I have shown groups of school-children that concept design and have asked how many of them have noticed the great tower over the top of

Parliament House. Usually half the group put up their hands; they think that they have seen it. However, the suggestion of doing something like that in conjunction with the sesquicentenary or bicentenary celebrations is I guess a reasonable one. As far as I know, it has not been put forward as a seriously costed proposal. I think it would be a bit hard to justify: there are so many other projects which can provide a very tangible benefit to communities and which would have priority over it that, in the absence of a real strategy plan and proper costing, I do not think we could contemplate embarking on it.

Mr HAMILTON: In relation to the State's 150th celebrations, can the Premier say what consideration has been given to the utilisation of facilities available in the north-western suburbs for the bicentenary celebrations and, in particular, the use of Football Park, which is an ideal location? I am aware that a military tattoo in the past has been held at Adelaide Oval, but I do not see any reason why Football Park could not be utilised. Also, along the north-western foreshores of Adelaide there are a number of jetties. I understand that a number of sailing vessels will visit South Australia, and it would be an ideal opportunity, if it was possible and if their draught was big enough, for some of those vessels to be able to come up to those jetties for people to have a good look at them. We could perhaps even have a mock invasion somewhere along the foreshore using some of the facilities that are already available amongst the military people within this State. Finally, I ask a question about the *Failie* restoration, which is a very serious one, given recent developments.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that the Premier takes into consideration that we are dealing with the 150th State anniversary and not with what will happen at Football Park on Sunday.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I can see why the honourable member would have an interest in the question that he has asked. In general, all venues in the State will be used quite considerably during the Jubilee 150 year. Many events of a sporting and other nature will lend themselves to Football Park as an appropriate venue, but I cannot say what detailed consideration has been given to that.

However, some sporting events are certainly scheduled for there, but whether or not there are other displays I do not know. The opening ceremony, on present planning, will be conducted on Victoria Park racecourse. Arrangements are going ahead on that basis at this stage. Of course, other areas such as Adelaide Oval, Elder Park, and so on, will probably be mobilised.

On the maritime activities aspect, considerable stress is certainly being laid on them, and I think that there will be a number of occasions where appropriate activities will take place around the coastal jetties—not just within the Gulf of St Vincent but also in other parts of the State. It is proposed that various sailing ships and other activities of that nature will be in the waters. There will be yachting contests and a whole series of events, so tremendous use will be made of the jetties and recreation areas.

Of course, there is the America's Cup promotional activity, which South Australia will be sharing through the South Australian challenger. I understand that work on the *Failie* is progressing well. There is some confusion in the public mind: on the one hand, there is the *Failie*, an old vessel which has been purchased and refurbished by decision of the Jubilee 150 Board in 1982. That vessel will take part in various ceremonies and sailings in the course of the Jubilee year. I understand that the project is on course and that there are adequate funds for it. The other project is called the Jubilee Sailing Ship—the *One and All*. I understand that it was looked at by the Board, initially, and it decided to

give preference to the *Failie* and, therefore, not provide any specific Jubilee funds to the *One and All*.

So, the *One and All* has been operating as a sponsored project by the group, which is handling it without direct assistance. The State Government has provided some assistance. For instance, we assisted them with bridging finance when they were waiting for some sponsorship money to come a couple of months ago. However, if we were to provide direct grants to the *One and All* project, it would in a sense be seen as being at the expense of the *Failie*. The Jubilee 150 Board made a very specific decision as between the two projects at that time. I do not think that we can interfere with that decision at this stage.

The *One and All* project has certainly had some financial problems, which have been compounded, I guess, by the recent theft of equipment. However, I hope that there will be a good public response. Certainly, where we were able to assist them in kind, or with some expertise, we have done so. That project, which involves not the renovation of an existing vessel but a reconstruction based on the plans of an old vessel to build from scratch, is, I believe, progressing quite well, despite some fund raising problems.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether up front funds are available for the proponents of the major projects? As President of the Roseworthy Agriculture College Council, which has a facility that will be used by the sixth World Three Day Event, I have quickly to admit to a vested interest and a conflict of interest. Being a member of the sixth World Three Day Event Committee, I am aware that the Committee is seeking to obtain the facilities of Roseworthy Agriculture College for the housing of grooms, possibly riders, certainly strappers and other people who are associated with the horses, which are the centre of the whole programme.

I use Roseworthy Agricultural College as an example, because undoubtedly there are other projects of a similar nature. The college is required to maintain an income for its halls of residence, either by conferences or for other purposes, and it is being asked to make available during May 1986 its halls of residence without the Three Day Event Committee having any funds with which to consummate the arrangement that has been entered into.

It does become quite important, and I believe that, with the long lead time that is associated with so many of these projects, funds are required now, and perhaps were required yesterday. I use a specific case as an example of the need for these funds to be made available now, particularly for the major projects which are an integral and important part of the Jubilee 150 celebrations.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I take the member's point. The world three day equestrian event, to which specific mention was made, is listed as being a major project that will receive assistance from the Jubilee 150 Board. I think \$50 000 is made available in this year's Budget for that event. I must point out, however, that the Government is not the sole sponsor of these projects. We see it very much as a joint effort, and it is not a case of the Government simply putting a heap of money down and telling people that there is the money to help them carry on with their event. We do require evidence that major fund raising is going on. In cases like the three day equestrian event, income will be raised through promotional activities, entrance fees and things of that nature, from which much of the finance will be provided; there will also be a sponsor contribution, and in a sense the State is another sponsor of an event such as that.

Also, some assurance is required that the event will go ahead or the actual project will take place before any money is passed over. In this case it is quite clear that the event will occur, because arrangements are already in place. How-

ever, the Board could be confronted with a request for money up front as starter money, with no real guarantee that there will be a further contribution, and we could run the risk of money being expended and the project falling in a heap in 1986. Therefore, before money actually changes hands, the Board has fairly strict requirements in relation to expenditure and evidence of need.

In general terms, once a project is approved and is a goer, the State grant money will be provided as required virtually from day one of the preparation, and stress is placed on the 'as required' aspect of it. That means there must be negotiations between the Board and the project organisers on the cash flow.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate the fact that the Premier recognises some of the difficulties that some of these organisations might have. The generation of funds through external sources might be further down the track than the immediate preparation. For example, world-wide television coverage will be a generator of funds, as will the sponsorships that are associated with a number of organisations, including companies associated with transport. However, they are not necessarily there when they are needed. The magnitude of some of these activities is such that the up front or lead time is greater than it is in other cases, and the expenses in the lead time are greater than they would be for others. The point has been made, and I appreciate that it has been taken up by the Board.

Membership:

Ms Lenehan substituted for Mrs Appleby.

Mr FERGUSON: Who will audit the Government grants to the Jubilee 150 projects?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Auditor-General will audit them, and they are subject to preliminary audit through the Department. I think Mr Kageler works with the accountants on the Jubilee 150 projects, but the final audit will be conducted by the Auditor-General.

Mr FERGUSON: Will the audit be done on an annual basis or will it be a once only audit?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It will be done on an annual basis. Outside organisations receiving Government grants will have to provide audited statements to the Government.

Mr FERGUSON: My next question relates to programme 3, 'The Ombudsman'.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be better if we could finish questions on programmes 1 and 2 before we go on to programme 3. I have been advised that I cannot stop any member from going back, but I would like to see that we are making some progress. Are there any more questions on programme 2?

Mr HAMILTON: On page 15 of the yellow book it is stated that there was another delegation from Texas to develop and prepare a significant exchange programme for the 1986 celebrations. Can the Premier say what progress has been made in that regard and what type of exchange programme is expected?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The short answer is that considerable progress has been made. There will be quite a substantial interchange of events and activities in 1986. Apart from general tourist promotion in the respective States, the twin town concept has been developed. Much of the activity last year in Texas, and vice versa in South Australia, was aimed at developing this twinning arrangement between a whole range of towns and cities with counterparts in Texas. That will obviously give some edge to the programme. In addition, there will be cultural exchanges, such as performing arts companies and things of that nature, and one or two other events that can be cross exchanged between South Australia and Texas. Details of that are still being worked

out. It will require following up this year by both sides, but I think that there have been fairly well established links between the Sesquicentenary Committee in Texas and the Jubilee 150 Board in South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions on programme 2, I call on members for questions on programme 3.

Mr FERGUSON: My question relates to the expenditure for the Ombudsman's Department. In view of the criticisms that have been made about this Department, does this allocation represent an increase in the Budget and, if it does, will it be sufficient to overcome the criticisms that have been levelled at the Department?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, there is a larger provision for the Ombudsman. One of the matters that was raised (I think there was a public report on it) related to the welfare Ombudsman function. The Minister of Community Welfare has discussed with the Ombudsman the possibility of the Ombudsman's office acting as the processor and receiver of complaints in this area, and agreement was reached on it. The suggestion was made that no funds or resources were being provided to enable that function to be carried out. That was certainly news to me, because we had agreed that some resources should be made available. This year's Budget contains a separate item.

The figure of \$8 000 for 'Payments to consultants' relates directly to that. That is for extra costs or particular services that are needed in relation to the 'Welfare' Ombudsman matter. The other matter on which there has been some comment is in relation to the appointment of a Deputy Ombudsman. The Government has agreed to that in principle. It is dependent on the work load in the Ombudsman's office—we are very much in the hands of the Ombudsman on this—and he reported to me periodically. We have made the decision and, in fact, budgeted to provide the position in 1983-84. The Ombudsman reported that at that stage the filling of the position could not be justified and he would advise at what stage he felt the work load and demand had reached the height necessary to make that appointment.

There was certainly on earlier figures a definite need for it, but there had been a considerable slackening of complaints which I guess is good in one sense if it suggests that there is less concern or cause for complaint among members of the public about administrative actions. So, I am in effect awaiting the advice of the Ombudsman, and we have again provided in this year's Budget for the contingency of a Deputy Ombudsman from January 1985.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier identify the Government agency or QUANGO referred to by the Ombudsman in a paper he delivered to an international conference in Stockholm earlier this year and say what the Government is doing about that matter? In a paper to the Third International Ombudsmans Conference, Mr Bakewell referred to a complaint he had received from a Government authority that he said he was barely aware existed. He said that to his mind it was the proverbial QUANGO, and following his investigation he had recommended that the relevant legislation should be reviewed to determine whether the body should be retained and to examine other anomalies in the legislation.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In his paper the Ombudsman did not identify the particular agency, and a request to his Deputy failed to elucidate which agency that was. I do not know at this stage which agency it is.

Mr OLSEN: He asked you to review the legislation.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not know whether such a request refers to a particular agency that he had in mind. I have not subsequently had a discussion with the Ombudsman on that point.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Do you not talk together?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We talk quite regularly, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for reminding me that that is something I must follow up. I think that as far as the Ombudsman was concerned that was an illustrative example for the purposes of the paper he was delivering at the international seminar and, incidentally, I point out that the Government fully supported the Ombudsman's attendance at that seminar and provided the finance to enable him to go. I think that it was a tribute to the Ombudsman and his contribution to that role that he was invited to deliver one of the keynote addresses to that international convention.

Mr OLSEN: On 29 June the Ombudsman said in a speech that the relevant Minister had agreed to a review of the legislation relating to the QUANGO in question.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is probably why I do not know, because I do not think that I was the relevant Minister, but I will check that out. I must admit that the Ombudsman has not raised the matter since his return, and I have not specifically asked him, but I know that at the time it received publicity we requested and did not get the information. If I am the relevant Minister, I cannot recall being asked to review this legislation.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier advise us in due course what the QUANGO is, which of his Ministers has agreed to a review of the legislation and what action the Government intends to take regarding it? Does the Premier agree with the Ombudsman that there ought to be a thorough review of Government authorities or QUANGOS? What is the Government doing about it? The Ombudsman has identified a need. Does the Premier agree with it and, if so, what action is the Government taking?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think that continuing assessment should always be made of the need for particular organisations, statutory authorities and non-government bodies that we fund, and that process is going on. We are tackling it with the same degree of vigour and energy as our predecessors did.

Mr OLSEN: It is really open to debate as to whether a thorough review is going on and whether these instrumentalities are meeting their objectives. Let me give one example to the Committee: whilst I support the Ombudsman's general statements, the former Government was doing something about that vital matter through a deregulation unit in the Premier's Department which this Government has scrapped.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We have discussed the deregulation unit on many occasions. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is being provocative. A number of areas and a number of projects that had to be followed up were identified. That work is going on. However, as has been covered in earlier debates, the unit itself was in fact reaching the stage where its presence was a cop out for departments taking some action in that area. Quite simply it was easier, confronted with particular needs for review or problems with regulations, to say, 'That is the job of the deregulation unit. We will not do anything until we hear from them.' That just plainly cannot work.

What this Government is trying to do is put that responsibility right back where it belongs: on the departments and agencies themselves to justify the regulatory or other powers they have. I have specifically invited (and recently I have repeated that request formally) bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry to provide to the Government details of specific regulations or authorities that it believes are unnecessary or in need of review, and I will certainly take that into account. Unfortunately, many general statements are made about red tape, deregulation and so on. We do not get enough specifics and my view is that one cannot get those specifics unless one actually pins down examples and then action can be taken.

Mr OLSEN: Still in regard to programme 3, related to line 5 on page 21, the Ombudsman Act has been amended to enable preliminary inquiries to be made without formal notice. Can the Premier say how many preliminary inquiries the Ombudsman has made without formal notice, which departments have been involved and what is the nature of the investigations?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, I cannot. That sort of detail would not be reported to me, nor do I think that it is a matter that I should constantly take up with the Ombudsman. I am sure that the Ombudsman will deal with that in his report. His reports are always interesting and lively documents. I imagine that this year's report will be no less so, and I guess that the statistics or details of that should be contained in the Ombudsman's report.

Mr OLSEN: Has the Ombudsman identified to the Premier any difficulties he has encountered with departmental heads or departments (not necessarily departmental heads) and the implementation of those new procedures? I suppose that we could add Ministers to that list.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, unlike members of the previous Government, all my Ministers get on fairly well with the Ombudsman and are prepared to co-operate. I put this point: it is in the interests of government to do so. I welcome the Ombudsman's probing, inquiring and investigating, because I think that it keeps the Public Service on its toes, and that is one of the purposes of the Ombudsman. Therefore, rather than trying to fob off or to keep those things at a distance, on the contrary, we welcome them and take up the comments, criticisms and suggestions.

Ms LENEHAN: My question relates to programme 4—'Equal Opportunity for Women'—line 3, involving the total salaries budget allocation. Page 19 of the yellow book refers to the equal opportunities for women programmes and projections, and under '1984-85 specific targets/objectives' it includes further work in the area of women's employment. My question relates specifically to the implementation of equal opportunity management plans for women in the Public Service. Will the Premier comment on the progress to date of the implementation of these equal opportunity management plans and say whether there is a significant backlog in the implementation of these plans and how closely the work in this area is being monitored at present?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That matter is perhaps more appropriately dealt with under the Public Service Board line, and when the appropriate officers are present I will be able to provide much greater detail for the honourable member, if I can take that question on notice for the appropriate time, when we can deal with that matter in some detail.

The work under this particular programme within the Premier's office relates mainly to the Women's Adviser, the Women's Information Switchboard and other staff. Naturally, they are involved in the input to these management plans but the responsibility for them lies with the Board, and we can deal with it under those lines.

Ms LENEHAN: Would 'initiatives to ensure the involvement of women in self-employment initiatives including co-operatives' (on page 19) also be covered more appropriately in another section?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, in direct terms it is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour (the Deputy Premier), who has a unit that has been looking specifically at that matter in the context of general self-employment co-operative grants. There is a line under his estimates providing funds for that particular area. Again, the input of the Premier's Department is specifically in terms of overall policy. The Deputy Premier, in assessing the programme and promoting it, obviously calls on the expertise of various officers, including the Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department.

However, the work is actually carried out in the Department of Labour, and a special budgetary allocation is made for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Chair ought to point out to the Committee that the yellow book is printed for guidance: we are not dealing with the yellow book. I point out to the honourable member that programme 4 simply deals with specific grants to women's organisations, etc., and does not deal with anything concerning the honourable member's question. I hope that we do not pursue that particular line.

Ms LENEHAN: I am sorry but my only other experience was last year and we did refer backwards and forwards in terms of explanations. Referring to the Women's Adviser's role and the allocation, I am delighted to see quite a significant increase from last year in that area. One area for which the Women's Adviser is responsible involves the review of the rape laws in South Australia. I note that a commitment has been given in the area of sexual assault and domestic violence, and that the recommendations of the Naffin Report on the review of rape laws in South Australia will be followed through to the legislative stage.

Could the Premier comment on how far down the track that procedure is at present, and can he give a commitment within that budgetary line to the extra provision of counselling facilities for violent men and also extra counselling facilities for the support of rape victims?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The legislative changes in this area are being looked at. The committee is strongly represented by the Women's Adviser. It is reporting in turn to the Attorney-General, who will probably have carriage of any legislative change that will be made. Quite a considerable degree of progress has been made. There has been very positive and constructive reaction to that report from the community, and that is being taken into account in the reassessment of the law.

The matter concerning violent men has also been the subject of some inter-departmental consideration. The chief carriage of that is within the Department of Community Welfare, because it is very often brought face to face with these particular problems. We are attempting to upgrade the information that is available. For instance, only a couple of weeks ago, I released a series of pamphlets on domestic violence, effectively advising people that help was at hand and what contact should be made, published in a whole series of ethnic languages—I think about 10 different languages.

These pamphlets will be distributed in strategic areas, for example, in doctors waiting rooms, various community and ethnic community groups and other areas that will have access to them. The whole purpose is to get the message across that domestic violence is not something that one simply tolerates socially but that if there are real problems in this area there is a whole range of agencies ready to assist.

The chief problem of people in these situations has been identified as, first, a sense of shame or failure because of the violence that is occurring that results in the individual not telling anyone, not even their close friends sometimes, what is occurring; secondly, a general belief that there is really nowhere one can turn. The object of these pamphlets is to point out that, yes, it is a widespread problem, there can be help through proper counselling, and these are the various agencies and groups one can go to, either in a family situation jointly or where the individual can make the cry for help. So, funds have certainly been set aside to assist with the promotion of information in this area. That will certainly meet some of the points raised by the honourable member.

Mr OLSEN: When does the Premier anticipate that legislative amendments to the rape laws will come before the Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not think any particular time table has been set. The matter is still being assessed prior to a report going to the Attorney-General. I am not sure of the time period to put on it, but at least before the end of the year the Attorney should be in receipt of a comprehensive report on the proposals. Just how soon it is picked up I cannot say at this stage.

Mr OLSEN: The yellow book states that during last year further projects were developed on women's employment and unemployment, including negotiation with sponsors under the wage pause and now the CEP programme. Can the Premier state the ratio of men and women employed in these programmes and say how many women given employment through these programmes have subsequently obtained permanent employment?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I understand that there has been some consideration improvement over the figures, but they are still far from satisfactory. Under the Community Employment Programme, the guidelines aim to achieve 50 per cent male and female participation. There are some problems, first, in terms of registered female unemployed. There is something like a third, rather than 50 per cent, registered, so immediately one has reduced the pool on which one can call. That reflects not the level of female unemployment, but simply the administrative mechanism which has been necessary to identify the people who can qualify under the scheme, namely, registration. Work has been done to try to get the Commonwealth to put some greater flexibility into the guidelines for that purpose.

The second problem, of course, is projects which are suitable to female employment. Far too often sponsors are coming forward with capital works programmes and other things which heavily concentrate in areas of traditionally male employment. That is a problem. One could almost say that there is an almost irreconcilable set of requirements. On the one hand, the guidelines require that the project shall be of lasting value and long term community use, and that often relates to structures and capital works. On the other hand, they are demanding 50 per cent female participation, and often one has to make a judgment to which to give weight.

Some States, notably New South Wales, have been much more successful than South Australia with the proportion of women on the scheme. That relates partly to the fact that there is, as I understand it, a higher proportion of women registered, but also—and more importantly—to the sort of schemes that are approved. Quite frankly, the suggestion has been that some of those schemes simply could not be regarded as being of great substance or lasting value to either the community or the participants; for instance, transferring details from one file to another type of manual recording system, and that sort of thing. We can employ people to do that and employ women on it, but whether at the end of it they have gained in skill or experience is another matter.

Our committee at the State level has been very concerned about having a training and skill input. We have tried to tackle it from another direction, namely, to promote women offering themselves for employment in non-traditional areas and encouraging sponsors to identify opportunities where women can be employed. In fact, two staff members of the Women's Advisory Unit are concentrating on this aspect to try to promote amongst sponsors and women themselves the sort of thing for which they are suitable. The figure at the moment I think has gone up towards 30 per cent. I cannot recall the latest figure, and again it is in the hands of my colleague the Deputy Premier. We are certainly well below the 50 per cent requirement of that CEP guideline. Although there have been considerable improvements, we

are still talking about 20 to 30 per cent, which is well below the target.

Mr OLSEN: How many people, particularly women, who have been in the CEP programme have been able to obtain permanent employment after completing the specific project?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The CEP programme comes under the administration of my colleague the Deputy Premier, and that question should be addressed to him.

Mr OLSEN: I would have thought that the Women's Adviser and Information Section, coming under the Premier's portfolio, would keep that information at its fingertips.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not know whether it can be obtained, but, if so, it will be supplied later.

Mr OLSEN: Mention has been made on page 19 of the yellow book of the expansion of the women's network to Mount Gambier, the Riverland and Port Lincoln. Will the Premier indicate what time frame has been established for the extension of that network?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I understand that work is taking place, and I would hope that we will see the networks established and running some time towards the end of the first quarter of next year, or into April or May.

Mr HAMILTON: Page 19 of the yellow book refers to ensuring that Government initiatives for the aged are appropriate for aged women. As we are all aware, amongst retired people over 65 years, women form the larger percentage. When one looks at the projection, by the year 2021 the percentage will increase dramatically. Will the Premier advise what projects or initiatives are being contemplated in this area? I am very much concerned, because within the Woodville council area there are about 12 000 retired people and that figure is increasing at about 4 per cent per annum. It is an important area and, when one looks at the figures for the north-western suburbs, there is a demand for more needs and initiatives, particularly for aged women.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, it is a large problem, compounded by the fact that the life expectancy for women is considerably greater than for men and the gap has widened over time. It means that we have a larger proportion of women in that age group, often women whose long term spouse has died before them and who must adjust to a new life style in their old age. There are real problems with that. The major initiatives to be taken in this area will come about following the appointment of the Commissioner for the Ageing. As members are aware, that Bill has been passing through the Parliament recently. We would hope that the appointment can be made fairly rapidly. Under the lines for my colleague, the Minister of Community Welfare, provision is made for that. The Women's Adviser and her Unit in the Premier's Department will have a direct input to the Commissioner for the Ageing's assessment of programmes needed in that area.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the new growth industry of equal opportunity and anti discrimination. Does the Premier intend to look towards amalgamation of these activities, which are, in fact, compatible under one heading, to avoid duplication and wastage of resources, or is the existing situation to be allowed to continue where, on the one hand, we have equal opportunity with ramifications in the labour force, as everyone is well aware, and on the other hand we have discrimination which also has ramifications in the labour force? What does the Premier intend to do to bring all these functional areas together so that we can get a consolidated concise operational area relating to discrimination and equal opportunity?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is certainly under review. While the programme is showing distinct areas, it is worth bearing in mind that there is a greater co-ordination of effort than could be picked up from looking at all the individual separate programmes. The Commonwealth's

Equal Opportunity Act has also accelerated that process. We are hoping that the State effort can be dove-tailed in closely with the Commonwealth. We are negotiating at the moment on the provision of premises for Commonwealth officers under the Federal legislation to work from in conjunction with our own officers. There will be legislative changes in the State's equal opportunity legislation as contained in the Bill which the Attorney-General will be presenting. We are aware of the need to ensure a co-ordinated effort in this area. We are working towards that, bearing in mind that there is a much greater co-ordination than is apparent from simply looking at the separate programmes.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on programme 4?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As there has been an increase in the grant for the Working Women's Centre from \$87 000 last year to \$100 000 this year, will the Premier say whether increased activity is expected at the centre?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The main area concerns wages for staff. Pay levels at the centre were reassessed last year and the increase that resulted will have a full year's effect in 1984-85.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions on programme 4, I call for questions on programme 5.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Premier outline the activities undertaken by the Disability Adviser towards which expenditure under programme 5 is directed?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Mr Llewellyn was appointed Disability Adviser during the 1983-84 financial year, and already there has been considerable response to his activities. One often hears of the demand for an appointment and the suggestion that it will be well received, whereas one does not know the actual value, the response of people and the advice that can be offered after the appointment has been made. However, since his appointment the adviser has played a key role in helping to co-ordinate Government programmes and he has been well received by the special interest groups of disabled in the community. He has undertaken a fairly strenuous programme, including a major trip to the Iron Triangle recently, where contacts were made with many groups that previously had been working in isolation but which have been brought together as a result of Mr Llewellyn's appointment. He intends to carry out similar exercises elsewhere in the State.

Yesterday, I talked to Mr Llewellyn at Morgan, where we were launching the Community Involvement Through Youth on the Morgan-Whyalla main. Money is being raised for the International Conference on the Disabled to be held later this year. Mr Llewellyn has played a leading role in helping the committee that is organising the conference. That will provide a big bonus in respect of his role in the community next year when the conference is held. All in all, we have received a double benefit from the appointment: first, the visibility of the disabled and their concerns; and secondly, the co-ordination effect among the Government departments and agencies. I am happy with the way in which that programme has been proceeding.

Mr HAMILTON: How many people are expected to attend the South-East Asia Pacific Regional Conference for the Disabled? Have those wishing to attend experienced difficulties regarding transportation and the allocation of accommodation for such disabled persons? I understand that problems may arise concerning public transport for these people. How are such problems being tackled?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I cannot give the exact numbers, but it will be some hundreds. True, problems have been experienced, not just in respect to transport but also in

finding suitable accommodation for the disabled. In fact, one of the beneficial side effects from staging the conference has been to focus major attention on accessibility in respect of much of our tourist accommodation and other facilities. The Adviser has been drawing up lists of standards and needs which we hope can be addressed in the future. I understand that the transport problem referred to has still not been completely solved, but the committee is working on proposals to solve it. Whatever we achieve in the short term for the conference by making venues accessible by transport arrangements can be translated into on-going programmes to help the disabled. That indicates the double advantage to be gained from holding a conference of this kind: not just the conference itself, but the attention focused on the needs in the community which would not have been clearly identified had it not been for the conference.

Mr HAMILTON: Some time ago I was appalled to see disabled persons being loaded and unloaded by means of a forklift at the Adelaide Airport. Since then, however, I have seen that the airlines, especially the international airlines, have done this by using a container. Disabled people should be loaded and unloaded with dignity.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I take the point.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no more questions on programme 5, I call for questions on programme 6. There being no questions on programme 6, I call for questions on programme 7.

Mr OLSEN: According to a statement on page 26 of the yellow book, the State Disaster Act is to be amended to encompass the command and control structure and operating procedures outlined in the Lewis/Scriven report. Will those amendments be introduced before the fire season that is expected to start in less than two months time? Will the amendments be based on the recommendations in the report, especially as they relate to the integration of the Country Fire Services and Metropolitan Fire Services over a two-year period and the creation of a central, highly skilled, full-time State emergency management organisation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Attorney-General is considering both these areas. Speaking realistically, I do not believe that we shall be able to implement major legislative changes before the fire season commences, probably at the end of October, although there has been a fairly late season with plenty of rain that has generated much vegetation growth. So, obviously, when the hot weather arrives we shall be in an 'alert' situation. I believe that it would be optimistic to expect that legislative changes could be in place by the start of the fire season. However, there has been a major restructuring of the State's disaster arrangements.

Recently, an exercise was conducted that was built around an earthquake and a fire in the city. The reports from that exercise are being assessed now. However, from preliminary reports I believe that the exercise was successful not only in identifying problem areas but in highlighting the enormous improvement in our responses since February 1983. Discussions are proceeding with an individual who has been identified to head the State Disaster Committee and negotiations are now proceeding on the date on which that person will be available. We hope that it will be as soon as possible. In the meantime Mr John Holland is still carrying out his general role in this area. The reports that I have indicate that we are in a very much better state of preparedness than we were in last season and the season preceding that, and there is no great concern. However, we are proceeding with the preparation of the amendments.

Mr OLSEN: That report found that a lack of unified service was one of the greatest weaknesses in fighting the Ash Wednesday bush fires, and it made a series of recommendations to improve them. I repeat my question: does

the Government intend to implement the recommendations to unify the CFS and MFS over a two year period? I think it ought to be noted that that report came out on 7 November 1983—some 11 months ago. Perhaps the Premier would like to explain to the Committee why there has been such a protracted delay without any action having been taken. It would appear from the Premier's comments that we are about to go into another fire season without legislative changes having been effected in accordance with the recommendations of the report.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There is certainly not a lack of action, and I refer the Leader to a series of major announcements on the progress that has been made. I would also remind the Leader of the Opposition that when the Lewis/Scriven Report was published the Government indicated that it would not accept one of the recommendations: the Government did not accept the recommendation for the integration of the MFS and CFS for reasons that ought to be well known, particularly to those members who deal with CFS in country areas, of which I would have thought the Leader of the Opposition was one.

The structure of the CFS, particularly its reliance on volunteers, is a valuable thing that must be preserved. As members would also be aware, the CFS has been subjected to very close scrutiny in terms of both its finance and organisation. My colleague the Deputy Premier expects to report to Parliament fairly shortly on the response to the latest such investigation, that of the Public Accounts Committee. Until that has been classified, we would be very foolish to move to some kind of amalgamation of the services. So, it does not involve an 11 month delay on the recommendation that was made. That recommendation of the report specifically was rejected for the reasons that I have suggested. A number of other recommendations have been implemented from almost the time when the report was brought down.

In regard to CFS and MFS co-ordination, I can report that the co-ordination procedures are very well in place, and I refer again to the trial major disaster exercise which was conducted a couple of weeks ago and which apparently (I have not seen the actual report, but am basing my comments on verbal reports that have been made to me) showed that a great level of co-ordination had been reached. I believe that we are well placed for the coming season. That is certainly the view of the professionals who advise the Government in this area.

Mr OLSEN: It will be interesting to read the transcript later, because I noted that the Premier made some contradictory statements in response to the two questions that I asked. One of the specific goals for next year, identified at page 26 of the yellow book, is the 'Appointment of additional regional officers in the State Emergency Services'. What regional centres have been identified, and when will the expansion take place?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They were outlined in a statement that I made some time ago. As I do not have the information in front of me, I will obtain it for the Leader of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the member for Mitcham, I again draw to the attention of members of the Committee that they should not go too deeply into matters referred to in the yellow book, which is intended only for guidance: we are not dealing specifically with the yellow book.

Mr BAKER: I question the appropriateness of the function of State disaster planning control and relief being under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet while all the resources associated with it are dealt with elsewhere. Having referred to those other areas, I ask whether it is appropriate for this matter concerning emergency services to be adopted

under that heading. Is this to indicate to the people of South Australia that the Premier has an interest in State disasters? However, will conflicts arise with the operation of this section and the normal operation of emergency services? It would appear to me that again there is a difficulty in rationalising this position with all the other resources that are dealt with under another portfolio.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: On the contrary, although it is true that emergency services matters are dealt with under another portfolio and that Ministerial control of their day to day operation is with another Minister, in the case of State disaster planning, that is, the overall planning in relation to reaction to disasters and in the actual handling of a disaster and the relief operations after it, there are very distinct advantages to that function being centred with the Premier as the co-ordinator of all Government activity. That is basically the reason for it. There are a number of functions of that kind where the day to day operations are carried out by another Minister. However, appropriately, in this regard the Premier has an overview—the ability to mobilise resources across departments. It is desirable that that responsibility be centred in the Premier's Department. For instance, if a disaster occurs, such as that which occurred in February 1983, attention is immediately focused on the Premier and the State Disaster Committee, the group which will initiate and control the relief measures to be implemented. It is a sensible way of handling it. It is intended not to cut across the organisational ability of services but simply to provide an umbrella for co-ordination, which is best handled through the Premier's Department. That is the whole point of having a Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr BAKER: Does that represent a change of heart? I note that in 1983-84 the Government allocated \$1 for this portfolio, notwithstanding assistance to victims, whereas now a person has been allocated to that position involving additional administrative resources. Has the Government suddenly had a change of heart on the whole procedure?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The procedures are based around, for instance, the recommendations of the Lewis/Scriven Report to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. The concept of upgrading the State Disaster Committee and having full-time co-ordinators in fact came from that report.

Mr HAMILTON: Given what the Premier has said about public awareness, can he advise what specific programmes of public awareness and liaison with the media are contemplated or in train? During the last disaster there were some elements of confusion. What specifically has the Government in mind in relation to that matter?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Two or three reports have been produced. The Coroner's Report highlighted the problem of bad or misleading information. I do not have a copy of the report in front of me, but from memory I think that the Lewis/Scriven Report recommended that there be a single source of information, in other words a definitive media outlet into which people could tune in order to get up to date reports, instead of relying on different reports from different media outlets. Following the bringing down of that report, we had a meeting. That indicates how seriously the Government has taken the report and its recommendations. We have not simply implemented it holus-bolus. We have had to look at a number of considerations. The media representative stressed that the media believed that it would be unfair, and perhaps even counter-productive, to insist on the enforcement of a single channel of communication, both in practical terms and in terms of people's knowledge of where to tune in and where to listen.

As a result, what is being developed is, as suggested there, an improved media creating public awareness, recognising that we probably will have to use a series of communication

sources. The whole idea is to somehow eliminate the confusion or conflict that may arise from a different assessment from those various media sources. Rather than, if one likes, closing down all the media outlets and leaving one standing, the idea is to ensure that all media outlets can be tuned in to a basic accurate information source. The exact arrangements for that have not been finalised, but discussions are proceeding with the media outlets to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions relating to programme 7, we will proceed to programme 8.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Recognising that we are not giving regard to the yellow book, perhaps the Premier could indicate how pages 28 and 29 became superimposed between programmes 7 and 8 and whether it is, in fact, to be regarded as part of programme 12?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I would have thought so. In that area in the programme budget it is in the capital budget in terms of these line estimates, so any questions on pages 28 and 29 relate to implementation for a section of the capital project, which is funded therefrom. So, when we deal with the Premier's capital budget we will discuss it then. There is no recurrent expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN: We have dealt with programme 9; we now go to programme 10.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to page 23, line 12. In the yellow book there is a reference at page 34 to allowances for contingencies. During 1983-84 there was an over-expenditure of \$30 961 against the amount voted of \$14 000. The yellow book reveals that the over-expenditure is related to a road safety seminar and the Coleman Report on Early Childhood Services. Can the Premier apportion on the overspending and advise what further expenditure is proposed on the Coleman Report proposals during the financial year 1984-85?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: On the Coleman Report, we have made provision under 'Miscellaneous', which is the follow-up work on the establishment of the Children's Service Office, so all of that will be done under that line. The road safety seminar was a specific one off cost in terms of analysing and upgrading our safety initiatives. That was \$9 000, and the Early Childhood Services Review involved \$14 000. The road safety initiatives will be picked up mainly through the lines of the Minister of Transport in the current 1984-85 year.

The CHAIRMAN: To which programme does the Leader refer?

Mr OLSEN: I refer to programme 10.

Mr FERGUSON: The road safety seminar costs and associated functions involved \$9 000. Will that be continued under the Premier's Budget line next year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No; it was a specific seminar established to provide recommendations to the Government on the road safety programme, but the road safety programme as such will be carried out by the Minister of Transport.

The CHAIRMAN: We now move on to programme 11.

Mr OLSEN: The Budget papers indicate significant under-spending last financial year by the State Promotions Office. For example, of \$189 000 allocated for publications and functions, \$29 000 was spent. I understand that the State Promotions Office has been reorganised within the programmed provision of advisory service to Government agencies. I ask the Premier to outline what re-arrangements have been made and what functions of a promotional nature are to be undertaken during this financial year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The reduction was part of the re-organisation of that unit with the departure of Mr Parks and an assessment of the respective promotion activities of State Development, Tourism and the Premier's Department. We are attempting to rationalise the area so that there is

no duplication of effort. I mention those three Departments, but there are others, of course, involved in promotion of similar activities. That was one reason why there were savings on that line in the course of the year.

The chief area of increase this year will be devoted to the publication of a Government services directory, which is produced periodically; one was not produced in the last financial year, so it is two years since we have had an updated Government services directory. Regarding general State promotion, a head of unit has been appointed, and that unit will be operating through the year. However, we are very keen to try to rationalise the expenditure as between various departments in this area. In the past, I think departments have tended to move off on their own programmes without a sufficient level of co-ordination. That has resulted in duplication of expenditure and, quite frankly, a waste of effort.

Mr OLSEN: I gather that, other than the directory that is to be reprinted or updated, the new appointee has specific promotional activities in mind to implement?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Under the contingencies there are a few: the 'It's our State Mate', or 'SA Great' grant, as it is now called. The honourable member is referring particularly to publications. Mr Kageler advises me that in fact the final publications budget is still being determined. We have stabilised the amount allocated to take account of the nominated programme, but specific decisions have not been made at this stage. It is still being worked on. The new State Promotions Unit head has been here for only three weeks. We thought it only fair to give him a chance to have direct input into what programming is carried out in 1984-85.

The CHAIRMAN: We now move to programme 12.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to 'Economic policy'. Does the Government consider that it is getting economic benefit from its urban renewal initiatives by expenditure through the Special Projects Unit of the Department? I refer to page 24 of the Department of Premier and Cabinet document.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Programme 12 relates to the Economics Unit, which produces a regular bulletin on economic statistics and indicators. During the year we have been producing a regular bulletin of those indicators on a subscriber basis which is fairly widely circulated. The idea is not to provide Government propaganda but simply to set out the factual situation in relation to the various key indicators in our State economy. Fortunately, most of it could be considered as being favourable propaganda, because those indicators have been very good but not uniformly good. The advantage of the publication is that it can identify those areas where we are not performing up to par or there are problems looming. Some interpretation is applied to those figures. I understand it is welcomed by key economic planners in the private business sector. They trust the information that is contained in it and find it a valuable adjunct to their own services.

I think such a unit is of vital importance to any Government that is seeking to develop and expand its policies. The unit is located in the Premier's Department because it supplies services to a whole range of Government departments. It works in closely with the Bureau of Statistics, and it provides us with a solid data base on which to assess our economic progress. I believe we are certainly getting good value for money from that—not just the Government but also the planners and decision makers in the private sector.

Mr FERGUSON: Going back to programme 11, how much did the Government spend on the Maralinga inquiry?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is hard to assess because mainly our contribution, which is continuing (we are in the process of preparing a statement), is in the provision of research officers to compile and collate material. What we are looking

at effectively are the salary components of those officers. The No. 2 officer in the Government Advisory Services Division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has had that special responsibility. I am not quite sure what proportion of that officer's time has been involved but at times it was quite significant.

We also had a further officer who has been seconded into the unit to assist with the preparation and research for our case. We are absorbing the funds for that officer within our budget. It is not an added cost because we have seconded that person across to do a job. There may be some other ancillary administrative costs, but by and large our input to the Commission will be based on the research efforts within Government itself without actually commissioning studies. The Royal Commission itself has adequate resources to do that.

In the health area we had commissioned a separate study into the effects of the atomic tests on Aboriginal Health, which was well in progress before the Federal Royal Commission was established. That inquiry has been subsumed into the Royal Commission budget and is under the Commission's direction. They have picked up the work and expanded it. We are providing officers for it but we will be reimbursed for that. Equally, the South Australian Government has provided a person, Dr Jill Fitch, to be a member of the Commission, but again she is on secondment, and her salary and expenses in the course of the inquiry will be met by the Commonwealth as part of the Maralinga inquiry. While there will be a substantial South Australian input into that Royal Commission, not all of it will be funded from State sources.

Mr OLSEN: Could the Premier say what is the circulation of the South Australian Economic Report and how many paid subscribers it has?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The net cost of the Economic Report is \$11 000 but it has been made available on a subscriber basis, so there is a fair degree of cost recovery involved. I will obtain the circulation and subscriber figures for the Leader of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: We will deal now with programme 13.

Mr OLSEN: Historically, the Budget is introduced in late August or early September, two months after the start of the financial year. Has the Government taken any advice on the presentation of the Budget nearer the start of the financial year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I would certainly like to see our Budget presented earlier, in fact, ideally before the commencement of the financial year rather than after it is a fair way through. However, our problem in that respect is that we are dependent on the timing of the Federal Budget. By about June or July, depending on when the Premiers Conference is held, we have a fair idea of our Commonwealth tax share grant, our capital works programme, and we can certainly embark on detailed Budget planning, but even up until the last minute, at the time of the delivery of the Federal Budget, there are always elements we might not have taken into account or of which we had not prior notice. We must be in a position to fine tune our State Budget in accordance with that.

Effectively, we are the first State (I do not know for how long this has been the case) to present a State Budget. We do that a week after the Federal Budget, and the other States follow. For instance, it was only last week that the New South Wales and Victorian Budgets were presented and Tasmania's a few days before that. We have a few weeks lead time. Queensland's Budget has just been presented. The other States tend to be between three to five weeks after us. We do not do too badly in that respect, but we are still constrained by the Federal Government. I know that

reviews are taking place at the national level to try to bring that process back closer to the beginning of the financial year, and the matter has been raised in Premiers Conference. If that happens we will certainly set the machinery in action to come as close to that period as we can.

The Review of Government Financing which has produced a series of reports that will be released soon, has devoted a special report to the Budget process and its timing. They would certainly support our Budget being brought forward as close as possible to the beginning of the financial year. I intend at the national level to continue to urge the Federal Government to try to decrease that time delay. I believe it would be in the interests of public efficiency and better spending if we did so because at the moment, for the first quarter of the year effectively, expenditure is taking place on the basis of last year's expenditure rather than on the basis of well established priorities which have been approved by Parliament.

Mr OLSEN: In the publication 'South Australian Economic Report No. 1' the Premier indicated that a future Labor Government would develop a public works programme incorporating time tables for up to five years: what progress has been made in developing that long term capital works programme for five years?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That process is well advanced. We established soon after coming to office a capital budget review, where a special team was assembled to look at the needs of the capital budget over a period of up to five years and to try to institute schedules and priorities which ultimately were looked at by Cabinet. That meant, of course, the deferral of some projects and the bringing forward of others.

One of the problems in this process, of course, is that one can be confronted with needs which have to be responded to fairly rapidly and which were not part of the programme. I give two examples, one relating to correctional services. One does not anticipate that an entire division of the major prison in this State would be burnt down, but once that occurs quite clearly one has to accelerate one's capital works programme to cover that loss and to provide the facilities that are necessary. In the past year or so, considerable effort has been put into formulating that correctional services capital works programme, which is a large and urgent one, a lot of the needs for which would not have been apparent if, for instance, four years ago one had established an orderly capital works programming.

That is one example, and there may well be others. However, bearing in mind that particular needs may arise that one cannot anticipate, we are in fact working at present to a three-year programme that is being developed into a five-year rolling programme, and I would hope that over the next 12 months (that is, prior to the presentation of the 1985-86 Budget) we will have that five-year programme in place.

Mr BAKER: In regard to programme 14, I refer to the Budget line for payments made for the review of Public Service management and a report on the review of Government financial arrangements—and more can be stated during the Public Service Board's assessment. The report has been in the Premier's possession since February. What specific action has he taken at this stage on the report's recommendations in regard to Public Service management?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is a very wide question, in that I would have to take it on notice. There has been considerable action. I can give the honourable member a detailed report on progress in regard to that.

Mr BAKER: I would appreciate that. Specifically, on which recommendations has the Premier initiated action, on which ones does he intend to take action, and which recommendations will be set aside for the future?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In any detailed information I will provide, I will attempt to indicate that, but the whole report is being subjected to evaluation, and action is being taken in some areas already. We have established 10 pilot departments that have had the various responsibilities of delegations devolved on them. Those 10 departments are now operating under those delegated authorities, and they have been chosen for their representative nature. They consist of a range of operative departments, policy departments, and so on. We will assess the success of those delegations and then decide whether and how to expand that programme to other departments; so, the work is in train but it is not a case of saying, 'Yes, no, yes, no,' to a series of recommendations. It is in fact an ongoing process. One has to experiment with some to ascertain whether they work, and that is what is going on.

Mr BAKER: Specifically (as I said, it should be canvassed later), I refer to the change in the operations of the Public Service Board, particularly the introduction of a new Act. How far advanced is the legislative preparation at this stage?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Discussions are quite advanced both in the Public Service and with the unions involved. There have been initial discussions with them, and an implementation committee is being established. Our initial hope was that we could have legislation ready for introduction before the end of this year. I am not confident that that time table can be met, because I think that it is important and what we are talking about is virtually a total rewriting of the Public Service Act. It is long overdue, but we want to make sure that we have it properly in place before we embark on it and not do it in bits and pieces. Therefore, I think that that time table is fairly optimistic, but as soon as our steering group is ready to report we will have legislative proposals before the Parliament.

Mr BAKER: In regard to the review of Government financial management, when does the Premier expect that report to be in his hands?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In fact, there is a series of reports, the first of which is in my hands now. Because they arrived at about the same time as the Budget was being finalised and other matters leading up to today's Committee, I have not had a chance to assess them properly. However, I hope to release them for comment in the next two or three weeks. There is a lot of information, both descriptive and policy related, which I think will be of interest to honourable members.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that on two or three occasions members of the Committee have sought information, which the Premier has indicated to the Committee that he will obtain. I am checking with *Hansard*, and I think that if at all possible it might be desirable to have that information available so that it can be incorporated in *Hansard* with the proposal on which members of the Committee have sought information. I do not know whether that is possible, but I bring that matter to members' attention now.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We will certainly try.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions in regard to programme 15?

Mr HAMILTON: In regard to the line 'Overseas Representation', can the Premier say when the existing term of office of the Agent-General will expire?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Albert Park's question is related to programme 16, not programme 15. As a matter of courtesy, the Leader of the Opposition usually gets the first bite of the cherry, but I will let it go this time. However, I point out to members of the Committee that they should be careful about this matter.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The current Agent-General's term expires in September 1985. The amount for the visit of the

Agent-General to South Australia in fact covers the cost of the briefing visit that has already taken place in July and August of this year for the Agent-General, his wife and daughter. One might recall that in the previous year there was an allocation for the visit to the United Kingdom by the Agent-General's son. These were all part of the contractual arrangements made with the Agent-General by the former Government, and the present Government has picked up and honoured those contractual arrangements.

Recently, the Agent-General visited various departments here in South Australia and brought himself up to date on what was happening, spoke to various honourable members and also responded to an assessment paper prepared by my Director on the future of the Agent-General's Office and overseas representation. So, a number of discussions were held on that point on his return. However, the reason for the amount proposed is that the visit also involved his family.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now deal with programme 16.

Mr OLSEN: As the Agent-General has just come back to South Australia for a briefing, can the Premier say whether it is the Government's intention to reappoint Mr Rundle as Agent-General when his term expires in September next? I presume that that decision would have had to be made because Mr Rundle would be seeking clarification of his responsibilities and financial future. Mr Rundle has, I understand, made clear that he would like to stay in the position. The Premier has made previous statements on this matter and I refer specifically to his statement on 10 July 1980, after Mr Rundle's appointment:

I think it was a wrong appointment, an inappropriate appointment. It should have gone to somebody with undoubted qualifications like Mr Bob Bakewell, with his international connections and his expertise in economic development. There are others far more highly qualified in the relevant fields than Mr Rundle.

Therefore, does the Premier still hold those views and does he intend to reappoint Mr Rundle?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: My relations with the Agent-General, whilst we have been in Government, have been cordial. I am quite satisfied with the way in which Mr Rundle has carried out his duties: contacts have been frequent, and there has been a lot of liaison. Soon after our coming to office, within a matter of weeks, while he was on a return visit to South Australia, Mr Rundle and I had a number of discussions about his future, the future of the office, and so on, all of which were satisfactorily resolved.

I am not aware of the Agent-General's having expressed a desire to have another term as Agent-General. It is not usual in these cases, and it is not intended. The term of office is for five years, and that is the term of occupancy of Agents-General. In fact, previous Agents-General probably have had shorter terms, because a couple of Mr Rundle's predecessors did not serve their full five years. Mr Rundle will have had a full five year term, and that is the first time that has occurred since perhaps the Hon. Lance Milne, who served a five year term as Agent-General in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

It is desirable in these positions to have a turnover of membership. It is accepted, whether one comes from the Public Service or private industry, that it is a specific term contract that is fulfilled, and each Agent-General puts his own particular stamp on the position, as Mr Rundle has done. I am perfectly satisfied with that, and I have expressed my confidence in him and the work he is doing. However, as of September 1985 either a new Agent-General will be appointed or we will have restructured the Agent-General's Office in a different way. That, at present, is the subject of investigation in which Mr Rundle is participating, based on

his past experiences. What is confusing the Leader of the Opposition is that I understand Mr Rundle intends to stay on in Britain after his term expires, for various personal and other reasons, and he did indicate that to me. I would hope his presence there means that we have a resource in Britain that could be called on by future Governments.

Mr OLSEN: As it is obvious that Mr Rundle will not be reappointed to that position, can the Premier reassure the Committee that the Deputy Premier will not go to London as Agent-General?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I see that the Leader of the Opposition reads the rumours as well.

Mr OLSEN: In the absence of any affirmation or otherwise, no doubt speculation will continue to run rampant on the basis that the Premier is not prepared to dispel it. What cost saving initiatives were discussed with the Agent-General that will be put in place in the operation of South Australia House this year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Over the past year or so there have been some considerable cost savings mainly relating to the non-replacement of staff. For instance, one staff member who retired in September 1983 was not replaced. There has been considerable concentration on savings in the various administrative expenses of the South Australia House operation. This coming year we anticipate there will be a further reduction. The present staff number of 12 will stabilise.

However, we have in mind in future, as part of the restructuring of the Agent-General's Office, the appointment of more people on contract rather than as permanent appointees. One of the problems in ensuring flexibility of response from the Agent-General's Office has been the fact that we have been committed to effectively permanent Public Service appointments made in that office which restrict us to particular skills or interests of those individuals. For instance, one cannot say overnight, 'We will downgrade the protocol aspects of the office and upgrade the trading aspects.' We have not had the flexibility to work within it.

The current Agent-General has worked very hard to make sure that he has a very lean operation that is well suited to the priorities of the Government. Presently, apart from the Agent-General, there is an acting official secretary, a personal secretary to the Agent-General, an accountant, two trade officers, a chauffeur, and five clerical officers, a total of 12 staff. As each vacancy occurs we review it, either on a non-replacement basis or on the basis of some contractual arrangement. I hope that the resources so freed in a revamped Agent-General's Office can in turn be directed to other areas of overseas representation of the Government.

Certainly, at this stage I would not favour rushing into establishing many embassies all over Asia, for instance. Whilst there is no doubt that our presence in Asia should be upgraded—and indeed it is, particularly in the State development area—we must look very carefully at getting maximum use from the Commonwealth Department of Trade and its trade commissioners. Already our approach based on that method has proved much more cost effective than have those of some other Governments that, for flag waving or whatever reasons, have established full scale offices that are very expensive and tend to concentrate less on trade and more on protocol functions, which is not to the benefit of the State.

So, in brief, we will maintain the level of activity of the Agent-General's Office. The Agent-General is looking at ways of seeing our office in London more as a base from which we can service Europe and other areas than purely a *quasi* diplomatic presence in Britain, involving attendance at trade fairs, various other contacts and seminars that can be set up.

In addition, we have through the State Bank an office in London also. I would hope that we could better co-ordinate activities between them because there are obviously very important visitors' services provided through the Agent-General's Office, copies of local newspapers and other things that relate to South Australia that South Australians overseas like to keep in touch with. A great deal of the work of the Agent-General and his staff is involved in responding to those queries for information, visitor requests, and so on. If we can better co-ordinate the State Bank office and the Agent-General's Office in that way, we might save some money and, at the same time, provide a better service for visitors in London. We are certainly mindful of maintaining that sort of presence, but the emphasis of our expenditure in the Agent-General's area ought to be on trade and development and tourism.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to programme 16, there is a budget allocation of \$40 000 for the Premier for overseas study. When will the visit take place, where does the Premier intend to go, and for what reason?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That line is under Intra-Agency Support, and is not allocated to programme 16. It is a nominal amount. No specific overseas visit is planned. There have been a number of occasions on which it has been suggested that I should travel overseas. I have expressed to this Committee before the view that the Premier's travel overseas should be specifically directed. If that means 10 trips a year because there are 10 reasons to go, so be it. If it means no trips, then there should be none. The concept of needing to go on some kind of overseas exercise simply for the sake of it is certainly not one that I support. The Agent-General has been pressing me to go to London. He said that it has been too long since a Premier from South Australia was there, and he has had a number of inquiries about investment seminars and various other things which could be organised. On his latest visit we discussed this and tentative suggestions have been made for some sort of event around April or May of next year, depending on the Parliamentary programme. While I have suggested to him and the State Development Department that they should look closely at that sort of programme, that is as far as it has gone.

There are a number of things, such as the Texas sesquicentennial arrangements, where we have promised that there will be a visit, but the timing of that has not been determined. A couple of Asian investment seminars are scheduled. There are things like the Grand Prix and the submarine project which may require some overseas travel, but it will take place only if there is specific reason to do so. At this stage no firm plans are there and the amount has simply been placed in the Estimates in anticipation of the probability of some kind of trip.

Ms LENEHAN: I wish to follow on from the previous answer that the Premier gave the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the restructuring of the office. In the final reply the Premier talked about tourism. To what extent does the Premier envisage the restructuring of the functions of South Australia House and the role of the Agent-General and his staff taking on a greater role in the area of promotion and economic development of tourism in South Australia? I note from the programme description that one of the specific initiatives for 1984-85 is that accent will be placed on developing a close liaison with business communities within the United Kingdom and Europe which are directly related to the economic development of the State. To what extent does the Premier see this economic development encompassing promotion development of the tourism dollar from the United Kingdom to Australia, in particular South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do see that as a function. At the moment we do not have direct tourism representation in Britain or Europe. As with trade, I think we should be using to the maximum the provisions of the Australian Government in its overseas representation through its tourist offices. We get good co-operation from them. We have tended to service this area from Australia. That has involved, for instance, the Director of Tourism's attending world travel fairs on a couple of occasions, in Berlin, London and places of that nature. A corroboree was held earlier this year in London to promote Australian tourism generally. We had a large South Australian presence in that.

The Director of Tourism has talked to the Agent-General about the ways in which he can reinforce our tourism presence. It is appropriate that on occasions the Agent-General himself sets up or attends exhibits or promotions and equally provides a flow of information on what is going on when he comes across it to the tourism department. Certainly the Agent-General is quite clear that we are looking for an upgraded effort in the areas of State development, investment identification and tourism promotion. I understand from the Director of Tourism that he is quite pleased with the input that has been made.

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

Premier, Miscellaneous, \$708 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Dr M.B. Hemmerling, Acting Director, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to page 29 of the Estimates of Payments, and the line Children's Services Office, where an amount of \$150 000 is allocated. Is that a reallocation of existing expenditure or is it new expenditure?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is a new initiative. As members will be aware, following the Coleman inquiry we have resolved to establish a Children's Services Office to better co-ordinate the areas of pre-school education and child care in particular, and general children's services. This figure represents the administrative support that we are giving to it this financial year. It is expected that the office will operate in early 1985. We have already advertised for a Chief Executive of the Children's Services Office and the appointment process is under way. Most of that amount will be devoted to salaries of the Director and others involved in the office, but it is a new amount. In other words, it is not being drawn from the allocations already provided to

Kindergarten Union or community welfare child care programmes. The amounts, both capital and recurrent, are being made available under their normal lines on this occasion to their normal functions.

Mr HAMILTON: Given the uncertainty in the community when this programme was first announced, how many representations have been made and what is the attitude generally in the community as to the track down which the Government is proceeding on the Childhood Services Office?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Initially, there were concerns, but they were mainly based on the changes about which people were not too clear. All those concerns have been taken into account. The chief problem basically was lack of communication. It was felt that we were imposing a structure or changes on organisations without full consultation as to how best their advice and expertise could be used. However, that was not the case: there has been thorough and careful consultation. The initiatives have been largely welcomed by professionals and organisations in the area. One of the organisations most affected is the Kindergarten Union, which, under the new child services legislation, will be replaced under the umbrella of the Children's Services Office.

At all levels of the Union there has been strong endorsement of the proposals. The board of the Union has considered the matter thoroughly. It raised problems that had to be dealt with, and those responses and discussions took place. The Union has written to the Government expressing support and has publicised that attitude in the press because of earlier letters from people who were concerned about the changes. Parent organisations and professionals in the field have also been consulted and a regular news letter has been put out to keep people abreast of progress. On the whole there has been not only acceptance of but also considerable enthusiasm for the changes to be made and the boost that we believe that such changes will give to the whole area of children's services.

Mr HAMILTON: Concern was expressed by child-parent centres and the Kindergarten Union concerning promotion of the changes. Has that matter been resolved or is it being discussed at present with those bodies? Has the Premier further information that I can impart to interested people not only in my district but throughout the State?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Details are still being discussed, but the general principle is that people's employment will be secured under the new arrangements and their opportunities should be greater rather than less, because we are looking at the gradual expansion of services. While we are aware of certain general concerns, they are totally unfounded as they relate to individuals who may have specific problems. Such problems must be addressed specifically, and that process is going on.

Mr BAKER: Is the sum of \$150 000 that has been allocated meant to cover a full year or is it intended that that area of operation will be passed to a more appropriate Minister in 1984-85?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is the amount being set aside for 1984-85, but that expenditure commenced in August when we assembled the team of four that is involved in the implementation process. About \$60 000 of that sum will have been spent in the August-November period until we formally establish the Council. So, the \$150 000 should be sufficient for this financial year. Obviously, a further allocation must be made for next year.

Mr BAKER: When does the Premier intend to move the office of the Council to another Ministerial portfolio?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No decision has been made on that matter. At present it is considered desirable that I, as Premier, have the oversight of this area as we establish the

office and get it in place. I am doing that at present and the Minister of Education is the Minister assisting me in this area. That means that my colleague is handling many of the day to day practical issues while I have overall policy direction. We may well see that arrangement as desirable to continue: with the Premier having the overall responsibility because it crosses certain portfolio areas, and with a Minister assisting. However, no time table has been set for any change and, until I am satisfied that the operation is up and running and that the time has come for it to be considered a single Ministerial responsibility, there is no call for a decision to be made.

Mr BAKER: Have the grants for Freedom from Hunger, Austcare and United Nations Association been transferred from the Chief Secretary's line to the Premier's line for publicity purposes or for practical reasons?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: For practical reasons. The office of the Chief Secretary has had a rag-bag of Government functions, but it has been gradually stripped of various functions. With the establishment of a Minister of Emergency Services and a Minister in charge of correctional services, and with both these portfolios being held by different individuals, the Chief Secretary's portfolio was effectively dismembered. The Chief Secretary has also had certain rag-bag functions and grants that we have tried to consolidate as a part of that process. In describing such functions as 'rag-bag', I do not suggest that they are not important, but in the past anything that could not fit into a specific category, such as cruelty to animals, would be given as a responsibility to the hapless Chief Secretary. We have tried to introduce rationality into this area, and this transfer is part of that process. Many of these grants have been made from the Premier's general line, and those that have been referred to by the honourable member fit conveniently into that category.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier comment on the apparent heavy cost of promotion of Freedom from Hunger and Austcare and on the multiplicity of similar material delivered to letter boxes of individual members and South Australians generally? Has his Government drawn to the attention of any of these major organisations a concern that the percentage in the dollar arriving in the area of benefit is perhaps questionable? Although I do not in any way criticise the creation of a fund, I know that there is at present public concern about the glossy material that is circulated and the obviously heavy cost associated with postage and the materials enclosed. Further, the original envelope is followed by at least one letter and sometimes three letters when the recipient fails to respond. In fact, the recipient may well receive three originals, three duplicates and three triplicates, and the end result may not be of advantage to the organisations. The Premier might also say which organisations will benefit from the special appeals and minor grants that are shown as \$11 050.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We ask for audited statements from any group that obtains grants from the Government so that we know that they are *bona fide* and that their accounts are being properly managed. However, we do not interfere with the policies of non-government groups in this way. I think that is a fair principle. If the Government has concern about or disagrees with an organisation's way of running things, surely its recourse is to withdraw its financial support and to explain to that group why it has done so, and not to try to stand over the group and tell it that it must do something in a certain way.

I am not sure how the respective promotions of the two bodies to which the member for Light referred are organised. I imagine that they obtain professional advice of some sort. I know that a lot of their promotional activities are free, that they devise events that they wish to hold, and so on.

I am happy to participate in requests if the cause is worthy of State Government support (and I guess that other members are happy to do the same) in order to assist with such promotions, which thus reduces the administrative promotional cost. But I agree with the honourable member that it can be a problem, and any organisation must look very closely at determining its mailing programmes or pamphletting.

Recently, Freedom from Hunger has been organising a door-knock exercise, and I know that it is also involved in sponsorships in various ways. I guess that none of that costs a great deal of money, as it relies very much on the voluntary efforts of its membership. In the past Austcare has organised certain events. Whilst its efforts are directed in the same general area, that is, support for Third World countries, alleviating famine, and things of that nature, I think it has clearly differentiated its areas of activity and has different kinds of support networks and, as such, it warrants continued Government support. I suggest that if the honourable member (and this would apply to all members of Parliament, who are listened to by these bodies—they are concerned about their image) has specific concerns about a type of promotion, he ought to communicate those concerns directly to the organisation involved. Organisations would probably welcome that feedback. From the Government's point of view, we ensure that funds are being spent for the purposes for which they were allocated.

In relation to funding for special appeals and minor grants, in a sense that is a contingency item which is set aside for various things that might arise during the year. In fact, recently I had occasion to provide a sum from that source to assist the Culinary Olympics team. Honourable members may be aware that the Culinary Olympic representatives from Australia are in fact South Australian chefs. Obviously, they could provide a quite powerful State promotion as well as a national promotion. They embarked on a number of fund raising activities in order to finance their participation in the international Culinary Olympics which will be held in Germany towards the end of this year—in fact, I think the team departed last week. As there was a short-fall in their fund raising, they asked whether the Government could provide assistance. As the Government had worked with them in sponsoring them and because it seemed like a reasonable promotional vehicle, a small grant was made, and it came from the source referred to, that is, 'Special appeals and minor grants'.

If something comes up during the year for which there is no other source of funds, and the cause is deemed to be appropriate, assistance will be given. This relates only to small amounts of money. Often an organisation is looking for just an indication that the Government is in support of its activities. Actual financial support that is obtained is perhaps less relevant than is the tangible sign that the Government, and therefore the community, is in support of its efforts.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer to the line relating to the Splatt Royal Commission, for which an amount of \$244 000 has been allocated for 1984-85. As the Royal Commission has been concluded, will the Premier say to what that allocation relates?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Various accounts which fell due during the course of the Splatt proceedings only became eligible for payment in the period from 30 June. One of the reasons for that is the very vigorous way in which the Attorney has required various claims to be costed. For instance, the fees paid to lawyers as part of that exercise are taxed costs which are properly assessed by the courts. They are based on a scale of fees and are subjected to pretty detailed analysis. In other words, it is not a case of a judgment being made off the top of one's head or a daily

requirement. The costs have been subjected to pretty close scrutiny, as well they might be. The cost of that Royal Commission has been quite prodigious and, of course, much greater than the Government anticipated. I suppose it is difficult to put a price on justice and on the community's confidence in the justice system, all of which was involved in that Royal Commission exercise.

Of course, the Royal Commission provided considerable insights into the whole field of forensic evidence, how it is collected, what changes can be made in that regard, and so on, all of which can be of ongoing value to the community. Therefore, it is not as though the money spent on the Splatt Royal Commission was simply money spent on that exercise and on nothing else. Apart from what the commission itself did, it was able to highlight and develop assessments of our whole forensic effort. Indeed, when one looks at the cost involved in something like the Chamberlain case, one can see how vital such experience can be. When one looks at a number of crimes in the community, in regard to which the solutions and successful conviction of persons will depend on detailed and proper presentation of forensic evidence, again one can appreciate that it all comes back to the subject of the Splatt Royal Commission. Notwithstanding, it is certainly a large sum of money involved. The amount of \$244 000 provided for this year is mainly for fees to counsel and scientists which had to be effectively taxed and looked at—something like \$220 000 of it relates to those fees. I hope that this represents the end of the costs arising out of that Royal Commission.

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

Works and Services— Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$600 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Dr M.B. Hemmerling, Acting Director, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I trust that the answer will not take a long time and that we might on this vote and subsequent votes for the rest of the day be able to make faster progress. Can the Premier indicate what the \$600 000 is to be?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That line is specifically to provide matching funds for the joint programme for the bi-centenary. The Commonwealth is putting up \$6 million between now and 1988 which we, in turn, are required to match under the requirements of the bi-centennial programme. We are using this line for those purposes. It is a notional amount

at this stage; it has not been called on, but is an estimate of what may be required on a matching basis through the year, subject to the Commonwealth's requirements.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Was that amount expended in 1983-84 for the same purpose?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is the \$600 000 only. The \$320 000 provided last year was the amount required under the Port Adelaide project. In fact, I think there was an earlier question about that exercise. The concept of the Port Adelaide project is that it be self-funding over time. The \$320 000 is, if one likes, the seeding money to keep the project rolling. In fact, by sale of land which is then put back into the development fund, not only will we recoup that amount but there will be a further expenditure during the year, but it will be funded from the rolling funds of the project itself.

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

Public Service Board, \$6 144 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.J. Strickland, Chairman, Public Service Board.
Mr J. Betts, Director, Executive Services, Public Service Board.

Mr OLSEN: I understand that the Chairman of the Board (Mr Strickland) is employed until the end of this year, pending decisions on changes to central departmental arrangements based on the initial report of the review of Public Service management. Does that indicate that the Government intends to have the necessary legislation introduced and passed by Parliament prior to Christmas, and will that legislation follow broadly the recommendations of the report?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: As I indicated earlier, the aim is to have changes in Parliament before the end of the year, although I am not optimistic about that time table being maintained. At the time Mr Strickland was appointed he was appointed, on a limited term. There were two purposes behind that: first, we had hoped and are still hoping to meet a time table that will see exactly what the long term future of the Board and its composition will be before the end of the year. If, in fact, we resolve—as we should do before the end of the year—the future of the Board, if there are no legislative changes needed to its composition, then we can proceed with appointments in the normal way.

On the other hand, if there are not, we do not want to be locked in at that stage to long term appointments. The second purpose was to signal at that stage that we are seriously looking at the future of the Board. If, for instance, we had gone ahead then and appointed a Chairman for a five-year term, the impression might have got around that the Government is really not interested in the changes that

are taking place because it has cemented a Chairman in. Incidentally, the Chairman's term is not connected with that in terms of Commissioner of the Board. However, that will be resolved before the end of the year, but at this stage there are no changes contemplated.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to tenure of appointment for public servants, I note that the Premier said earlier this year that it was not the Government's intention to alter the basic tenure right of public servants. However, the matter has been addressed in the latest report of the Auditor-General that was tabled. Mr Sheridan said that security of tenure of appointment, its effect on performance and the image of the Public Service and the public servant, is one of two issues fundamental to effective Public Service management. Is it ALP policy to alter the position stated by the Premier or to reject the view of the Auditor-General?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think there are two categories of public servant in this sense. There is that category of person who joins the Public Service with a view to a Public Service career; that is, he envisages a long-term career development within the Public Service. That implies certain advantages but it also puts certain constraints on that person in terms of career opportunity. One of the advantages of making that decision is that under our present system, anyway, a person does in fact become, after a suitable probation period, a tenure officer, and except in certain circumstances (fairly unusual circumstances) that secures that person's right of employment. What is proposed in respect of that category of person in the suggestions of the Review of Government Management is that, rather than people who are permanent long-term public servants being appointed to particular positions in the Public Service, people should be appointed to particular levels of skill or expertise, and within that there should be the ability for them and for departments to switch them around among various functions to develop their skills and provide variety.

If that was more readily possible, I think a number of points to which the Auditor-General is referring could be overcome. He is taking it a step further and suggesting that by introducing an element of insecurity of employment we are inducing better performance. I believe that within that category of person the basic security of tenure is not the issue: it is the challenge and the job they are doing and their perception of their security within that particular position. With the attitude, 'if you think you have a particularly cushy job and you can put your feet up, and as long as you stay out of trouble, that's it', certainly you might lose some incentive, and the idea of having greater mobility and flexibility within the various levels helps overcome that.

Then there is the other category of public servant who joins the Public Service from the outside with a specific job, skill or purpose in mind. Whilst it is true at the moment that we can and do have contract appointments, the arrangements for them tend to be more complex, and we do not have many of them for that reason. Again, the idea would be to introduce a system where it would be much easier for people to be contracted for specific jobs at specific levels of the Public Service. That would match one of the points the Auditor-General is making, in that if there is a mix of people in those categories (and I would see the contract approach being concentrated more on the higher levels of the Public Service and not applying to secretaries and others of that nature who might wish to have careers) I think we achieve a much more efficient and lean Public Service.

Both those approaches are being addressed through the Review of Public Service and Government Management, and I hope that we will come up with some productive answers to this which do not affect the basic long-term rights one expects from the Public Service as an employer

but which at the same time provide the flexibility to which I think the Auditor-General is referring.

Mr OLSEN: Do I take it from what the Premier has just said that the tenure appointment of public servants as it relates to departmental heads is likely to change and that the contractual positions are more likely to occur at that level than at the lower level?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I would not suggest any particular cut-off level. I see the contractual approach occurring more likely at the higher levels of the Public Service than at the lower levels of appointment. The purpose of the contract would be to introduce people with particular skills or contributions that they themselves would envisage would operate for only a short time. Indeed, as I say, we have people already who have joined the Public Service on that basis who see it not as a career but as an important part of their own career development, the Government perceiving them as being able to make a positive contribution, and they tend to be at the permanent head level. I would not make any absolute rule about that.

Mr OLSEN: On page 41 of the Premier's Financial Statement reference is made to planned increases in personnel numbers in the areas of State Development, Arts, Labour, Police and Public and Consumer Affairs, to name but a few. Can the Premier advise the exact increase in each of the listed departments?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think we have set out all the figures in the Budget papers.

Mr OLSEN: Reference is made to it on page 41 but it does not list each department specifically.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think that information can be obtained from that statement. On page 57 in the summary of the programme structure you will find the full-time equivalent outcome for the Department of the Public Service Board, its total programmes, total numbers and the proposed numbers for 1984-85. In fact, quite precise information is provided.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer to programme 1 and the increased expenditure in regard to the school leaver recruitment programme. Can the Premier outline the objectives of the programme and the number of school leavers expected to benefit from it in 1984-85 compared with 1983-84?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The whole point of the programme is to address the particular problem of the age profile in the South Australian Public Service. As a result of a combination of policies we have a fairly rapidly ageing Public Service. That is partly because of a policy of non-replacement and maintaining numbers, and the policy of attrition that has often meant that more mobile and younger people have left the Public Service, while others closer to retirement have stayed in order to reach retirement age and to gain whatever benefits in terms of superannuation and so on that may bring.

At the same time, there has not been the intake of young graduates or school leavers into the Service and this has shown up as a major problem; so, the purpose of the programme devised within the Board was to provide specific employment opportunities for young people, school leavers in particular, who are probably worse off as it were in terms of job opportunities than is anyone in the community. By having a systematic programme we are able to implement that progressively through the year, which means that through the competitive assessment procedures, and so on, the Public Service is able to attract very high quality applicants in these categories. Some will stay on and continue a career in the Public Service, and I guess that others will develop skills and go out into the broader community. That is fine: I think that that is one of the roles that public sector employment should be providing. In 1983-84, 371 people were employed under this scheme. The 1984-85 target is

400—hence an increase in the allocation made—and much of that increase in costs relates to the supernumerary component. Perhaps Mr Strickland can expand on what that means.

Mr Strickland: The supernumerary component is that component that is additional to what the Department had actually planned, so that, if we are recruiting a number of school leavers or people under the age of 19 (which is the target group we are going for), it is very difficult at the beginning of the year to predict exactly how they will be distributed throughout the 36 departments and agencies involved. So, these funds are held in the Board and provided to enable that department to take on those school leavers. Last year all those taken on were maintained by those departments and added into their subsequent budgets. In fact, they usually held them against vacant positions, which was extremely encouraging.

Mr HAMILTON: Under the Management Improvement Programme, I refer to a proposed expenditure of \$100 000. How will this amount be used?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This is one of the provisions made in conjunction with the programme that I announced where we will try to achieve major savings in the executive officer and administrative officer range in the Public Service. It is not a case of merely making cuts or requiring positions to be abolished. We must have a programme of positive skills development in order to get better productivity and efficiency from the skills of those officers. The detailed programme has not been finalised. Incidentally, in its formulation we are involving some private sector people to give advice as well.

However, basically the specific elements will be a senior management development programme, which will look at people at that level and major sectors of Government activity. We will look at executive officer development programmes. This is due to commence in February 1985, will run for approximately six months and will involve some 20 to 30 executive officers at any one time. Then there will be a series of development forums for departmental heads. About six sessions have been arranged to focus on resource management, and there will be high level speakers. In fact, over the past year or so, we have found occasion increasingly to bring permanent heads together as a group or in subgroups, with very good consequences. It is amazing how little day to day communication there can be because people are intent on their own departments and areas, and unless one provides some reasonable forum for them to come together one loses the benefits of that interchange. Therefore, this programme is aimed at developing that.

There will be various redeployment and retraining schemes, selection schemes, and so on. Eight Government departments have, together with the Public Service Board, purchased a management improvement package that is based on the management text *In Search of Excellence*, which I think at present is high on the best seller list in the country. I have been advised that this has been used in the Housing Trust with some considerable success, and we will use it on a pilot basis this year in Government departments. So, we see this (if one likes) as a sort of counterweight to pressures exerted by a reduction in numbers, the replacement being an opportunity for management improvement, which can increase skills and the ability to discharge functions, where the standard response has often been, 'I am overloaded.' The standard solution has been not to reassess why that individual is overloaded, but to call for more resources. We are trying to work that syndrome out of the public sector.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier explain the role of the Public Service Board in the promotion of occupational health and say how its activities are related to those of the Department of Labour and Department of Health?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: What is proposed is the establishment of an occupational health and psychology unit in the Board. To date, while the Board has had some involvement in psychology, counselling, and so on, there has not been that specific directed initiative. Members of the Committee may be aware that the Deputy Premier has made a number of statements on this whole question of occupational health, particularly arising out of the Matthews Report, and he has also made clear that the public sector must show a lead in this area.

One of the methods adopted has been to develop a code of practices that will have attached to it specific targets which have to be achieved and for which departmental heads will be held accountable. That has been developed within the overall occupational health and safety initiatives. As far as the Board's particular role is concerned, this unit will promote the implementation of that code of general principles, observe and monitor practices in departments, try to develop some procedures in particular areas such as repetitive strain injuries, and try to look at what programmes are being carried out and assist other agencies to make sure that they are more directed to agencies.

However, they are basically aiming at a greater degree of responsibility on the part of management and commitment on the part of workers to occupational health and safety programmes. I think that it is fair to say that it has been lacking, except in some departments in the past, and this is one way of trying to highlight the area. The result will be that for this sort of expenditure we would hope to see some tangible savings over time. We are talking about \$68 000 and two employees, so it is not a costly initiative but in terms of value returned we could be multiplying that many times over.

Mr OLSEN: In the Budget papers tabled by the Premier, there was an indication that the Government has given a commitment not to reduce public sector employment, and has agreed as a minimum to maintain overall public sector employment at the levels existing at 1 July 1982 (employment at June 1982 was 96 259 persons). Furthermore, the papers revealed that public sector employment planned for 1984-85 was projected to increase by .5 per cent. Based on that estimated growth, public sector employment levels are expected to rise by 495 persons on the 1983-84 levels and 3 316 persons on the June 1982 levels. That seems inconsistent with the statement made by the Premier to the *News* on 22 June, the day following the Premiers Conference, when he said:

There could be a cut in jobs department by department but the Government hoped to be able to adhere to its policy of maintaining staff levels at the July 1982 ceiling. We are just going to have to make savings somehow somewhere. It may mean in some instances that there could be a job reduction.

Will the Premier elaborate on that extraordinary turnabout on the Government's proposal as given to the *News* and say what is happening?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Leader of the Opposition is not comparing like figures with like. The figure of 96 000-odd quoted is the overall public sector employment figure, including statutory authorities etc., over some of which the Government does not have direct control; indeed, they were not included as part of the undertaking that I gave in correspondence with the Public Service Association in particular before the election. For instance, if there is a statutory commercial operation in a particular area, the level of employment is dependent on the level of demand: it can rise or fall. What was being talked about was employment within those Government departments on which we had had representations made to us, and the undertaking there is not to let that employment fall below that 30 June level.

This has been controversial policy, because it has been interpreted in some sectors within the Service and in the trade union movement as well as meaning an undertaking to preserve employment in particular departments or areas. It is understood finally—but it certainly caused a lot of hassles earlier—that there was no such undertaking given and where I talked about—and this is consistent with the statements I made to the *News*—possible reductions in particular departments and particular areas, that is true. In fact, that has happened, based on needs and priorities in those areas, and it is clear from the figures that some departments lost employees during 1983-84, on a June 1984 to June 1983 comparison. There are 13 listed out of about 32 departments.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This is just a comparison of reference points that will be in the Public Service Board Report to be tabled shortly.

Mr OLSEN: There is something contradictory about this, even if we take the Premier's point that we are talking about employees in departments. The documents that the Premier tabled with the Budget statement indicate clearly that if one takes only employees in departments, which the Premier has argued are separate from statutory authorities (and I do not think there has been a growth in the statutory authorities, as the Premier is implying; in fact, there has not), the fact is that in departments themselves there has been an increase of about 1 400 persons since 30 June 1982. That is in the Budget papers the Premier tabled in Parliament when bringing down the Budget. The Premier has said that the trade unions have misinterpreted it, have taken his overall figure, and then reduced the departments, and that is not what he meant, and then he argued the other position. One cannot have it both ways. The fact is that overall—and it is in line with what the Premier argued in relation to the trade union movement as it relates to each department—there has been a 1 400 person increase.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Can the Leader of the Opposition refer me to particular documents?

Mr OLSEN: Employments Aspects of the 1984-85 Budget, page 7. It is a table headed 'Employees in South Australian Government Departments and State public sector employees June 1980 to June 1984.'

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think I referred to this matter in the Budget speech. We are talking about 240 or 250 persons, a 1.8 per cent increase, mainly in areas such as community welfare and correctional services. These are areas where we declared that a specific priority in increased employment was going to be made. Honourable members may recall that we made the announcement about teachers immediately after the election; in other words, each of the extras has been explained.

Mr OLSEN: On 30 June 1982 there were 49 410, and on 30 June 1984 there were 50 803. So, there was a 1 400 increase. That is clearly spelt out in the documents tabled in Parliament and it indicates there has not been a maintenance in the total numbers in the Public Service: there has been a significant growth in the number of persons employed in the Public Service under this Administration. That runs counter to and contradicts statements made by the Premier both in the *Advertiser* and the *News*.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There has been a very minimal increase at that level for reasons explained, and I have spelt them out on a number of occasions.

Mr OLSEN: A figure of 1 400 is different from 200. The Premier cannot explain away 1 400 into 200. Fair go!

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will look at the detail of those figures.

Mr OLSEN: I think the Premier should, because the plain facts are that the Premier—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I am sorry. Here is the reason: we are talking about full time equivalents. I thought that I was not going mad. As usual, the Leader of the Opposition cannot understand or read the figures: there is a difference.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There is no point in laughing in a stupid way. The Leader of the Opposition has already demonstrated this fact a couple of times today, and I have been fairly quiet and kindly about it. Please do not confuse the Committee. We are looking at a situation of full time equivalents: that is the only reasonable measure one can have. Now that I have seen the table, I realise that the Leader was looking at the number of persons. At any one time there are a number of persons involved, depending on the mix of full time and part time, and many factors relate to the number of persons actually employed at any one time. The relation of full time equivalent jobs is what we are talking about.

I repeat again that the differences there would correlate and are in areas which have been quite precisely spelt out. All I can say to the Committee is this: are they not areas of need? For instance, was there not the priority for correctional service officers? Did I not hear the shadow Minister demand that we employ more people and then a few weeks later say, 'Look at the cost per head of prisoners; you have employed too many people.'? Did I not hear people complaining about tax evasion and, more importantly, about delays in the Lands Titles Office? I recall the very question coming from a member opposite. Was it the member for Bragg? I cannot recall. One member asked that question. The answer is 'Yes, and we are trying to address the problem by employing more people.'

In the Woods and Forests area, one might recall the massive forest salvage operation which took place and which resulted in a large number of people being taken on for that purpose. There has been a big uptake in activity there. That is a commercial operation. If the honourable member was Managing Director of Myers or John Martins and there was a sudden upsurge in retail trade and he said, 'We will not put anyone on; we will allow the queues to grow longer and close the doors half an hour earlier,' he would be quite rightly criticised. Commercial operations such as Woods and Forests cannot afford to do that.

There have been specific decisions, made after careful assessment, to increase numbers in certain departments and for very pressing reasons; reasons which are often pressed on us by members opposite. But, there have also been reductions in other departments. If we are going to use figures, let us try to use them accurately.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier has had three separate positions in the past five minutes on Public Service numbers. First, he said that it was the *status quo* and that he maintained the 30 June 1982 numbers. The second position, when he got caught out on that, was that there were only 240. Then, when he got caught out on that, he argued the needs basis across the Public Service. So, we have had three positions in five minutes on Public Service numbers, which proves the point that the public has been misled.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: First, the undertaking was that we would not allow public sector numbers to go below that figure. That is not inconsistent with either of the other two positions. Secondly, there was some confusion over actual figures. It was not a different position—we were simply talking about the figures which were being used and which were totally wrong as far as the Opposition was concerned. Thirdly, I made the point that there are areas of need which require priority employment. Again, that is totally consistent with the position that I have held. They are not three

positions but part of the explanation of what is happening with the numbers. That is the answer to the question.

Mr BAKER: I believe there is a fourth position. The Premier has explained that he is in control of his own State departments only, but, when he was talking about full time equivalents, the Premier used the table that showed the position for the whole public sector. I wish the Premier understood what he is talking about, so that we could all get on very well. The table refers to full time equivalents for the State public sector and not just the Public Service. The Leader is right—there has been an increase of 1 400 persons in State Public Service Departments. That is fairly clear.

I refer to the Guerin Report, which was fairly scathing in regard to the inability of the Public Service Board to react to modern needs and which outlined a number of deficiencies. However, it did not go far enough in many ways in relation to the sort of changes that are needed. It was recommended that there be a restructuring. The Premier set aside \$100 000 for a management improvement programme, and he has appointed Mr Strickland on a part time basis as Chairman of the Board. Yet, he maintains a fairly substantial commitment to the Public Service Board. There is an increase from \$5.7 million to \$6.1 million in the 1984-85 Budget. I gained the impression that, if the programme recommended by the Guerin Report was put in train, there would be a reduction of resources going into the area called the Public Service Board, whether it became a Government management resource or whatever. Will the Premier explain the inconsistency? On the one hand he is going to take up the Guerin Report, but on the other hand there seems to be no reduction in the funds available to the Public Service Board to carry on its activities.

Mr OLSEN: The 'no soft options' approach.

Mr BAKER: Yes. It is marvellous.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Budget has been prepared on the basis that there are no precise timings. The honourable member has been a member of the Public Service and knows how budgeting works. Most of the departmental Budget estimates and bids are prepared for the end of the financial year and are subject to assessment in the course of the Budget process. Whatever structural changes or rearrangements take place, those functions must still be carried out. They will be carried out by the Public Service Board in its present form, so long as there is a Public Service Board in its present form. I have already indicated that we do not have precise time tables because of the consultation process involved with the changes. In that case it would clearly be an improvement not to budget for the full year. As changes take place over the year, adjustments can and will be made. It is not inconsistent but simply sensible budgeting to ensure that contingencies are covered. At the moment we are embarking on the programme on that basis.

Mr BAKER: Then we can expect a cost saving on the Public Service Board line in 1984-85. Is that a reasonable expectation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Not necessarily, no.

Mr OLSEN: It is a Clayton's cut. Further to questions asked by the member for Albert Park on the school leavers programme, I ask the Premier to table in due course an age profile of the Public Service. Reference has been made to the age profile of the Public Service being top heavy, so it would be interesting for us to look at its age profile. I know that that will not be available today, but if that could be tabled in due course it would be appreciated.

In relation to the 371 proceeding to 400 school leavers coming into the Public Service this year, how many are from the country? I draw the Premier's attention to the fact

that, with the advertisement that went into the paper, a country person applying, and submitting that application in time prior to the closing, simply would not get a turnaround in correspondence to enable him or her to reply. I am interested to know how many country children are in the school leavers programme.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: On the first point, an age profile was published in the review of Government services management. I draw the attention of Opposition members to an update of that publication. It does not change drastically year by year. It will be in the Public Service Board report.

Mr OLSEN: I was thinking of 30 June this year.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It will be in the Public Service Report. I will ask the Chairman of the Board to answer the question about access to country children.

Mr OLSEN: When is it anticipated that the Public Service Board report will be available?

Mr Strickland: It should be within two months, and there will be a specific section on that matter this year following matters that we pointed out in previous years. In relation to the recruitment of country school leavers and country young unemployed, we did make a very specific effort to include them this year. The regional co-ordinators based at Whyalla and Mount Gambier went out to schools and explained it ahead of time. We placed advertisements in country newspapers. Whilst I cannot give the Leader specific numbers of those that came in, as the overall number of applications was around 7 000 throughout the State, I will obtain that information. I believe that we made a special effort to include country people this year. Many Aborigines come from the northern areas, and we were pleased that we had 40 applicants under the school leavers programme from people of Aboriginal background.

Ms LENEHAN: In providing the information, could we have a breakdown by sex to see how many young women were employed through the school leaver recruitment programme?

Mr Strickland: Yes, we have that, too.

Mr BAKER: I refer to the TAS Scheme. That is the treasury accounting system, if the Premier is not aware. The Public Service Board explanation says that the TAS scheme introduction has been applied to 1984-85. I know that when I was in the Public Service the TAS scheme was to be implemented as a matter of high priority. We have the Public Service Board, which is supposed to be directing management throughout the service, not having introduced the system into its own department. How can we justify the delay of what I believe to be a sound accounting system for so long?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That question would be better directed to the Treasury, which is in charge of the implementation of the accounting system, although the Board does have a role in its implementation. Perhaps the Chairman could respond.

Mr Strickland: The Treasury Accounting System, which is a Government wide effort to bring together financial information on a common basis, is being implemented department by department. The honourable member would have to ask the Under Treasurer where each department lies in the programme of implementation. However, as specific problems arise concerning departmental systems coming on to the programme, the Public Service Board's Financial Consulting Unit, which is in the Management Systems and Review Division, provides technical assistance. The part that has been referred to in the Board's programme estimates relates to that. It is a very complex system; that should be understood.

Mr BAKER: I am aware of that.

Mr Strickland: It cannot be introduced overnight. As to the speed of introduction the honourable member should ask the Under Treasurer.

Mr BAKER: As the Public Service Board is perceived to be the front line Department setting the framework of operations (and the Guerin Report refers specifically to restructuring of the role of the Public Service Board), I think it is inconceivable that it has not been introduced.

Mr Strickland: I have no firm date, but I could get it for the honourable member if he so required.

Mr Betts: It is expected to be this financial year.

Mr OLSEN: On page 29 of the Estimates, we are told that more than \$32 000 was overspent last financial year on office machines and equipment. Can the Premier say what equipment that comprised?

Mr Betts: The sum of \$34 000 was spent on a new word processing machine to replace the stand alone unit that we had previously. In addition, two visual display units were acquired for the implementation of the supplementary national general ledger system in departments. One was for our own use in the Public Service Board and we have converted to that system over the last financial year. The other was for use by the Financial Consulting Unit, which is providing a consultancy service to agencies in moving from the common accounts and reporting system to the new software international general ledger system to which I have referred. In addition, two IBM computers were acquired during the year at a cost of about \$20 000. One was for use on work force monitoring. That function has subsequently gone to Treasury, so that item of equipment has gone with the group of people that have been transferred. The other computer was for use in the Management Systems and Review Division, which provides a system consultancy service to agencies. In addition, there was an IBM controller, valued at about \$10 000. These specific items were networked with the main frame computer at the Government Computing Centre. Another item was a printer costing about \$1 000.

Mr OLSEN: We have been told that the Public Service Board has submitted for Cabinet approval a proposal for an early retirement scheme to provide for people over the age of 55 years who are working in certain departments with certain classifications. Under that scheme employees will be offered two weeks pay for each year of service with a maximum of 52 weeks pay, and with a time limit of three months in which to accept the early retirement scheme. What is Cabinet's determination of this matter?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That was part of a larger investigation into various matters. The previous Government instituted an early retirement scheme for blue collar, daily paid workers. The question was raised as to whether that sort of scheme would be suitable and effective for white collar clerical workers. The proposal was investigated and the mechanics of how that would operate on a service-wide basis were explored. There have been instances of limited special arrangements being made in some cases. This proposal was considered at Cabinet committee level, and it was decided that the scheme was not practicable, nor could it be implemented successfully to give net benefits. So, such a scheme will not be introduced.

Mr OLSEN: When the Premier says 'net benefits', does he mean that the benefit was not apparent in dollar savings, despite the reduction in Public Service numbers?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is a whole question of cost benefit. In fact, the cost savings of such a programme did

not stack up. As with attrition programmes, one is still confronted with the problem that the wrong people take advantage of the scheme at the wrong time, thus causing major dislocations in the work force. This in turn means that one must fill gaps or repair the function at greater expense than the scheme itself embodied. I believe that we learnt a bit from the experiences of the previous Government in that respect both as regards attrition and uniform early retirement. Both tend to be sledgehammer mechanisms that end up costing more than the benefit in cost savings would suggest.

Mr OLSEN: The reduction in the Public Service by 3 700 with a consequent annual saving running into tens of millions of dollars has helped the Government's Budget over the past two years more than would have been the case had the early retirement scheme not been implemented by the former Administration.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Most of this was in areas of construction departments and in the blue collar work force where, in fact, the Government is still paying out large sums. It just transferred it from paying directly to the daily paid labour force of the Government to payment to contractors for the Government. Certainly, we have successfully worked out of the system the problem that we had when we came to office: double payment was going on. Because the scheme was not comprehensive enough on the part of the previous Government and because of its no-retrenchment policy, which we certainly support, people in Government with skills were being paid to sit on their backsides to do nothing while contractors were being paid to do the work that they could have done, with the result that there was an enormously wasteful double payment.

One of the first things that we did was to adopt a policy of ensuring that the work force that we had was fully and productively employed and that we did not have to pay twice. Although it is true that there was a reduction in the staff and in the direct Public Service wages bill, the other side of the equation was what had to be paid for contract projects and through the capital works that would have been paid for directly through the wages bill. So, the saving is illusory, because the scheme was not fine-tuned enough. That has been demonstrated beyond argument. So, in this Budget we are making special provision of \$3 million to which the construction departments will have access on the basis of properly developed programmes to ensure maximum efficient use of the work force, thus solving the problem. By establishing it in a central pool on which they draw, we thus put on them the responsibility of developing those programmes and ensuring that they are directly related to it.

Let us not be under any illusion that, merely because one ceases to pay public servants to fulfil a function, that is a saving, because that function is no longer carried out. For example, if we privatised the education system, we would merely be turning the cost burden of directly funding our own State Government system to grant support for private or non-Government organisations to fulfil the same function.

I would suggest to the honourable member that probably the costs would be identical. The matter of privatisation is a philosophical one: the question of cost savings is not. The policies of the previous Government resulted in double payment and gross inefficiencies. If the former Government had stayed in Government and that policy had been allowed to continue, the financial problems that we had would have been compounded even more.

Mr OLSEN: I am not entitled to debate that matter with the Premier, but what we have just heard is arrant nonsense.

Ms LENEHAN: I refer to the Equal Employment Opportunity Programme Development sub-programme and to a component of that which is the Individual Departmental Equal Opportunity Management Plan. What is the current status of the Equal Opportunity Management Plan within the various departments of the service? Also, is the implementation of that plan on schedule and, if it is not, is that because of a lack of staff or promotional funding? Finally, how closely is the implementation of the plan being monitored?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We did not achieve the equal opportunity planning objectives proposed under that development sub-programme referred to. The increase over 1983-84 income in fact indicates that the management plan schemes are about to come on stream. In fact, eight departments have been identified to undertake pilot studies in 1984-85. Work is now under way, and the resources have been provided. For example, the Public Service Board, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Agriculture, Education, Technical and Further Education, Labour, Environment and Planning and Community Welfare Departments, are involved. A range of departments carrying out quite disparate functions are involved. Included are two of the central departments, the PSB and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, as well as the policy type of departments, such as Environment and Planning, and service delivery departments such as Education and Community Welfare. Therefore, there is a good mix of departments. The pilot schemes will provide the basis on which we can expand the schemes to include other departments. One of the problems in this area is that one must work with departments that are supportive of and willing to operate the programmes.

Experience has indicated that if a scheme is imposed without that initial commitment it does not develop well and is then used as evidence that such things cannot work and that it was a failure. Somehow a commitment to such a scheme must be built into the personnel management function. Much of the preliminary work has been done in the departments that I have referred to, and in a sense they have volunteered to assist by indicating their interest and commitment to the programme, thus providing a much better base than that provided by the previous attempt to set up a blanket programme in which it was envisaged that everyone would try to participate, although not everyone had made a commitment to it. Once the programmes can be demonstrated to be working within those participating departments, obviously the achievements in those departments can be demonstrated to other departments and the network can be extended.

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Premier give a clear indication of the status of Aboriginal employment in the Public Service? I am interested in how it compares with other States and in some indication of how well or otherwise we are doing in South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The National Employment Scheme for Aborigines (NESA) is run and funded by the Commonwealth Government. The Government has been employing and assisting trainees in that scheme, and in the past 12 months some nine trainees have gained permanent employment in the Public Service. Admittedly, it is only a handful, but from that small beginning we hope that the number will expand considerably. Since its introduction in 1977 South Australia has had the highest intake of NESA trainees in the Commonwealth. The numbers are not large (some 450), but nonetheless the number is significant having regard to the size of the Aboriginal population and the people participating in the scheme. While trainees can apply for normal entry into the Public Service, often they are disad-

vantaged because they do not have suitable educational qualifications or appropriate skills.

Therefore, we are attempting to provide strategies whereby those skills can be developed, so that in time people can apply for employment, or if they have trainee status in the public sector they can then automatically qualify for jobs, because of their skills obtained. We see it as a very positive programme which does not plant people into jobs but which provides them with skills prior to their establishment in a job. Under the School Leaver Programme (which I think the Chairman of the Board mentioned earlier), we have in fact identified four people of Aboriginal background who have gone on to full-time work. It is a small beginning, but I think the programme will lead to further work in this area.

Ms LENEHAN: I have previously worked with an Aboriginal trainee, and I wholeheartedly support the NESA scheme. I refer to the Equal Employment Opportunity for Disabled Persons sub-programme (page 65 of the yellow book). To what extent is this training being implemented, are intellectually disabled people in the community being afforded the opportunity of vocational on the job training, and what has been the success rate of the scheme?

Mr Strickland: The intellectually disabled comprise only a section of the wider disabled group, and I think the honourable member would probably be aware that we have an officer employed in the Equal Opportunity Unit of the Public Service Board who is intellectually disabled. He has performed an absolutely astonishing task, and it makes one wonder why we have not afforded such people more opportunity in the past. There is an initial problem with, say, speech or something like that, but once that is overcome the contribution that such people can make is really quite amazing.

Since the inception of the total scheme in 1981, 34 people have been trained on it, and of that number 28 have secured ongoing employment in the South Australian public sector. That was a very pleasing result. Our allocation for next year is \$53 800. We want to take into the scheme 14 more people, and in terms of ongoing employment we are hoping for a success rate similar to that which has occurred in the past.

Mr BAKER: In reference to a previous question asked about the decrease in the day labour force within the public sector, will the Premier admit that those resources were underutilised at the time when the scheme was brought in and that we did not get anything for the money that was allocated? Secondly, having identified that there was a \$60 million saving in salaries, has the Premier identified the additional costs arising through this transitional period which would have been borne by the Government?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: First, yes, there was some under-utilisation; indeed that had been identified in 1978 (on from 1977). With the winding down of some big projects and the squeeze on capital funds, that was certainly true. Of course, that was compounded under the period of the last Administration by the massive transfer of capital funds in order to prop up the recurrent budget, and that further reduced the capability of some of those capital programmes that might have kept that work force employed. I do not deny that there is a problem. Indeed, my Government has addressed that problem.

There has been further reduction in some sectors of that daily paid work force in the period we have been in office, for that very reason. As the honourable member well understands, I am talking about the way in which one tackles that problem. I have not done the precise calculation—setting up the putative savings of an early retirement scheme and the consequent reduction in numbers against the outgoings on the other side—but it was a fact of life that we had a situation of wasteful double payment.

I am not suggesting that the Government did that deliberately. It certainly deliberately had the policy to put as much work into the private sector as it could, and it did not care greatly that that resulted in extra expense. However, it is the blunt nature of an attrition policy or early retirement scheme that leaves, for instance, a particular gang short of one skilled individual. Unless one is prepared to employ that skill in that gang, the whole gang is rendered useless. If one cannot dismiss that gang, or if it is not taking part in the redundancy scheme, people sit in the depot and do nothing because they cannot fulfil the work commitment of that aspect of a project. One has to let it out to private contractors. That kind of problem was very costly: I have not done a detailed exercise on it, but it just stands out in the accounts.

Mr BAKER: I want to make the point that these things are not clean. The previous Government had enough guts to take some measures, and there are some costs, as we all know, with this exercise, but the ultimate savings to Government—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): Will the honourable member come to order. We are not debating these questions. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Treasury, \$91 862 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J.W. Olsen

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, Treasury Department.
Mr P.J. Emery, Deputy Under Treasurer, Treasury Department.
Mr L.B. Kidd, Assistant Under Treasurer, Treasury Department.
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant, Treasury Department.
Mr P.C. Cornish, Commissioner for State Taxation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): I declare the vote open for examination.

Mr OLSEN: Will the successor to Mr Barnes as Under Treasurer come from within the existing Treasury officer ranks?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That has not been determined. Obviously, with such a senior and crucial position, it is in the interests of Government to test the market, as it were; that process is under way at the moment.

Mr OLSEN: I presume by the Premier's comments that he will advertise the position Australia wide. What does he mean by 'test the market'?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I mean that the position will be advertised, and in that way the market will be tested.

Mr OLSEN: When does the Premier expect a decision to be made?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I hope that we will have a successor identified prior to the Under Treasurer's retirement in November.

Mr OLSEN: I note that line 5 provides for a proposed allocation of \$2.6 million to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, which is the rebate of liquor licence fees of 9 per cent. Does the Premier intend to introduce legislation to amend the Licensing Act to reflect the current rate being charged? If not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, eventually. The most convenient time would be when the Licensing Act is before the House. No problems are being experienced in terms of the current arrangements. An administrative process has to be gone through; that will be done in the interim.

Mr OLSEN: I now refer to assistance to home buyers under the Housing Loans Redemption Fund, to which page 93 of the yellow book and page 32 (line 7), of the Estimates of Payments relate. It is stated that the future of the fund is to be considered upon receipt of proposals currently being developed by the SGIC in relation to mortgage life insurance provided as an alternative to Housing Loan Redemption Fund membership. A private sector insurer has been invited to submit a proposal in relation to the provision of mortgage protection facilities. If not, will tenders be called before a final decision is made on the future of the fund?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I cannot answer that. I will ascertain the information and advise the Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Supplementary to that question, is it Government policy not to include the private sector in submitting proposals for such an alternative?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, it is not Government policy to exclude the private sector.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In relation to that question, since the last meeting of the Estimates Committees a new Housing and Construction Ministry has been developed. Why is it that, in the detail associated with any package directly related to improving availability of housing or benefits for home ownership, this particular measure is not contained within that Minister's portfolio?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It has been traditionally administered as a financial matter through Treasury. This year for the first time the housing capital programme has been transferred to the Minister of Housing and Construction. This is still under the purview of Treasury, which handles accounting, checking and things of that nature, so it is appropriate that it remains there. I do not think its particular location is vital. It is an insurance programme, and as such is financial rather than house construction.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Line 3 on page 33 of the Estimates of Payments deals with provision of economic policy advice. Between the June quarter 1983 and June 1984 the index points contribution to the total CPI for Adelaide of selected State and local government charges was 0.57 index points, which is nearly three times the national contribution of 0.21 index points. If the Adelaide contribution had equated to the national movement, Adelaide's CPI would have been 10 per cent lower, that is from 3.6 per cent down to 3.3 per cent. Has the Premier received advice on the impact of this Government's revenue raising initiatives on the CPI for Adelaide during 1984-85? I raise that question against this unit, which is the unit charged with the responsibility for the provision of economic policy advice.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: At the time of the revenue package which was announced in August 1983, and which was in operation in the 1983-84 Budget, certain estimates were made and put before the House on those impacts. In fact, this Budget does not involve increases in those imposts; therefore there will be no specific or extraordinary effect in that area in 1984-85.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On what basis does the Treasurer substantiate the claim that there has been no effect when it is demonstrable that there has been a .3 per cent greater cost in this State than elsewhere?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That was based on the 1983-84 revenue measures. That effect has now worked itself into the system and obviously, unless there are charges in the rates, upwards or downwards, there will be no change in impact.

Mr BAKER: I refer to economic policy advice and the relationship between the unit in Treasury and the unit in the Premier's Department. Is there a conflict of resources in that regard? Secondly, I am concerned about the ultimate effect of taxes and charges on the population and choosing those taxes and charges that have minimum impact. Has the Premier asked any of the Treasury or his departmental officers to look into the impact on employment in this State of the increased charges that are being imposed?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The functions are different although it is always useful for Government to have some alternative sources of advice. The role of the Economics Unit in the Premier's Department is to collect the base data, to look at indicators, to work with the Bureau of Statistics, to conduct its own surveys and information. That information is fed into the Treasury considerations, the Budget process. For instance, the Economic and Expenditure Committee of Cabinet which meets regularly always has a presentation of current indicators and current economic performance from the Economics Unit. The Treasury economic policy advice relates to those areas of Government Treasury and financial policy in specific terms and the efforts are complementary rather than in conflict.

As to the impact of the imposts on employment and so on, yes, attempts are made to make those assessments. For instance, that is what is behind a decision not to go the way of some other States—Tasmania, Victoria and New South Wales—in imposing a general levy on pay-roll tax, because quite clearly there are regressive employment effects from that. In terms of economic impact on employment, of course, one must look not just at the cost structure and what that involves but the employment effect of Government revenue deterioration, or a big blowout in the Government deficit, or the Government's interest bill. All of those factors have a major effect on employment and the net effect of our revenue measures has been favourable. That is most demonstrable in the actual figures themselves.

Mr BAKER: In view of the relatively poor performance of this State in securing revenue from the tax sharing arrangements in this financial year, does the Premier attribute that to the lack of resources in good financial policy advice or is there some other factor he would like to distinguish for the very poor return from the last Premiers Conference?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not agree that there has been a very poor return. Comparatively speaking we are holding our own. The crucial factor is our population base; it is as simple as that. The computation on Commonwealth tax sharing for revenue purposes, as I thought the honourable member knew, is based on population. We have been in a situation where our share has been at risk quite considerably through that one factor alone, and that is why there is considerable concern about the review of the Grants Commission and what it might do to South Australia's current share of tax grants. We have certainly got a big task, part of which is to argue that South Australia has special reasons for getting more favourable consideration than some of the other States.

I would say that, looking at that base from which we operate, we are performing quite well but that does not overlook the difficulties we have. Our Treasury officers are extremely respected at the national level, by the Federal

Treasury and their other counterparts. One of the things I think that has aided us is that we do have a reputation in this State in relation to the Federal Government for providing pretty straight factual information. While that has some disadvantages at times if we wanted to obscure some of the facts, in the long run I think that does yield benefits. Our extreme vulnerability is not due to any lack of competence but to pure demographic facts of life.

Mr BAKER: In asking those questions, I was referring particularly to the need of the Government to be able to argue on the basis of other areas of need, and the Premier has determined that on a population basis we are not going to do sufficiently well, as we have done in previous years for various other reasons, at the financial conference. That goes back to the fact that I know that, when I was associated with the Public Service, there was evidence of the enormous resources provided in certain States for the creation of need on different bases to the one which the Commonwealth has accepted now.

The ultimate decision taken on the new Financial Agreement is some reflection that we have failed to sell a particular argument. Will the Premier be seeking further outside financial advice on some of the matters affecting government, or will he continue to rely on the resources of Treasury as his major means of determining Budget strategy and the relationship with the Commonwealth?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There is no question that the Government's primary source of advice, its expertise, is in the Treasury. We have an extremely skilled and professional staff—I give the honourable member the benefit of not being interrupted so that he can hear my answer—with a very high reputation. The Leader of the Opposition suggests that it is condescending. I suggest that this former member of the Public Service, the member for Mitcham, has been somewhat more than condescending in the remarks he has been making about Treasury officers and the level of their advice. I would have thought that he would know better.

Mr OLSEN: Further to that, there is no need to advertise outside for Treasury officers for the next Under Treasurer. That is the point we are making. The Premier is saying that he has to advertise elsewhere for an Under Treasurer. We are saying that he does not need to do that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): Order! The session has been going very well and in a very orderly manner, and I cannot accept cross interjections.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I appreciate the point that the Leader of the Opposition is making, but it is in direct contradiction to the member for Mitcham's asking what outside sources of financial advice I am taking in relation to the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement and whether I will just rely on Treasury. That is not consistent with the approach being taken by other members of the Opposition, but he has a right to his own opinions. However, for instance in our examination of the review of Government financial management, we did have a private sector input, and in other areas there is consultation with the private sector. In fact, with the formulation of the South Australian Government Financing Authority and other initiatives in the financial field, the interface between Treasury and the private sector has developed to a very great extent, and I think that there is a lot of mutual respect.

Therefore, we are certainly well equipped in terms of our dealings with the Commonwealth and the Financial Agreement. I do not agree that we have done comparatively badly if one considers the sort of base on which we operate. There is no doubt that the States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, have been pressing for a revised Commonwealth Financial Agreement. The Grants Commission undergoes its investigation, as is its statutory duty, and then

we have to try to haggle around the outcome of that to minimise the disadvantages that may flow to South Australia.

However, let me say that one of the factors involved in this, which members of the Opposition should note well, is that we have Buckley's chance of making a strong case for special Commonwealth assistance *vis-a-vis* other States if we are not demonstrating some sort of tax effort on our own. In other words, it is all very well to say (as members of the Opposition try to say) that we have the lowest per capita tax in Australia. I simply point out that, if we go to the Grants Commission or anywhere else, on that basis the first question that will be asked of South Australia is, 'You are fourth or fifth in population, providing levels of services sometimes in the first or second order. What effort are you making from your own resources to pay for it?'

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is no greater than that fourth or fifth level operation. The argument that is put to us (and indeed the previous Government would have been in horrendous trouble over this) was, 'You can get support from the Commonwealth or the Grants Commission recommendations to the extent that you are prepared to demonstrate that you have some self-help.' A Government that allows its own tax base to erode will not get support from those quarters because the other States will simply say, 'Why should we be raising more within our own resources, getting less, and seeing the value of that destroyed by South Australia (or whatever State), which is making no tax effort itself and which is getting compensation from the Federal Government?' One just cannot sustain that argument, and anyone who has had experience in Federal financial relations would know that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Premier certainly would get 150 per cent for effort in the taxing field. I return to my previous question about why South Australia was .3 per cent above the weighted average for the State capitals in relation to the CPI, and refer the Premier to his own answer, pointing out to him that, in the Australian Bureau of Statistics catalogue No. 6401.0, we find that South Australia was so far in advance of the other States because of Government owned dwelling rents, water and sewerage rates, motor vehicle registration fees, driver's licence fees, urban bus fares, urban rail and tram fares, and so it goes on.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: What is the date of that bulletin?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: That bulletin would be in relation to the figures at the end of the June 1984 quarter. In relation to the same area of activity in respect of the CPI, what advice has the Premier had from Treasury this year in relation to the estimates of the CPI for Adelaide in relation to 12-monthly changes between each quarter during 1984-85 (that is the prediction) and the underlying rate of inflation for 1984-85? What projections have there been of South Australia's position in relation to the CPI and the underlying expected rate of inflation? Will the Premier explain the assumptions that underpin his estimates of those quarterly rises?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The assumption we have made is that we will remain by and large over time. There may be variations from quarter to quarter in line with the national performance. The honourable member has drawn attention to a particular quarter and a particular element of that. In fact, our CPI percentage has varied on a quarter to quarter basis, sometimes being below and sometimes above. In fact, in the September 1983 quarter we were .2 per cent lower than the national eight capitals average. In the December 1983 quarter we were .4 per cent lower than the weighted capital average. We were .4 per cent above it in March 1984, when there was a minus effect nationally and we remained steady.

The reason for that is that the impact of the Medicare effect was greater in the other States than it was here. It was not specifically charge related. In the June 1984 quarter we were exactly the same as the eight capitals average. I would like the honourable member to bear in mind also that the CPI measures changes: it does not compare the bases. For instance, if Housing Trust rents increase they will, of course, have some impact on the CPI, but that does not say anything about where in relative terms those rents lie in the cost of living scheme of things. In other words, the CPI is a measure of movement, not a measure of actual cost, and our cost of living overall is still in many areas extremely favourable compared with those of other States. Our level of transport fares, rents, and so on, is quite low. Electricity charges have been the subject of discussion recently. It is often forgotten that we have the lowest general level of electricity tariffs of all the mainland States.

Mr OLSEN: That is Victoria.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is not so. I am talking about before any changes take place. However, at a time before changes take place we have the lowest level, except for Tasmania, which has always traditionally had much cheaper power because of its hydroelectric scheme. That is often forgotten because people look at the increase without looking at the relative standard of what has happened elsewhere. So, I think that one should always maintain that perspective.

Mr BAKER: Is it true that, if we discount the royalties, which is taxation received on resource development projects, and compare our level of taxation per capita on the basis of average weekly earnings per State, we are in fact the highest taxed State in the country?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not think that is correct: we are about fourth or fifth.

Mr BAKER: No, that is not true.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think it is true.

Mr BAKER: What is your basis of saying that we are fourth or fifth?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I would like the honourable member to produce the evidence. If there is a substantial increase in royalty income, one should bear in mind that that in turn provides the capacity to lower other forms of revenue raising. So, it is relevant in that sense, but the figures are not as the honourable member states.

Mr OLSEN: Does the Government contemplate any further revenue raising initiatives this financial year? I draw the Premier's attention to page 99 of the yellow book, which states that one of the Treasury's specific targets will be to assist in the preparation of legislation for revenue raising initiatives. I should have thought that we had covered every revenue raising initiative that one could have thought of over the past 12 months to two years in South Australia. That statement suggests that there has been some discussion between the Government and Treasury on further revenue raising measures. I ask the Premier to specify what is contemplated.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I do not know that anything specific is contemplated. Our revenue raising is under constant review. If legislative changes are needed they are made. For instance, we have talked about one: at such time as amendments to the Licensing Act come before Parliament we will move to alter the revenue raising in that area by formalising the 11 per cent rate, reducing it from 12 per cent. Revenue raising refers to the category—not to whether one is actually increasing it as opposed to decreasing it. A constant assessment is going on. I might add that it includes tax avoidance as well. A number of initiatives are in train in that area and, to the extent that we can close those loopholes, equally we can lower tax rates.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier give an undertaking that he will not impose further tax measures during the remainder of this Parliamentary term?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Leader of the Opposition is very keen on these constant requests for an undertaking. I remind the Leader of a promise I made in 1982 in good faith based on the information as I then understood it. As one can imagine, that has made me very wary about giving blanket undertakings in the light of our financial experience in this State. I am simply not prepared to give undertakings in that way.

As I said in the Budget speech, I believe that we now have the State's finances on an even keel—on to the sort of balance that will not require major revenue raising initiatives—and, provided that the economic recovery continues, I am very confident that that will be so. However, I again remind the Committee of the implications of the Commonwealth tax sharing review that is being undertaken by the Grants Commission. That could have very serious implications for the State and the State's finances. So, that is the only reply that I can give and it is the only honest reply that is called for in the circumstances.

Mr OLSEN: I therefore ask the question: was it not a very honest statement that the Premier made in 1982, or does he have no faith whatsoever in the past two years in which he has been acting as Treasurer of this State? The Premier is not prepared to indicate that over the next 15 months he will not undertake further tax raising measures, yet he was prepared to do so prior to 1982, and he has been controlling the books in the past two years.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Equally, it might be possible to reduce some of our revenue imposts. Does the Leader of the Opposition want me to give an undertaking that I will not reduce any taxes?

Mr OLSEN: I would be pleased if the Premier could give some relief to the poor old taxpayer whom he has slugged with 142 individual charges and a tax hike of 39.7 per cent, unknown in this State, over the past two years. It has been clearly pointed out to the Estimates Committee that, if the Premier wanted to qualify to Loan Council and Premiers Conferences as a State that had tried to increase its tax base, he would have to take first prize.

The Premier earlier referred to a number of reports in relation to the Government review of its financial management and said that they are being progressively received and released. I understand that a summary of those investigations will be available in about November this year. Can the Premier indicate the results that have been reported to him to date and will he consider releasing those reports for public comment?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, as I indicated earlier, I intend to release them for public comment: they are very valuable documents. However, I cannot indicate what is contained in the reports because Cabinet has not had an opportunity to consider and approve them for release; nor have I been able to look at more than one or two of the preliminary reports in detail. As I have indicated, there are a series of reports. The preparation of the Budget and the Budget process has meant that I have not been able to devote the time necessary to assess them; that will be done in the next two or three weeks. I hope to have those documents generally available for discussion. This will be a very valuable contribution to the understanding of public financing in this State.

Mr OLSEN: I have mentioned the number of State charge increases since November 1982 (142 increases). An attempt by the Opposition to ascertain the amount of additional revenue collected by the Government from the increase in those charges by submission of Questions on Notice was unsuccessful.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: What line is the Leader referring to?

Mr OLSEN: I am referring to the Estimates of Payments, page 33, line 8. Will the Premier give an undertaking that all future reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in relation to increases in State charges will indicate the estimated additional revenue to be collected or obtained for the remainder of that financial year as well as the full year effect on revenue so that, when it becomes before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and the Parliament, we are aware of the income that the Government will derive, first, from that financial year and, secondly, for a full financial year.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In most instances those figures have been available.

Mr OLSEN: No, they have not.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In fact, they have usually indicated how ludicrous the attacks by the Opposition on the increases have been, because in many cases the amount of revenue that the 142 charges has raised is perhaps some thousands of dollars, and very often it simply relates to either the cost of collection or the general rate of inflation.

Mr OLSEN: Can I respond to that by saying—

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been very lenient. I point out that we are creeping into a debate about matters that are really not in the lines. I hope that we do not continue in that vein, although I will allow the Leader to qualify the situation.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier said that that information was available. The fact is that it has not been made available. I placed a Question on Notice seeking that information, and that specific information was denied. I received the response to the Question on Notice, and I can show it to the Treasurer if he cannot recall that the information was denied to the Opposition. So, it is simply not available. It is a legitimate piece of information that ought to be given to the Parliament when these increases are made.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is up to the Committee. I hope the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to support the financing needed for the extra resources to supply this information.

Mr OLSEN: I point out that it is page 33, line 8, programme 5 'Provision of Financial Policy Advice'. So, there has been an increase of funds to make that information available. I refer to programme 5, page 33 line 8, and to the yellow book where it makes reference to advice given through SAFA in relation to fund raising and fund management. The 1983-84 Budget papers provided for an estimated intake of funds from statutory authorities amounting to \$127.5 million. For the 11 months to May 1984, only \$25 million had been sourced to the Budget. During June a further amount of \$109 million was obtained from statutory authorities, resulting in a year end intake of \$134 million—\$6.5 million above Budget estimates. Does the Premier agree that his actions in exceeding a planned intake of funds into the Budget from statutory authorities by \$6.5 million has the effect of artificially reducing the deficit on Consolidated Account from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million at 30 June 1984?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will ask the Chairman of SAFA, Mr Barnes, to respond to that.

Mr Barnes: There are two separate points to be made, the first being that of timing. One of the objectives behind the setting up of SAFA is to raise money at less cost than previously. The second objective is to better marshal cash in the system and to use it and defer borrowing into the future, because the longer we can push off borrowing the more we can run down cash in hand and, in the normal course, the more we can decrease the net cost of borrowing. Normally it costs more to borrow funds for the long term

than one gets in return by investing funds for the short term. So, if we can use those funds that would otherwise be invested for the short term and push off that borrowing, we will tend to reduce cost. That is the basic reason for the bunching of borrowing towards the end of the year. We push off borrowing into the future.

The picture is more complicated than this, but the main single reason for the additional borrowing towards the end of the year is that, on the payment side of Consolidated Account under capital, there is a single item of \$10 million which was not in the Budget. That is authorised by special Acts, advance for capital purposes to the Local Government Finance Authority. If one wanted to mark dollar notes and allocate additional borrowing to a purpose, the one most closely comparable would be to, say, additional borrowing to finance an additional loan at interest—something without a net impact on the recurrent Budget. That is an additional loan bearing interest to finance a loan to an authority, the Local Government Finance Authority itself bearing interest to leave the recurrent side of the Budget in the same net position. That is a little artificial, as you do not mark dollar notes.

Mr OLSEN: The net effect of that, because \$6.5 million came in, is to reduce the deficit from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million. It artificially deflates.

Mr Barnes: I would not say 'artificially', but all other things being equal, if a Government made only one decision to advance \$10 million to the Local Government Finance Authority and did not make the corresponding decision to obtain additional funds, the answer to the Leader's question would be 'Yes'. That second decision reduced the deficit on Consolidated Account below what it would have been.

Mr OLSEN: So, we have seen at 30 June this year a figure brought in on Consolidated Account that had been reduced as a result of that. The \$6.5 million extra that has been brought in through the system over and above what normally would be taken from statutory authorities (or was anticipated in the Budget would be taken from statutory authorities) has the effect of taking the Consolidated Account deficit down from \$8.1 million to \$1.6 million, which was the 30 June 1984 result.

Mr Barnes: That is true and, for illustration, had we taken another decision not to advance the—

Mr OLSEN: That is the point. The member for Light is saying that any account not paid until 1 July would affect the figure. To proceed further on funds invested by statutory authorities, the Budget papers revealed that the planned intake of funds from statutory authorities is \$150.57 million—\$14.67 million in excess of the authorised Loan Council borrowings programme of \$135.9 million. In his annual report, the Auditor-General, in referring to the South Australian Government Financing Authority, stated:

Three factors need to be watched carefully in using these funds—that is, the SAFA funds—for public purposes:

1. that the funds so used are channelled through the Consolidated Account, so that prior Parliamentary scrutiny of their intended use and effect on the State Budget can be made;
2. that those funds are not used as a device to expand the capital works programme in order to avoid difficult decisions with respect to project priorities;
3. their use does not accelerate the growth of the net impact of debt servicing costs on the Consolidated Account and on taxation.

The additional intake of funds from statutory authorities over the two-year period to 30 June 1985 is estimated to be \$22.2 million. That is taking the end 1984 and end 1985 figures. An additional \$22.2 million in borrowings to fund some of the promises makes it seem that additional borrowings will be needed, which the taxpayer of the State

must service by way of increased taxation. Will the Premier confirm that that will be the case: that, because we have exceeded it by \$22.2 million, there will be a debt servicing cost which the taxpayers will have to pick up?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I was going to comment generally that this must be set off against the strategy which was first adopted last year, which has been repeated this year, and to which specific attention has been drawn, namely of nominating all of our Loan Council borrowings (which were \$127.6 million in 1983 or \$135.9 million in 1984-85) for welfare housing. By so doing, we attract a concessional interest rate for the housing programme. That means, of course, that we must borrow and use statutory authorities as a source of deposit funds with the Government. Perhaps the Under Treasurer would like to comment.

Mr Barnes: What the Treasurer said is correct. For any given total of capital activity, the borrowings to finance it will cost the Budget less if ways can be found of doing some borrowings at concessional rates. Putting to one side the major question—which is obviously one for the Treasurer himself—for any Government the grand total of the capital programme is a major matter of Government policy. It can be said that, if you refrain from building a school or hospital or refrain from any other capital activity that does not return debt services, there will be a lesser borrowing and a lesser cost on debt services on the recurrent side of the Budget. That decision as to what shall be the total of the capital programme must always be one for Government policy.

Putting that on one side, the choices facing the Government once it has made that decision run something like this: to take into the Consolidated Account the total borrowings from Loan Council; to appropriate a small part of them, as was done a few years ago for housing; and then, having decided that housing needs more funds because the target is, say, 3 100 additions to the rental stock to meet a demonstrated demand, to do other things, such as arranging management contracts for people such as the super investment trust or someone outside, to provide funds for the Housing Trust to get around the old Loan Council constraint. If, however, the Government follows the other track and says, 'No. If we take funds directly out of the Consolidated Account, all our Loan Council borrowings, and allocate those to housing, the first effect is to get them at 4½ per cent instead of, say, 13 per cent, which is a major saving', at the same time there will be a cost to those borrowings which must be put in place of those funds to build schools, hospitals, etc. However, for a given capital programme the aggregate cost will be less than the result of following the other option, which was done two or three years ago.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: There was a proposal at the Premiers' Conference this year to prevent this practice that we had adopted of allocating our total programme to housing. I presume that the Commonwealth assessment was that this was deriving an unanticipated net benefit by means of a specific financing arrangement. In the original proposal put by the Treasurer there was to be a limit on the funds that could be nominated for housing. One of the little publicised but important achievements from South Australia's point of view at that conference was to get the Commonwealth Treasurer not to insist on that limit but to leave it open. The figure having been left open, we took the opportunity to nominate the total, which gives us in aggregate an overall advantage.

Mr OLSEN: I seek an undertaking from the Treasurer that the estimated intake of funds into the Budget of \$150 600 000 during 1984-85 will not be exceeded, on the basis that, on each occasion we drag more in, as we did this year, and reduce the deficit on Consolidated Account for cosmetic purposes, at the same time we create a debt servicing

cost to the South Australian taxpayer. Will he undertake not to exceed that allocation that is included in the Budget papers this year, unlike last year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is an estimated figure. We do not know what the rest of the financial year will present us with. Frankly, I will not give undertakings that will completely destroy our flexibility. Parliament has other occasions on which it can look at our financial situation. To illustrate our *bona fides* in this area, may I say that there was no need this year, strictly speaking in accounting terms, to introduce Supplementary Estimates. We introduced them, first, because I felt that, if we did not, there would be a great hoo-hah from the Opposition about denying the Opposition its rights, and secondly (and more substantially) I felt that it was important to give Parliament and the Opposition the right to scrutinise the accounts. There will be that opportunity for scrutiny, but I cannot give undertakings that the Leader of the Opposition knows full well would be irresponsible.

Mr BAKER: The manpower associated with State taxation has increased by 14 bodies. The major explanation for this is that the number of inspectorial positions, mainly related to the financial institutions duty, is to be increased. As all our financial institutions are operating on computerised systems, where is the need for the 15 inspectorial positions to ensure that the FID institutions are doing the right thing?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The figure is 9, not 15. We have strengthened our inspectorial investigation function. It is only done on the basis that it will yield net value to the overall revenue. The more efficient the collection of our tax revenue the greater will be our ability to reduce the tax rate. Each position created in that office is assessed on that basis. Regarding the strict assessment of the needs of the taxation branch, every single individual is showing a net return for any salaries or outgoings that are provided.

Mr BAKER: From the figures supplied I assume that the increase in staff overall is a net 2.5 officers, and then there are an additional 9 positions. Although I realise that we cannot take those figures as firm, can the Treasurer say what areas have been identified in the collection of FID to demand the allocation of nine extra staff with a resultant increase in salaries of about \$250 000? Why are nine more staff needed in 1984-85 to oversee the collection of FID, when all the financial institutions are operating on efficient computerised systems? Is someone robbing the Government by not disclosing the true financial information?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Presumably that is the assessment that has been made. I will check with the Commissioner of State Taxes and let the honourable member know.

Mr OLSEN: The debt servicing rearrangement initiated by the Government has had an impact on electricity tariffs. In the *Sunday Mail* of last weekend, the following report appears:

In response to a question on the effect on tariffs of the cost of gas in the contract, the Premier said, 'Don't ask me those questions. Ask the finance people. I do not think it is fair to ask me to respond'.

That is a gross evasion of responsibility, because the Treasurer well knows that the debt servicing rearrangements have added significantly to the Trust's costs. Indeed, a Cabinet submission approved last year stated that the rearrangements would cost the Trust an extra \$12 million a year, yet the Treasurer consistently refuses to acknowledge that this has an impact on tariffs. Will the Premier acknowledge that his debt servicing arrangements for the Electricity Trust at a cost of \$12 million has had an impact on the Trust's deliberations on setting tariffs?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: For a start, that quotation was recorded as a result of a Saturday morning telephone call I received at home, and I did not have in front of me all the

requisite documents. If one reads the article in context, one will see that that is what I am saying: it will be seen that, in response to detailed questions on the impact of certain things, I said that the financial authorities of the Trust were far better able to answer the questions than I was sitting at home on a Saturday morning.

However, let me pick up the main thrust of the Leader of the Opposition's question. The regularising of interest rates with public authorities was in fact a practice that was recommended to, and accepted by, our predecessors in Government. Let me make that point quite clear. It was left to the Government to implement it, but it was recommended to, and accepted by, our predecessors. The way in which the Leader has commented on the matter indicates some degree of hypocrisy on this whole issue. Secondly, I concede that it had a financial impact. That was spelt out at the time. However, what I am saying (and this is irrefutable) is that it is not the cause of tariff increases in 1984, as proposed and discussed. The effect of that has been absorbed into the Trust's accounts. Unless the proposal is that the Electricity Trust or any other statutory authority obtains some special concessional arrangement (and the Opposition keeps bleating about full disclosure of true costs, market prices and competitiveness), I am not quite sure what the Opposition is on about. It is not having an impact on the increase in tariffs this year, and I stand by that statement.

Mr OLSEN: As the Treasurer would well know, officers of the Treasury make many submissions to the Government of the day: it is up to the Government to accept or reject those submissions. Included in those submissions is a whole range of tax raising measures that surface from time to time. Governments have the responsibility to agree or disagree with those proposed increases. By the rearrangement of debt servicing the Government has applied a retrospective tax on the Electricity Trust. I do not condone that. If the intention is to set up some basis of financing, that should be set up as from day one when the relevant legislation has been passed. With this move the Government has established a retrospective charge on the Trust of some \$12 million, as the Cabinet submission of 14 July 1983 clearly indicates.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The 1982 amendments to the Government Financing Act which allowed this to happen were introduced by the previous Government with that clearly stated intention. That is a fact. I do not know why (unless it is to preserve the purity of position in Opposition) the Leader denounces constantly what in fact was a key piece of the previous Government's philosophy. The Leader cannot in any way assert that it is having an impact on the tariff increase made this year.

Mr OLSEN: But you just admitted that it did.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: What impact that it had has already been incorporated: it is not having an impact on the tariff increase this year.

Mr OLSEN: As it relates to the Electricity Trust, the Government is picking up not only \$24 million, as well as the \$4 million if this 15 per cent rise goes through—which makes \$28 million from the levy—but also \$12 million on the extra debt servicing costs applied to the Trust. In addition, at the end of 1985 for a full financial year the Government will be picking up \$6.8 million in extra royalties from increases in gas prices. I indicate clearly to the Premier that the Liberal Party does not believe in retrospectivity, in applying a charge backwards, in relation to instrumentalities such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: A rearrangement of debt is not retrospectivity. If the Opposition is suggesting that ETSA as a commercial authority should have subsidies provided that are not provided to some other authorities, then let it clearly say so and indicate how much that subsidy should be.

Mr OLSEN: The Treasurer gave a commitment to this House 12 months ago that he would look at the levy and at the matter of debt servicing so as to reduce the impact of tariff increases on the Trust in the future. Although 12 months has elapsed, no action has been taken—although we have become accustomed to that. The Government has done nothing, and that is why South Australians are about to face another massive hike in power charges.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In relation to the matter of FID and the staff involved, I am advised that we are talking about salaries of the order of \$180 000 in 1984-85, which is notionally nine people at a relatively junior level. They are not associated with inspections, as I suggested earlier. The general inspection process is undertaken over the whole range of activities. They are not specifically FID inspectors. They are employed for routine handling of inquiries from charities and other organisations, the processing of returns, and so on. They are the stipulated administrative resources required to administer the financial institutions duty provisions.

Mr BAKER: Does that mean that it will be handling those people who will not be paying FID?

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

The CHAIRMAN: I have allowed the current questioning to proceed on the basis that the matter of Treasury charges is covered to some degree by the policy of Government through the Treasury Department. I point out that the Opposition will have a further opportunity to ask questions about ETSA charges, because that matter can also be dealt with under the Minister of Mines and Energy's lines. I hope that members of the Committee do not take the debate too far in regard to this matter at this stage.

Earlier I said that I would seek information from the Leader of *Hansard* as to whether it will be possible to insert in proper order in *Hansard* certain information that members are seeking to obtain. I have been advised that that is possible but that the information must be provided as soon as possible, and not later than Friday 19 October. The information is required in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to ETSA charges and the policy advice that the Government has received in relation to ETSA. I am quite sure that the Government is probably getting plenty of policy advice at the moment. I draw the Premier's attention to *Hansard* of 11 August 1983 (pages 163-4) and to the statement that he made then. It contradicts the statements that he has made today. Did the Premier consult with the Trust about the debt servicing fees prior to their implementation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, there were discussions with ETSA and with the Minister on that matter.

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

Mr OLSEN: Page 2 of the Auditor-General's Report reveals that the South Australian Financing Authority increased its asset base during the year by some \$50 million by sale and lease-back of assets originally financed from Consolidated Account and the Highways Fund. Can the Premier say whether the proceeds of this transaction were sourced back to Consolidated Account as a portion of funds invested by statutory authorities amounting to \$68 million for a series of round robin transactions? In other words, I am trying to trace the track of that \$50 million.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will ask Mr Emery to answer that.

Mr Emery: The \$50 million approximately which was yielded by that lease transaction entered into as part of the overall pool of funds available to SAFA in 1983-84 was in practice used to add to the investments of that Authority

in that year. So that, if one was trying to trace that particular part of the funds coming into SAFA, one would find that they would trace into an addition to the financial investments of that Authority.

Mr OLSEN: Can Mr Emery nominate what investments the \$50 million went to?

Mr Emery: It was a range of investments in bank bills, corporate debentures and letters of credit by international banks.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the equity lease entered into by SAFA for the \$50.9 million involved in the sale and lease-back of Crown assets by a number of departments, provision is made for lease payments to be made by SAFA. Will those departments obtain benefits from utilisation of the leased assets be levied with a charge-out from SAFA? If so, what rate of return will be sourced to SAFA from the asset usage?

Mr Emery: In broad terms, the answer is that the transactions taken together would have no financial effect on the departments whose assets were used to form the basis of the lease.

Mr OLSEN: In effect, those departments have the use of those assets, one could say, rent free.

Mr Emery: Those assets were assets which had previously been financed in a variety of ways: in some cases, for example in the case of the Highways Department, from grants or from State motor taxation or, in some other cases, for example in cases of assets of Woods and Forest Department, from Loan funds. So, those arrangements, in effect, remained in place. The assets were channelled through SAFA into a lease and the funds remained in SAFA. In other words, the original arrangements which had financed the original purchase of those assets remained in place and the departments concerned made neither a gain nor a loss from those transactions.

Mr Barnes: In the general pool though there was a financial advantage because the outgoings on the lease, the costs, were less than the return from the investment, so there was a net gain to the Government. But, it did not affect the individual departments; that remained in the general pool. It was to the Government's benefit or to the benefit of the total Budget, if you like.

Mr OLSEN: The funds that were on link to the various bills and a whole range of things nominated before are all on fixed time frames or on call?

Mr Emery: They are on time frames that relate quite precisely to the time frames in the lease arrangements, so that there is no risk or interest rate movements that might damage the return received.

Mr OLSEN: What is the average time frame?

Mr Emery: If I recall correctly, the time frame initially is three to five years; then there is a period of review at the end of that period.

Mr BAKER: What guarantee do we have that that relationship will remain as such—that your liabilities and assets actually line up? Secondly, what was the net benefit to the Government of the leasing arrangement in dollar terms?

Mr Emery: This matter is referred to at page 11 of the annual report of SAFA, which was tabled by the Premier with the Budget. It refers to the fact that the cost of the lease ranged between 0.6 to 1.4 per cent below the cost of the financial borrowings. We might say that that represents the benefits to SAFA as compared to other forms of borrowing.

Mr BAKER: That is half a million dollars out of that transaction.

Mr Emery: The annual benefit is something more than \$500 000; it is something between \$500 000 and \$1 million. It is closer to \$1 million.

Mr BAKER: The second part was the tight relationship that has to be maintained so that funds cannot be used for other purposes.

Mr Emery: Yes, the funds at present are being used in a range of investments the term of which has been matched to the term of the investment. There is no risk of any significant kind in that. That will, on present policies, remain the case.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This arrangement was entered into within days of the Federal Treasurer's altering the rules which would have robbed a certain arrangement of the financial benefit that it has. In fact, ideally South Australia has been somewhat late into this area of refinancing. Other States have been very heavily involved in it. The decision of the Federal Government took some of those States not only by surprise but intervened in some major transactions. We were fortunate that we reached a point where this particular transaction was finalised. However, it does mean that this avenue is closed.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the rearrangement of the State debt, a number of semi-government authorities with loans outstanding to the Government would need to be indebted to SAFA. In turn, SAFA became indebted to the Government by way of a non-capital contribution of \$103 million. Will the Premier provide—and I presume that this will have to be in writing unless he has it available now—a detailed list of the individual amounts of loans outstanding for each semi-government body involved in the transaction between parties, including the former rate of interest payable on each loan at the date of transfer?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the list at page 22 of the second annual report of SAFA.

Mr OLSEN: Does that include the interest?

Mr Emery: It does not include interest details.

Mr OLSEN: Is it possible to receive the interest applicable to each one of those?

Mr Emery: The interest now applicable is the same for all, that is, the common public sector rate, which is determined quarterly. The interest rate which applied previously of course varies between those authorities, but that could be obtained if the Premier so wished. We obviously do not have it on hand.

Mr OLSEN: That interest could vary from what it was at the date of transfer to the now common rate?

Mr Emery: Yes. The previous interest rate would vary from one authority to another. Some were up and some were down. Some were approximately where they were.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It depends on the historical experience.

Mr OLSEN: Could the Premier supply that information in due course?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, we can provide that.

Mr OLSEN: For the 11 months to May 1984, funds taken into the Budget from statutory authorities stood at 25 and there was the 109 to which some reference has been made being lodged during June. It was revealed that \$66 million was lodged by SAFA on 30 June. Can the Premier advise which statutory authorities lodged the remaining \$68 million taken into the Budget and whether the \$66 million injection from SAFA was financed from proceeds of the promissory note issue draw down of \$70 million?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: SGIC lodged \$50 million and the South Australian Superannuation Investment Trust \$18 million.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the amount of \$66 million borrowed by the Government for SAFA, it is revealed that repayments of principal are subject to negotiation each year. It seems to me that is a generous concession that has been arranged. The Premier seems to have established the annual cost but not any principal repayment, in that it can be

adjusted from year to year for any repayment of the principal of the loan standing. Can the Premier indicate the reason why that has taken place, why we have not entered into a pre-arranged credit foncier repayment programme for the funds that have been borrowed by SAFA, and will he also advise by what amount the Government expects to reduce those borrowings in 1984-85?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will ask Mr Emery to answer that.

Mr Emery: The question, as I understand it, relates to the repayment arrangements as between individual authorities and SAFA. Is that so?

Mr OLSEN: Yes, the interest but not the principal.

Mr Emery: It is true that the formal arrangement is that repayments, if any, will be by agreement and discussion annually, and that is a matter essentially of convenience to individual authorities. Most authorities are annually increasing the amount of their indebtedness and it is simply a matter of unnecessary inconvenience for authorities at the same time to be making repayments, for example, calculated on a credit foncier basis and at the same time to be receiving new debt, so that arrangement is purely one of convenience, administratively and otherwise, which I might add has been, so far as we know, appreciated by all authorities concerned. It has significantly reduced the administrative task of calculating and making repayments and, to my knowledge, has not led to any problems as far as individual authorities are concerned. It has been part of the simplification process that has taken place.

Mr OLSEN: The maximum flexibility and manoeuvrability?

Mr Emery: I think we would say flexibility rather than manoeuvrability.

Mr OLSEN: I would add the last one as well as the flexibility. In relation to funds lodged by statutory authorities, that is, excluding SAFA—and I refer to the \$68 million—can the Premier advise whether these funds have been borrowed under the same repayment principal arrangements that relate to SAFA, the loan of \$66 million? If not, how are they different?

Mr Emery: As the Premier mentioned, there are two loans: one by the SGIC and one by SASFIT. The SGIC is a fixed period, if I recall four years. The SASFIT loan is a long term indexed arrangement. Mr Wright advises me it is a long term indexed arrangement of 20 years, so they are fixed repayment arrangements.

Mr OLSEN: In relation to the debt restructuring that took place between the Government, SAFA and, as we have mentioned SASFIT and the SGIC (as I understand it they total some \$223.5 million), what was the average interest rate earned by each individual institution? In other words, what did they get before the restructuring and what did they get after it?

Mr Emery: I think it should be made clear that we are now talking about quite a different transaction. The one we were previously talking about was a new loan. The present question relates to debt restructurings in relation to the previous Savings Bank, the State Bank, SASFIT, and the State Government Insurance Commission. As explained on page 14 of SAFA's most recent report, in brief those arrangements did not alter the interest rate, on average, receivable by those institutions, that is, it was a rearrangement of debt and had no effect whatsoever on the interest rates being received by those institutions.

Mr OLSEN: Page 11 of the SAFA annual report reveals (and I refer to the estimates at page 34 line 2) that there was an offshore loan arranged in 1983-84 which was drawn down early in 1984-85. Can we get the details of the funds obtained and the application of those proceeds?

Mr Emery: There was a loan made early in 1984-85, although it was in respect of a loan allocation made in 1983-84 by Loan Council. Essentially, it is a short term loan which has been reinvested in the currency of borrowing at the present time pending a longer term decision by the Treasurer as to the use of those funds.

Mr BAKER: Returning to the moneys being handled, and I presume they are the LGS assets of the banks, the \$232.5 million, Mr Emery said the interest received by those institutions has not altered at all. Is there any net benefit to the Government from that transfer arrangement if the interest received has not altered?

Mr Emery: The benefit to the Government derives from the fact that the practical effect of those arrangements has been to increase the potential funding available to the Government and the semi-government sector if the Government wishes to make use of that potential.

Mr BAKER: Can it be clearly explained how that in fact will be managed if you are pushing that money back into the institutions themselves and not getting any administrative or other fee for that? You have more money and you have greater flexibility, but in terms of net benefit to the Budget, I presume it is nil—or will there be some other means?

Mr Emery: It is true to say that the net effect on the Budget is nil, with one minor qualification which should be referred to for the sake of precision: in so far as the SGIC part of it is concerned, the SGIC is receiving a slightly higher return than previously in recognition of the fact that it has a somewhat reduced degree of negotiability in its debt. The increased flexibility available to the Government or SAFA derives essentially from the fact that, as a result of those transactions, SAFA now owns certain securities which, if it so desires, can be sold into the market. For example, SAFA owns a significant volume of Electricity Trust debentures, and, if those funds are required for Governmental financing purposes, they can be obtained through the sale of those securities into the market. So, it has increased the potential flexibility available to the Government if it needs that flexibility in the future.

Mr BAKER: Under those circumstances, one would then lose the relationship between one's asset and liability and, if interest rates should fall, what would be the circumstances then? Would one then place before the institutions a lower rate of interest? Is that what you are saying?

Mr Emery: No, the relationship between the Government and those institutions will remain the same, and in the circumstances that the honourable member outlined there will be no gain or loss to the financial institutions concerned or to the Government.

Mr BAKER: I would like to get to the following with regard to this more flexible arrangement, that is, the whole process of financing—and I do not claim to understand the full ramifications of it. There is the potential that one can use those funds to finance State Government operations in the same way as almost a Loan Council by saying, 'Right, you could fund State Government activities with no return on them through this process and build up your long term debt.' Is that a feasible scenario?

Mr Emery: I think that that comment, to the extent that it is true, is true of any potential source of funds of SAFA. In the end, it is a matter of a decision by the Government, as Mr Barnes explained earlier, regarding what capital programme it wishes to decide from year to year, and the question of obtaining funds to finance that programme will be decided from year to year in the light of financial circumstances. I do not believe that this arrangement is different from any other way of raising funds in that respect.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: In terms of the Government's programme, there are always ways and means of raising funds and of raising funds outside the strict constraints of

the Loan Council. For various other reasons, this mechanism is established, but basically in formulating a capital works programme we must address, first, the need for capital works at any point in time and, secondly, our capacity to finance them over time. We already have, particularly as a result of the high interest rates in the past few years and now a very high real interest rate, a considerable acceleration and build up in our overall debt. That is obviously one of the constraints when one considers the capital programme.

The added factor, of course, this year has been the agreement of Loan Council to have an overall ceiling on loan borrowings among the States. That is in for only an experimental 12 month period to ascertain how it works, but our bid was very much related to both capital programme needs and our capacity to pay and finance; so, we certainly have to be able to meet the rise and fall of capital works programmes. For instance, in a sense we are in a period of hiatus with our electricity authority's power station programme. We have come to the end of a phase of massive borrowings. The result of that is about to show up in terms of the commissioning of the power station, but very soon we will have to embark yet again on borrowings for another stage or generation of power supply. Pipelines are another example of where we may have a particular need, in this case dictated by the discoveries of resources or the need to put them into markets. So, there are peaks and troughs, and we have to be able to respond to them, and this provides us with the flexibility. If we do not have it (and in the past we did not have it), there are other ways of doing it.

Mr BAKER: I question then the total of \$9.5 million in debts to the Treasury—\$7.4 million for the State Transport Authority and \$2.1 million for the North Haven Trust. Are you sinking the debt into the Authority? I raise particularly the North Haven Trust, because, as I am aware, it has been sold and there will be a flow of funds into the Treasury as a result. Yet there seems to be an offset against SAFA for this item. I seek clarification.

Mr Emery: A major portion of North Haven Trust assets were sold, but the cash so generated was paid by the Trust to SAFA and the indebtedness of the Trust to SAFA correspondingly reduced, so there was no question of any subsidy or anything of that kind. It was a cash transaction.

Mr BAKER: What about the State Transport Authority?

Mr Emery: That relates to the fact that that Authority has been funded for its cash deficit in the year as distinct from its accounting deficit, which is included for depreciation as a non-cash item. In effect, the Government has said that the State Transport Authority will be funded for that non-cash part of its deficit by a relief of debt that has taken place through the State Transport Authority's indebtedness to SAFA being reduced and the Government's indebtedness to SAFA being increased by the same amount. Incidentally, that transaction occurred in previous years in a different fashion.

Mr BAKER: That went through Treasury in previous years, did it not?

Mr Emery: Previously it was a reduction in the State Transport Authority's debt to the Government, which has now taken place in a different way. It is a different mechanism rather than a different policy.

Mr BAKER: It is a very good illustration of the point to which I guess I was trying to get in the process.

Mr OLSEN: A number of business houses have informed us that officials of the State Taxation Department have recently been active in requesting details of payments made to employees for kilometre reimbursement for use of their personal motor vehicles in connection with their employment. Is the Premier considering an amendment to the Pay-roll Tax Act to ensure that reimbursements of this nature will in future be subject to the payment of pay-roll tax?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I will ask the Commissioner of State Taxation, Mr Cornish, to join us. He might be able to respond to this question.

Mr Cornish: Yes, that is true. It is in accordance with the current provision in the Pay-roll Tax Act, which is being followed up. It is an existing provision that has been there since the introduction of the Pay-roll Tax Act.

Mr OLSEN: It is a matter of applying the present tax provisions, and closing what are considered by the Government to be loopholes in the taxation provision.

Mr Cornish: Yes, that is correct.

Mr OLSEN: Has extra staff been employed?

Mr Cornish: It is part of the inspectorial resources that were progressively increased during the past year, and they have already been mentioned as being fulfilled in this current year.

Mr BAKER: In relation to inspection, it has been suggested that the inspectorial staff has been increased because there seems to be some problem with interstate manipulation of money and the avoidance of FID. Is there any truth in that statement?

Mr Emery: No, it is incorrect. Inspection staff were approved by the Government in about April 1983, well before FID was introduced.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It took a long time to get that staff.

Mr Emery: They were put forward and justified for other reasons apart from the introduction of FID. It may be that they will have to investigate some aspects of FID in due course, but that was not part of their reason for establishment.

Mr BAKER: Has there been any indication to the Treasury of FID avoidance through interstate transfers?

Mr Cornish: There have been no indications but we suspect that it may happen.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is something that we would certainly monitor closely because it has been raised. Certain alarmist statements were made about massive transfers of transactions and so on. First, there is a limited capacity to do that; secondly, the financial benefit to be gained is not as great as might be suggested; and, thirdly and most importantly, there is no major evidence of this occurring. There seems to be an inconsistency on the part of those who seek to criticise it. On the one hand, there is the argument that we are collecting far more than we estimated would be collected under FID and that in some cases there is some sort of windfall gain. On the other hand, we are told that there is massive avoidance of FID and that people are taking transactions out of the State. The two simply do not accord to reality; they happen to be inconsistent.

Both allegations are often made from the same source, but the truth is that certainly the effect of the introduction of FID has been a rationalisation of accounts in banks and probably more care in banking practice and account rearrangement as a result. I do not think that that is a bad thing in itself. It perhaps promotes efficiency in business transactions and dealings, and in the case of people opening account after account and not properly managing those accounts, it has resulted in some financial benefit to those who have assessed where the bank accounts are and who have acted to consolidate them. As a result, those people are probably deriving more interest and other benefits which far outweigh the effect of FID. So, that has been one effect: there has been a consolidation of accounts.

There may have been some transfer of transactions or transaction methods. However, it certainly has not been very pronounced, and there is no evidence of massive evasion. FID seems to be working quite satisfactorily. We still have it under review and we still receive, naturally, periodic complaints or suggestions as to amendment. My response to that has always been to let the system settle down a bit

so that people get a better understanding of it; then adjustments can be made.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Honourable members chortle at the idea of a better understanding. By that I mean that the FID is certainly a new tax and, as a result, people need to understand it. Secondly, it is a progressive and equitable tax. A lot of ordinary people, for instance, did not realise how effective a very broad based tax would be. One can fix a low rate on a progressive basis, which means that those in the middle and lower income sectors of the population do not make a contribution, although the overall take of that tax can be quite significant. It has also enabled us to abolish certain stamp duties that were falling quite inequitably on small business and again on lower income earners who are forced to seek second mortgages and things of that nature. When I say 'understanding', I really do mean that. However, people were stamped into believing that this was some monstrous rip-off whereas in fact it is a very equitable tax which is a far better alternative than, say, putting an extra 1c per litre on petrol, which would have yielded about the same result.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Premier accuses members on this side of chortling when that matter is raised. I suggest that he does a bit of door-knocking in order to ascertain whether or not the people are satisfied with it. The people very clearly indicate that the Government is eating away at their assets.

Turning to another issue concerning overall surveillance of income to members of the Public Service (as witness the question relative to mileage), has there been a directive from the Premier or from within Treasury that, in relation to the wages and salaries of members of the Public Service or weekly paid employees, payment in future shall be by way of cheque and that in some cases the authority or department for which the individual works has been directing to which bank it will make the money available—in other words, directing business to a particular bank with which it happens to undertake its normal transactions?

Mr Kidd: There was a trend towards encouraging people to take their salaries by cheque rather than cash. That trend began and, I believe, peaked some years ago. When I say 'some years ago', I mean two or three years ago. The main consideration behind it was the question of the security of the pay-roll people handling and having to transport large sums of cash. If my memory serves me correctly, we were encouraged in this endeavour by people in departments such as the Police Department, which was being asked previously to provide escorts for pay-roll personnel carrying cash from the Reserve Bank to their respective departments. That was the main consideration behind encouraging employees to take their money in that form.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is it known whether the organisations within Government circles that entered into such an arrangement specified the bank to which amounts would be paid: for example, the Country Fire Services to Westpac, with the result that a person who might have an account with the State Bank, the National Bank or some other organisation had the money directed to an account that he did not personally want to open? As a result, did such persons, when they transferred that to their normal bank account, lose a second bite by the FID tax?

Mr Kidd: We certainly were not aware of any such moves. In fact, we went to great lengths, again if I remember correctly, to make sure that a great deal of flexibility was available to employees regarding which institution they had their funds lodged with. If they chose, instead of getting it by cheque for instance, a direct lodgment to the banking institution, a building society or something else—and my memory is not entirely clear on the details—I recall our

making efforts to negotiate with institutions for the exchange of pay-roll credit information to ensure that an employee could have the entire say as to which institution it went.

Again I am dredging my memory a bit, but I think that we had to draw the line at splitting the pay between several different institutions. We were not able to accommodate that kind of request. However, we certainly provided, as I remember it, maximum flexibility and, indeed, went out of our way to do so.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If maximum flexibility was not being undertaken by certain organisations, it would not necessarily be with the authority of the Government that they were undertaking that direction?

Mr Kidd: No, I believe not. It is not a matter of which we have been aware as the central financial advisers to the Government, anyway.

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier advise the total amount received by Treasury during 1983-84 in relation to the issue of Government guarantees covering State and semi-Government debts? In addition, will the Premier provide a detailed list identifying the source of such income?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: To what line are you referring?

Mr OLSEN: The Estimates of Payments, page 35, line 6, 'Accounting for Government Expenditure and Receipts'.

Mr Wright: Government guarantees this year total \$3.5 million, of which \$3.3 million is collected from ETSA and \$0.2 million from the Barley Board. The only other area is the State Transport Authority, where Government guarantees will come into effect next year.

Mr OLSEN: When does the Government expect to make decisions based on the triennial actuarial review of the South Australian Superannuation Fund which was tabled in Parliament in August and which recommended that either contributions be increased or benefits reduced because of the rise in costs of the fund to taxpayers? When tabling that review, the Treasurer said that the Government did not think that any decision should be taken on the contributions or benefits until a full consultation had been held with representatives of the contributors. I assume that those consultations are now under way. What time table has the Government set for making final decisions on this matter, and when are they likely to be implemented on the basis, I understand, of a four-year period and a 68 per cent increase in the State's contribution, from \$61 million to \$76 million in 1986-87?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Regarding the status of contributions, under the way in which the scheme is funded that is a natural increase in contributions. It can be funded differently, but this is the most effective and financially appropriate way of doing it. That means that over a period of time, as the Actuary's report indicates, our annual contribution in dollars must increase. Therefore, quoting precise figures does not mean much. Every organisation, whether public or private, that is funding superannuation is experiencing similar outlays, although they may be funded in different ways. The consultation is under way. There is no great urgency in respect of this matter in the sense that, unless a decision is made within three weeks, we shall be in major financial trouble.

I refer members to the Actuary's report and assessment, which points out that the sort of under funding that he suggests is beginning to emerge is the equivalent of about 5½ per cent wage increase across the board phased in over 35 years. So, we are not talking about massive sums or a massive turnaround of funds in a short time. There is also the question whether a general inquiry should be undertaken into the Superannuation Fund. For instance, a colleague of the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Legh Davis) has on notice in the Legislative Council a motion urging the State Government to establish an independent public inquiry into

the Fund. The Government is considering whether an inquiry is desirable in the context of present negotiations. We have not laid down a firm time table in this matter, but I hope to make an announcement within the next few weeks about the progress of the consultations and to indicate what we intend to do.

Mr BAKER: About two weeks ago I wrote to the Premier about running alternative profiles through the State Government computer, and I referred especially to mortality rates. As yet, I have not received a reply. Is the Premier happy for me to proceed in this matter?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That would have probably gone to the Public Actuary, and I am awaiting his response. Until I receive formal notification from him I cannot decide.

Mr BAKER: The Budget papers reveal a shortfall in receipts from debt recovery of about \$20 million. If, in fact, the debt recovery had reached the sum specified in the original Estimates, an extra \$20 million dollars could have been offset against recurrent expenditure. During the 1984-85 financial year that debt recovery will take place. During the Parliamentary sittings I asked the Premier a question on this matter and he said that that was not the appropriate time. I now ask whether the debt restructuring that took place was deliberately understated or whether through non-collection, \$20 million less was made available than would normally have been available for budgetary purposes.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: A combination of factors is involved here. Direct interest on investments was down by about \$6 million. There was a series of receipts and payments, the timing of which has been influenced by the preparation of the accounts in terms of the time of transferral. There is the guarantee of fees payable by ETSA, which we discussed earlier and which was classified as 'Other departmental fees and recoveries'.

Mr Wright: The \$20 million shortfall on recoveries and debt services was made up of four or five components. As the Treasurer said, interest on investments was down by about \$6 million on Budget, mainly because the level of funds available for investment was significantly less than originally expected. In addition, interest rates generally during 1983-84 were lower than originally expected.

Secondly, actual receipts from guaranteed fees were about \$3.3 million from ETSA and about \$200 000 from the Barley Board. It was recorded elsewhere in receipt documents under 'Departmental fees and recoveries' in 'Treasury, Miscellaneous'. It was considered that it was more appropriate to classify these guarantee fees under that line instead of under 'Recovery of debt services'. The guarantee fee covers the amount of indebtedness by these statutory authorities in the form of semi-government borrowings, leasing arrangements and other forms of indebtedness.

Thirdly, under the sinking fund recoveries there was a \$3 million short-fall in relation to ETSA, which followed a restructuring of ETSA's debt which the Government arranged during 1983-84 and which was effective from July 1983. Following that debt restructuring, which we canvassed earlier, the concept of sinking fund payments made on a credit foncier basis, has been replaced.

Indeed, we have now set up an arrangement which is more of a net financing type of arrangement between the Government and ETSA. So, to the extent that they are net callers of additional loan funds, sinking fund payments are not recovered from that statutory authority. So, overall the net effect on the capital side of the Budget is the same as it would have been in the old circumstances. The \$3 million budgeted to be recalled in 1983-84 was credited directly to the capital side of the Budget. Therefore, overall it has had no net effect on Consolidated Account.

The fourth point in relation to the shortfall is lower interest recoveries than expected from most statutory

authorities. The main reason for that was that interest rates throughout the year were lower than originally expected. That was offset by virtually an equivalent saving on interest payments made by the State to the Commonwealth (referred to in another part of the Budget papers, under 'Special Acts'). The interest paid to the Commonwealth Government offset the shortfall experienced on the recurrent receipts side. The fifth point to which the honourable member specifically referred concerns the timing of the interest payment by SAFA to the Government. The amount involved was about \$5 million. In effect it caused the deficit to be \$5 million greater than it would have been otherwise.

Mr BAKER: Had the previous arrangement existed, and taking other things into account, the current Budget would have been \$5 million better off.

Mr Wright: That is really what we are saying.

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

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$47 620 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

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 P.J. Emery, Deputy Under Treasurer.
Mr L.B. Kidd, Assistant Under Treasurer.
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant.
Mr P.C. Cornish, Commissioner for State Taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the line relating to the casino. I understand that a company named Genting Berhard from Malaysia has contracted with the ASER Investment Trust to provide casino management services, should the ASER Trust's application to operate South Australia's casino be successful. Is the Premier aware that Malaysia's Islamic movement is seeking to ban Genting's activities in that country? Is he also aware that Genting was under favourable consideration to operate two casinos in Queensland, but that it withdrew its applications at short notice when strict controls to be imposed by the Queensland Government were made known to it and that since that time there has been no public explanation for the withdrawal? Will the Premier confirm that the Lotteries Commission is taking these factors into account when selecting the operator for the casino?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I have no direct knowledge of the Lotteries Commission on this matter, and I make it my business not to know, because I think the principles behind the Act and the way in which this matter has been approached is for the Government to remain at arms length from the decision to be made, for the Lotteries Commission to make its assessment, and for that in turn to be endorsed by the

Casino Supervisory Authority. I understand that it has been publicly announced that a number of applicants are being considered. The local consortium has generated a bit of publicity about its bid. The Genting organisation has been mentioned in this connection as has the Austrian casinos operation and Federal Hotels. I am not sure how many there are in total. The Lotteries Commission must make an assessment, and in doing so it is drawing on State, Commonwealth and international police advice. A full security exercise will be undertaken. I do not know whether that has been completed or whether it is still in progress.

The reason why a decision has not been made by the Lotteries Commission is that it is going to great pains to check out all of these aspects. I was not previously aware of the situation referred to by the Leader, but I am sure that it would have been signalled to the Lotteries Commission in the course of its inquiries. As I have said, with those inquiries it is obtaining assistance from the Licensing Court and from the law enforcement authorities, so that ultimately the operator decided upon will have a completely clean bill, professional expertise and the support of the Casino Supervisory Authority. I am not sure when a decision will be made, although I understand that it will be made soon. I hope that it will not be too long before a decision is made, because we are ready to go with the development of the casino as soon as the licence operator is determined.

Mr BAKER: An escalation of some 20 per cent has occurred in the State's contribution to the Commonwealth in respect of loan moneys previously provided. Has the Treasurer any information as to what that repayment schedule will be over the next five years?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That represents the full year effect of this concept of nominated funds for housing and interest and principal repayments which are received pursuant to the housing agreement. The majority of these costs are in turn recovered from the Housing Trust. So under that heading we are looking at a full year's costs. In regard to future trends, perhaps Mr Kidd can address the Committee.

Mr Kidd: The nominated fund arrangements are a special set of arrangements which have been in place for the past two or three years. We do not know how long they will continue, because they are a Commonwealth initiative and are not enshrined in any agreement. They are subject to Commonwealth administrative discretion. The process has been very good for South Australia. We hope that it continues for some time.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: As I pointed out earlier, this year the Federal Treasurer suggested that the arrangement be terminated or, at the least, that a strict ceiling be placed on the extent of nomination. It is possible that next year the same proposition will be put to the Premiers.

Mr BAKER: I would appreciate knowing what is the increasing debt situation, whether it be paid through the Housing Trust, Treasury or whatever, and what increase in payment schedule would be on existing arrangements in five years time. Is it possible to obtain that?

Mr Kidd: I believe so.

Mr BAKER: Certain assumptions relate to the current amount of capital provided.

Mr Emery: Yes.

Mr Barnes: One thing picked up in an answer like that is to show what would happen on the special Act line—interest on the public debt—because under a different set of circumstances, going back to the old, the increase year by year and impact on the Budget of that special Acts line would be greater than the one under this line, because under the one the State would be paying 12 or 13 per cent, but under the other, this line, it is paying 4.5 per cent. For completeness of the answer, it would be desirable to pick up the two.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—Treasury Department, \$12 500 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

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 P.J. Emery, Deputy Under Treasurer.
Mr L.B. Kidd, Assistant Under Treasurer.
Mr J.R. Wright, Treasury Accountant.
Mr P.C. Cornish, Commissioner for State Taxation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): We now turn to the proposed expenditure by Treasury Department of \$12.5 million. This, of course, involves capital grants.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I notice that this \$12.5 million is to be made available to the Local Government Financing Authority on top of the \$10 million made available in 1983-84. Is it expected that beyond 1984-85 additional funds will be made available to that Authority or can this amount, along with the previous \$10 million, be looked upon as a fund for the Authority to initiate its activities?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Perhaps Mr Elleway will answer that.

Mr Emery: I have the privilege of being a member of the Board of Trustees of this Authority. The basic purpose of the \$10 million which the Government provided in 1983-84 and the \$12.5 million expected to be provided in 1984-85 is to provide that Authority with a sound capital base on which to build its borrowings and investments. It will be a matter for discussion, I would imagine in about nine months time, as to whether a further contribution of this amount would be required. The Authority would regard it as an open question as to whether that would be appropriate. Certainly, from the Authority's point of view it is a very solid start and at the moment there would be no necessity for a further contribution of this amount. However, that will depend, amongst other things, on how rapidly the Authority grows.

Mr BAKER: The question I was attempting to explain before relates to financing of capital outflows beyond the Treasury lines. The expenditure to May 1984 was some \$278 million, yet in the financial year 1983-84 the Government in fact spent \$389 million. Some \$100 million was expended during the last month of 1984—quite a fantastic effort. Can the Premier provide details of those items of expenditure relating to that \$100 million specifically spent? Has he any knowledge of whether there were any prepayments involved in that expenditure?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think, as the Under Treasurer in response earlier today to a question on this area suggested, there is a bunching of payments inevitably in these areas, depending on, of course, the desire to hold to the last

possible moment any cash benefits that are available, so that it is common to see those payments being made in the flow of funds towards the end of the financial year. I am not sure to what extent we are able to identify the details. We have not got those details; we have tried to obtain them.

Mr BAKER: With last month's payment of capital—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We will be able to get them.

Mr BAKER: To the Premier's knowledge or to the Treasury officers' knowledge, were there any payments for capital services which related to delivery in 1984-85; in other words, prepayment of that or is it all postponed?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: To the best of our knowledge, there was not. In relation to housing there could have been an element, depending on the particular flow of funds required there, but the details that we can extract might give some indication of that.

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

State Development, \$14 639 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
The Hon. D.C. Brown
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr K. Smith, Director, Department of State Development.
Dr R. Sexton, Executive Director (Marketing and Trade), Department of State Development.
Mr C.J. Johnson, Senior Administrative Officer, Department of State Development.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson): I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

Mr OLSEN: Whilst the officers are being exchanged, I will ask the Premier a question. We are having some degree of difficulty in trying to meet the time constraint laid down by the Estimates Committee. I know that under Sessional Order 14 the meeting times and sitting times of the Committee can be varied. Rather than the areas of State Development and the arts continuing to restrict our questions, as we have with Treasury, to some 20 to 30 of the questions we would have liked to ask, but because of the time constraint we were not able to do so and as there was a precedent set in 1980 for the Committee to meet the next morning for one hour, would the Government be prepared to concede that we should sit for an extra hour tomorrow morning so that we can continue the examination?

Government members scoff. I recognise that Government members attempted to facilitate in the latter part of this afternoon and this evening the Opposition's getting as many questions on as we can, and that has been appreciated. A precedent was set for this because, when the Premier was Leader of the Opposition, the then Premier responded to a similar request and an hour was granted the following day. It is not my wish in the Arts or the State Development area—two obviously very important areas—for us to short circuit questions.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I cannot accede to that. I think it is up to the Opposition how it allocates the time. A full day is devoted to it. The circumstance in 1980 was one where in fact a couple of the Estimates Committees were quite truncated because of insufficient time being allowed. We have allowed for that to a greater extent to ensure that each and every Estimate gets the same amount of time by having a Friday sitting, and sitting early. It would impose too much of a burden on the officers. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, members of the Government on the Committee have constrained their questions in order to allow the Opposition free rein. However, ultimately it is in the hands of members of the Opposition.

I do not think our answers have been prolix or extended. I have certainly tried to keep them brief to allow as many questions as possible consistent with getting the information across. It is a decision Opposition members have to make. They could divide the time. If they do not have time, that is bad luck.

Mr OLSEN: I do not want to delay proceedings, because the longer we do that the more we are eating into question time, but I am disappointed that the Premier will not accede to our request as his request was acceded to previously.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Once!

Mr OLSEN: It was acceded to. I also point out that a glance at the *Hansard* pulls tomorrow morning will indicate how some of the earlier questions and answers—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the Leader that he is indeed wasting his own time. It is really not a matter for the Premier; it is a matter for the Sessional Orders. When the Sessional Orders are determined, that is when the matter should be decided.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: With respect, I ask you to look at Sessional Order 14, which requires that it be considered with the Speaker, but quite obviously, if it were going to be acceded to it would need to be with the concurrence of both sides of the House. The Leader's request of the Premier is completely in order, I suggest, in concurrence with those Sessional Orders.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the Committee it is not the sort of thing that is envisaged by Sessional Orders. That should be determined at that time and, in any event, the question has been raised and rejected.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier has referred on a number of occasions to the fact that the new marketing plan for State Development has been based on detailed market research. What have been the main results of that market research?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think those results have been described in various statements and debates we have had. The product of those results can be seen. I think the Leader would have some fair knowledge of it.

Mr OLSEN: You have not even answered my letter, when I specifically asked for a copy of the survey results. You did not even pay me the courtesy of an acknowledgement.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I am sorry, it is not my policy to ignore letters. I cannot recall that letter.

Mr OLSEN: It was written by Michael Wilson, the Acting Leader.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is why I cannot recall your letter. I certainly do not recall a letter from Michael Wilson. If you would like to send me a copy, I will look at it. The detailed survey results are obviously a marketing tool that the Department has at its disposal and I do not think it should be brandished too widely.

Mr OLSEN: It certainly has not been brandished about very widely, because nobody has made those figures available.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The product of it is plain in the market strategy, which has been described fairly precisely,

and the target and the nature of that marketing campaign have been set out, and that is based on the research.

Membership:

The Hon. D.C. Brown substituted for Mr Baker.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: As a further point, it is in fact qualitative rather than quantitative research. The Leader of the Opposition talks about the figures. It is in fact an attitudinal survey based not on hard and fast data, but on a series of comments and reactions which eventually develop the profile and, as I say, it is the marketing tool that our competitors in other States would probably very much like to get their hands on and, as such, we certainly do not want to make it widely available.

Mr OLSEN: It is not to suggest there is significant bad news for South Australia in the market researches being the reason why you will not release it; that is, we figure on the lowest rung as it relates to business environment in Australia; we are the lowest amongst respondents in those things that are important to small and medium business.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Leader of the Opposition has answered his own question about availability of the survey.

Mr OLSEN: I want to make something quite clear, because there is an imputation that the Premier is trying to make. I have not seen and have not had made available to me a copy of that market research. I think that ought to be put clearly on the record and if the Premier is implying that an ex-employee of the Department of State Development has made any such information available to me, he is quite wrong, because that is not the case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Leader has now asked his three questions. We will come back to him. The member for Davenport.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I wish to follow up what the Leader said. The first question relates to marketing in the United States of America. First, is the Department continuing with Grayden and Levine, the two marketing people? What is their strategy in the United States of America for not only the next 12 months but for the next few years, and what payment is being made to Grayden and Levine this year, compared to last year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Grayden programme, which was initiated by the member who has asked the question, was embarked upon on the basis of a periodic review as to its effectiveness. The incoming Government picked up that programme. In fact, it made sure that the funds were available to it but the major assessment of the programme and its effectiveness has gone on. The findings of it suggest different approaches may be necessary. Perhaps in order to detail them to the Committee, I would ask Mr Smith to speak.

Mr Smith: The allocation of funds for this year is of the order of \$370 000, which compares with \$352 000 used last year. At this stage a commitment has been made to spend only of the order of \$95 000 to maintain the impetus behind the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation programme and the balance of the funds is held pending a detailed review, as the Premier indicated. The detailed review of the Grayden marketing programme is due for completion very shortly, at the end of this month. The view held in the Department is that the programme has been relatively effective up until now, but to continue a broad based mailing programme beyond this year is probably not the most cost effective way of handling the fund, and we will be looking at alternative means of gaining some investment opportunities out of the United States market. We think it is time to take stock and use the data base that is available.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can I pass just a very brief comment and say, having spent some considerable time

trying to work out the best marketing approach in the United States of America when I attended the Industrial Development Research Council of America, which is regarded as the most sophisticated marketing body for States in America, the view was certainly expressed by numerous States there that if you take on someone like Grayden and Associates, you need to take them on for a five or six year period. I think it would be disastrous to cut the programme off halfway through that sort of venture. I now ask my next question, which concerns the Establishment Payments Scheme and the Motor Vehicle Assistance Scheme. This is under 'Incentives to industry'. I see that an allocation under the Establishment Payments Scheme, looking at the yellow book, of \$675 000 has been made for this year. Is that correct and does that reflect a significant down-turn in recent years? I can recall as Minister that we were in fact paying out over \$1 million a year under the Establishment Payments Scheme. Has the basis for payment under that scheme changed? If it has not changed, and I certainly know of no announcement which says it has changed, does that mean there is now a significant decrease in the number of new developments taking place in this State which are now eligible for establishment payment? After taking inflation into account it would suggest that we are down to something like half the amount in real terms of what it was in 1981-82, or even less, and that would suggest only about half the industrial investment in this State in the manufacturing sector. Could the Premier, in answering that, also indicate how much of that allocation is for the Motor Vehicle Assistance Scheme for the coming year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: First, the Motor Vehicle Assistance Fund is a separate fund. It is not caught up in that.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I realise that, but it is in the yellow book under one lump sum. For the one figure you have Establishment Payments Scheme and Motor Vehicle Assistance.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: About \$1 million is attributable to the Motor Vehicle Assistance Programme. In relation to the first question regarding the EPS scheme, first, I do not think members should be under the misapprehension that payments under that scheme necessarily reflect totally the level of employment expansion or industrial activity in the State.

In fact, the figures show that South Australia is performing very well in this area against the national trend. There is a continuing decline nationally in manufacturing. South Australia has in fact not only maintained but also slightly increased employment in that sector, as I said, against the national trend. Payments under the Establishment Payments Scheme have run on a par with, if not slightly above, their earlier level. To date, that is, as at 20 September 1984, approvals have been made for payments of the order of \$2.2 million, representing some 950 new jobs, which is a very good performance in that area. However, I repeat again: in some respects one cannot use it. It depends a lot on the pattern of establishment. One may indeed find that greater demands are being made of such funds in a period of recession than in a period of expansion. However, the scheme is there: the guidelines have not changed and the activity is at the same level.

Mr OLSEN: What relationship exists or will exist between Enterprise Investments and SAMIC? That is one of the recent applicants in the second round of management investment company licences.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The purposes of the two are quite different. SAMIC is a venture capital operation that attracts particular tax concessions, of course, as under the Commonwealth scheme. Incidentally, SAMIC has not yet obtained a licence. It is an applicant in the current round that will be determined next month. However, we believe

that it has a good case, and its claims are very strong. As far as Enterprise Investments is concerned, its activities are more directly in a commercial area. I invite Dr Sexton, who is the Department of State Development representative on the Board, to explain to the Committee what sort of strategies the fund intends to pursue.

Mr OLSEN: I am looking for the relationship between the two. That was the question specifically.

Dr Sexton: Enterprise Investments is to encourage growth of existing industries through expansion and not to assist start up ventures, whereas SAMIC is basically to assist start up ventures. There is a relationship, but the relationship is in the sense that they are both assisting new employment and new growth. However, one is a start up operation and the other is for continued growth and expansion to reach a new high growth plateau.

Mr OLSEN: However, they will operate as separate entities and there is no relationship between the two?

Dr Sexton: That is right.

Mr OLSEN: Has the Premier indicated to any of the State owned financial institutions that they will be required to take up investments in the Enterprise Fund and, if he has, does he suggest that there is some lack of confidence in attracting investors to them by making such a direction?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No, definitely not, and there is certainly no need for such directions to be given. The applications for investors (and one should bear in mind that the prospectus has not yet been issued) will be fully underwritten and subscribed without State Government involvement.

Mr OLSEN: Page 132 of the yellow book states that senior officers from the Department attended migration seminars in Hong Kong and Malaysia, which resulted in significant investment for the State. Can the Premier give details of the investments that have been generated?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Dr Sexton attended the seminars and I will ask him to provide some information.

Dr Sexton: The seminars were conducted as a result of an investment and planning investment of just over \$20 million, and nearly 600 jobs are expected to be generated through that investment. It is very early days in the sense that the seminar is now only starting to feed through to investors in this State, and we expect that the total would be much greater.

Mr HAMILTON: In regard to State marketing and promotion on page 41, can the Premier explain the functions of the Department in the area of overseas representation for which \$130 000 has been allocated?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Overseas representation, as I indicated in another context, is undergoing a considerable reassessment. We have been fortunate that senior officers—the Director himself and others—have over the past 12 months been able to give a fairly detailed assessment based on direct experience overseas themselves and on looking at the return for the programme. I ask Mr Smith to make some comments about the general thinking in this area.

Mr Smith: The basic situation is that for the time being, while we review the total representation, the arrangements that have been made for a couple of years at least will continue, but we have changed the accent significantly to provide for more assistance to potential investors to the State and, in particular posts such as Singapore and Hong Kong, for more work that is directly involved in co-ordinating trade development activities for the State. In other words, it is a much more directed programme than it has been before with very clear objectives being set by the Department.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier explain how the \$7 million allocated for pay-roll tax rebates to encourage regional development has been distributed between regions? That appears in programme 4 on page 41.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The principles of payment are based on employment. We have a breakdown of the number of establishments that are pretty well scattered throughout the State. Something like 300-odd establishments qualify under the reimbursement scheme and, as I said, they are fairly evenly distributed. They also comprise a complete range of enterprises. This whole area of incentives to industry has been subjected to fairly close scrutiny and a committee's assessment. It has reported, and the report is now under consideration. One of the things that it has considered specifically is the effectiveness of this kind of blanket rebate system.

It has been suggested (I think with some good cause) that it tends in some areas to be fairly indiscriminate in that a scheme that is aimed particularly at encouraging expansion and development or establishment in areas where such activity might not have taken place is simply being paid as, if one likes, a reward for being in the area and operating in it. So, obviously this whole thing needs some reassessment. Such an assessment took place in Victoria recently, and in a sense, because they moved in this area before we did, we can learn a little from their experience about what effects it has and fine tune any changes that are made. However, at this stage pending the final consideration of the review report that scheme remains in place.

Mr HAMILTON: Finally, \$738 000 is proposed to be spent on the Small Business Corporation. How much of this money is allocated for salaries and what are the other items of expenditure?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: As the honourable member would realise, in establishing the Corporation we have upgraded it and increased the staff resources available to it: in fact, we have just about doubled it. It is estimated that the staff and fees component of that budget represents about \$324 000. The rest relates to establishment costs, accommodation, and so on. The establishment costs component is a one off amount established as part of the Corporation's start up funds. Then there are various other allocations for the computer centre for which we are receiving funding from the Federal Government as well on a 50/50 basis, various training programmes and various grants and services that will be made by the Corporation. We expect it to be officially open for business some time in October; the exact date has not yet been determined.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I wish to ask a series of questions about the marketing approach or campaign undertaken by State Development in New South Wales and Victoria where it attempted to attract people to South Australia by highlighting the lifestyle here compared to the lifestyle in those States. Recently the Premier said that over 4 000 people had responded to that campaign. How many of those people have actually moved to this State, what types of jobs have they taken on and what have been the benefits of that campaign?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: First, let us establish what the campaign is aimed at doing. It is a first stage aimed at raising awareness but targeted awareness. It is aimed particularly at entrepreneurs and people who are mobile. The assessment is that people between 35 and 50 years of age are not as mobile as those younger and older than that, in that their families have reached a certain stage of education, whatever, and their career has probably reached a point where relocation is a difficult decision. All this is all based on the quality of research that has been done.

So, the target, based around lifestyle, has been aimed at that group—either the young person still with either a very young family or no family looking for somewhere to settle down and getting stuck into it or, alternatively, an older person who wants to develop his business or start up a

business and does not have the same geographical ties to a particular area.

That is the first stage of the strategy: an awareness programme. The response in terms of simply the expression of interest has been very much higher than we could have expected, but naturally such responses do not automatically translate into actual arrivals of business. At this stage it is probably still too early to identify precise numbers, but I am advised there are about 100 firm prospects at this stage; that is, people who followed up the material, made further inquiries, indicated the nature and type of the business they wished to establish, and evidenced a fairly firm intention to make that move.

We are talking of a programme that has been running for only a few months. Obviously, those sort of prospects will translate into action over the next six months or so only. We are pretty optimistic: the programme has achieved its first stage purpose. We need in this financial year to follow it up and really start pushing home specifics.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Technology Park, the multi tenant facility, is reasonably well occupied at present. Does the Government have any plans to build another multi tenant facility, particularly as it seems to be the greatest area of demand at Technology Park? In answering that, can the Premier indicate why a number of companies that had virtually committed themselves to establish at Technology Park still not have built?

When I look out there I still see no company that has built having negotiated with the new Government. In other words, the companies there are companies that negotiated with the previous Government. Even British Aerospace, which the Premier announced some months ago, had negotiations with the previous Government. Are there any other developments outside of the multi tenant facility where new buildings will be built; how soon are those new facilities likely to be built and announced, and why has not British Aerospace gone ahead with its development?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The honourable member should bear in mind the multi tenant facility has attracted tenants who in time, depending on the success of their operations, could move out into their own custom built buildings. In other words, for some that type of complex will be a staging base, we hope. At this stage, there is no consideration of a further building of that kind, although obviously if there is a high demand for it we will certainly look at doing so.

The strategy would be to try to encourage some of the existing tenants to extend, develop and relocate at Technology Park itself. Physical evidence is there that the first stage of the three stage Duntech complex is now well advanced in construction. The actual commencement time of the British Aerospace project has been deferred as a result of discussion at its London head office. The Government and Technology Park people are keeping in constant contact with them. The design work has been proceeding, and planning for that stage is well advanced. Recently, British Aerospace picked up a major defence offset contract that will be carried out here in South Australia. The more of that type of business that it can develop over the next 12 months the sooner a decision will be made to actually commence construction.

Some of the Corporation's overseas marketing operation is conducted under the auspices of the Grayden programme, and in the earlier response to Grayden we are making that distinction, as the Director mentioned, between the technology marketed under Grayden and their general marketing programme. The feeling is that the general marketing programme has been too diffuse and is not yielding the results, either actual or potential, that it should at this stage, bearing in mind the lead times, and that is part of the assessment. There have been some more direct results from the technology aspect of that programme. Seven United States com-

panies visited Adelaide as a direct result of the trip in February 1984 following up some of that marketing work, and there are a number of prospects. I can add nothing at this stage. I do not want to get involved in premature announcements, but we are quite satisfied at the moment that there will be a good level of occupancy.

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say whether the Porter Bay project is still proceeding according to the initial plans? Earlier this year the Premier announced a \$27 million redevelopment for the Porter Bay project and said the Government had reached agreement in principle with private companies to own and manage the project and that final feasibility studies were to be completed by July. The Premier also indicated that the Government's financial involvement to the extent of \$8 million was conditional on private sector involvement and financial commitment proceeding as agreed. Have the final feasibility studies been completed and has the Government finalised its financial commitment?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, the major studies have been completed and Cabinet has had before it some detailed proposals on the next stage of development. One or two matters, some relating to the financial arrangements, have yet to be clarified before formal announcements of the progress of the project can be made. The response from local investors, including the fishing community in terms of marina purchase and so on, has been encouraging. In terms of private sector investment, it is proposed that Porter Bay Development Company will be established and that it will have a 25 per cent interest by the State Government itself. The advantage that this gives us is that we are involved in expenditure on the marina and other aspects of the project. Further, by having a direct interest in the development company we can share in any profits that are forthcoming from that development, and, if all goes according to plan, there should be profits accruing to all the investors involved.

Other investors include a couple of private companies, but I am not sure that we can disclose their names at this stage. Other putative participants in the company include the Co-operative Building Society and a group called PRD, a realty development company from Queensland which is also connected with the Quality Inns group. We are especially pleased to have the involvement of that company, albeit a Queensland concern, for it has experience especially in the resort and tourist aspect as well as real estate development on the Gold Coast and in similar areas. The company is interested in the project and its investment will be a valuable adjunct.

The State Government Insurance Commission is also interested in participation on an investment basis. There is also a degree of participation by Port Lincoln investors: aside from the purchase of lots, Port Lincoln businessmen will be investing directly in the project. There is therefore a wide spread of interest by both the public and the private sectors. We have also had expressions of interest from companies involved in tour packages and so on, and more work will be done in an effort to get the involvement of such companies both overseas and within Australia because that is important for the resort stage of the project. In summary, the lead-up work is going well and we are satisfied with the feasibility studies that have already been made. However, we cannot make a final announcement until all the financial arrangements are in place.

Mr OLSEN: Have recommendations been made to the Government to review pay-roll tax and the land tax rebate scheme?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I dealt with that matter at some length in reply to a question that the member for Albert Park asked earlier in these proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If not I declare the examination completed.

Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous, \$5 675 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
The Hon. D.C. Brown
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr K. Smith, Director, Department of State Development.
Dr R. Sexton, Executive Director (Marketing and Trade), Department of State Development.

Mr C.J. Johnson, Senior Administrative Officer, Department of State Development.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare this expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: To cover losses and other payments associated with the operation of Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd, \$4 500 000 was allocated last year but only \$1 350 000 was spent, thereby having a significant effect on the Budget because of underspending by more than \$3 million. The sum of \$3 200 000 has been allocated for expenditure on this line for 1984-85. Will the Treasurer say why last year's allocation was underspent? I assume that the sum represents a payment to the State Bank for losses previously incurred. Was the failure to make the full payment last year an attempt to improve the Budget figures?

Mr Smith: The lower level of expenditure compared to the expenditure anticipated last year resulted from the cannery manager forward contracting a packing programme to keep the staff occupied. In the event, it did keep the staff occupied and led to a significant stock build-up. Because of the nature of the agreement with the purchaser of the stock, he was able to negotiate advance payments, which put less pressure on the Treasury to top up in order to meet loan commitments and the like. The reason for the larger allocation this year compared to the actual expenditure last year is that, in view of the decision to place the management of the cannery in the hands of Berri Fruit Juices Co-Operative Ltd subject to a satisfactory marketing and production business plan coming forward, there is substantial provision for redundancy payments as well as paying out obligations of the Receiver.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Redundancy payments to whom?

Mr Smith: To existing employees of the cannery. The costs would have to be met by the Receiver, and the Treasury underwrites those losses under the old agreement.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The redundancy payments would be made in the event of termination of services.

Mr Smith: Not yet.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: What is the basis of the proposed redundancy payments?

Mr Smith: That matter has still to be negotiated.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: A notional sum has been allocated in anticipation. If, for instance, the marketing plan succeeds,

that will limit the number of redundancies. We cannot do more than make an estimate at this stage because the numbers will depend very much on whether, at the end of the BFJ assessment, we have to close down entirely or whether part or all of the operation can stay in action.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The sum of \$338 000 has been allocated for the Adelaide Innovation Centre this year. What is the nature of the agreement with the Commonwealth Government for the funding of the Centre, and why is that payment so substantially increased on the actual payment made last year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is on a dollar for dollar basis. Effectively, we are looking at a four-month period of operation last year and a full year effect this year.

Mr GROOM: The sum of \$250 000 is to be allocated for the Riverland Council for Redevelopment this year. Can the Premier comment on this allocation and say what benefits will flow for the Riverland?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This arose from the problems of the cannery, but not entirely, because there are other major structural problems in the Riverland. At the same time, there is great potential in the Riverland and, for that potential to be realised and for the necessary restructuring to be carried out, we believe that there must be a body that can establish an overall redevelopment plan and ensure that it is implemented. Consultations and seminars that have been organised have led to the establishment of this proposal. Advertisements have been placed and a short list has been drawn up for the position of full time Executive Chairman. Obviously, the salary of the Chairman will come out of this \$250 000. Interviews for the position will take place in early October and, as soon as an appointment has been made, other members of the council will be nominated and work will commence. The Executive Chairman initially will have working with him or her a project officer and a stenosecretary.

Also within the amount of \$250 000 provision has been made for consultancies and studies as required. We see that as being a realistic budget for a council that has a great ability to mobilise the potential of the Riverland and to assist in the restructuring process. That is in addition to the major exercise that is being done in regard to the cannery itself.

Mr GROOM: I refer to the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, for which an amount over and above the amount spent in 1983-84 has been allocated. Can the Premier outline the reasons for the proposed expenditure? Further, can he outline what sort of benefits will accrue from this type of expenditure at Technology Park?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This year provision has been made for an addition to the staff, namely a marketing manager, and that will upgrade and make that function more specific. Effectively, the Executive Officer of the Technology Park Corporation has been carrying out a dual function. Other amounts have been increased simply in line with inflation. A very important further allocation is to be made to the marketing programme for Technology Park: that has been increased by 25 to 30 per cent. That is apart from the appointment of a specialist marketing officer. It represents a further stage in the development of the Technology Park project.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Chairman, no doubt you would have noted that Government members are preventing adequate time being available for consideration of the lines under the Minister for the Arts.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has no control over the right of any member of the Committee's seeking information.

Mr FERGUSON: An amount of \$315 000 has been allocated for the State Enterprise Fund in 1984-85. How will that amount be spent?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The amount represents a starting up fund for the company. First, \$100 000 has been made to the company in return for 200 000 A-class shares. That will leave a balance of \$215 000. That is the company's estimated operating short-fall for the current year. This obligation arises because of the Government's guarantee of principal and interest in respect to the company's preference shares and convertible note borrowings. The State Government Financing Authority will also make available a loan of \$300 000 to Enterprise Investments as establishment costs. As I mentioned earlier, the prospectus will be issued towards the end of October. These funds are in the nature of investment funds as far as the State is concerned, and over time as the fund successfully invests we hope that we will see a return for our investment and also for that made by shareholders.

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

Works and Services—Department of State Development,
\$3 000 000—Examination declared completed.

Arts, \$5 645 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. Amadio, Director, Department of the Arts.
Mr K. Lloyd, Acting Senior Finance Officer.
Mr C. Winzar, Director, Arts Development Division.
Mr J. Mildrum, Chief Administrative Officer.

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

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the second line on page 45 of the Estimates of Payments. It refers to a policy matter referred to at page 161 of the yellow book, where the following statement is made:

In conjunction with the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to liaise with the developers of the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment project regarding the needs of patrons using the Festival Centre.

I seek an assurance from the Premier that the needs of patrons finding severe parking problems now in regard to the Adelaide Festival Centre will not be overlooked with the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment project.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They will definitely not be overlooked. On the contrary, we envisage that the development of the ASER project and its facilities will be very much complementary to (and in fact will reinforce) the Festival Centre Trust's activities. This has provided us with an opportunity that has been fairly enthusiastically pursued to ensure a physical integration of the plaza areas between the

railway station environs and the existing Festival Centre. Of course, considerable joint activities can be undertaken during the course of marketing the Convention Centre, for instance, as well as all sorts of functions that will revolve around the international hotel. I believe that the Festival Centre and its facilities can play a very useful part. Already the Trust and the developers have had discussions with officers of my Department.

Mr OLSEN: I refer to the reference to professional and technical support at page 171 of the yellow book. Once again this concerns a policy matter on which I seek clarification. Reference is made to conservation needs. The State Library, of course, is part of the North Terrace cultural precinct. Is the Minister proposing to assume responsibility for the State Library?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No. I am not. The honourable member should remember that the State Library is part of a libraries network that has been extensively developed over the past seven or eight years, mainly as a result of the impetus provided by the Crawford Committee Report. That has resulted in the establishment of a major network of regional libraries in association with local government.

For that reason, the libraries function in Government has remained with the Local Government Department, because so much activity is in what we call the public library as opposed to the State Library sector. However, on the other hand, the State Library has certainly been an active participant in the redevelopment of that North Terrace precinct that is taking place. They are represented on all the committees. Stage 2 of that project, which the Government would wish to proceed with but no time table for which has been set, envisages major extensions and modifications to the State Library itself. So, obviously, they are very involved in the overall development of that precinct. We see no need, at least currently, to integrate library services within the Department of the Arts.

The only thing one could envisage perhaps further down the track would be if there was a separation between the local government regional library network and the State Library; in other words, if one wished to see it as a kind of 'stand alone' institution. But, bear in mind that the State Library has not just a research function, it has a very large lending service in children's, adults and youth lending services. So, as a result, I do not see that that is called for at present.

Mr OLSEN: Has a Deputy Director been appointed to the Art Gallery? If so, who is it and at what remuneration?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Applications have been called: they close on 10 October.

Mr OLSEN: Is there any plan within the Art Gallery Division for previously unremunerated board members to be now paid a fee?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Cabinet has assessed the whole structure of fees being paid to boards and committees of Government authorities. A complete assessment has been made of appropriate levels of remuneration in all those areas by the Public Service Board. In the course of that exercise I instructed that all bodies—whether they have been paid in the past or not—should be considered and an appropriate level of fees determined.

In some instances where fees have been offered they have not been claimed by board members. However, it is the intention in relation to the Art Gallery, whose board members have never been paid in the past, to provide an honorarium for its members. I think it is only fair: they are expected to do a lot of work. In fact the work load in the past 12 months has gone beyond simply attending a monthly meeting; they have been present at seminars and discussions within the Gallery. I would like to see that involvement and role of Art Gallery board members continue. It is only

reasonable that there be provision made for an honorarium, of course to non-public servants, on such bodies. Funds are being provided for that purpose.

Mr OLSEN: What level of fee are we talking about?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I think that a total of \$9 000 has been provided. It is either a sessional level or rate. I will get those details.

Mr OLSEN: Referring to Estimates of Payments, page 45 (line 9), what appointments are anticipated to absorb the \$86 000 referred to for the Centre for Conservation of Cultural Material?

Mr Amadio: Funds have been provided for positions of head of the centre, a steno-secretary and a total of four conservators at a total cost of \$86 000 in order to get the Centre under way. It is anticipated that it will be operating by March next year once the new buildings on the northern side of the total North Terrace complex (adjacent to Adelaide college) are built and operating.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Centre handle all the conservation needs of the Art Gallery, Museum and State Library?

Mr Amadio: Yes; it is intended that there will be staff transferred over to the centre from the Art Gallery, Library and Museum and that it will handle all the needs of North Terrace institutions. It is a unique development by Australian standards.

Mr OLSEN: That starts in March 1985. What is the anticipated full year cost of that? Is it approximately four times the amount in the Budget?

Mr Amadio: It would not be that much. I would have to do some calculations on those figures—probably about three times.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Two positions are transfers, so that is not an increase.

Mr Amadio: It is anticipated that those positions will be filled in the middle of this financial period, probably between January and March, so there will be a saving this year.

Mr OLSEN: I refer now to the yellow book at page 156 and the 1983-84 specific targets or objectives which state that evaluation has been commenced of the economic impact of arts activities on the State's economy. When did the evaluation commence and when is it expected to be completed?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is a continuing examination: the assessment has commenced; some major work has been done at the national level through the meeting of Ministers of the Arts, which is soon to be constituted as a formal council of Ministers of Culture, which is the expression used at the Federal level. However, a study was conducted by them and is being assessed. In addition, funds were provided last year to do a special assessment on the economic impact of the Adelaide Festival of Arts, specifically.

Detailed questionnaires and other assessments were made during the course of this year's Festival. The provisional first report of the study group has been presented to me, and I hope to publish it after I get a chance to assess it in the fairly near future. When we talk of continuing examination, the concept is to use the data base that has been provided both nationally and through the special studies to assess the employment impact in particular and the effect on tourism of arts activities in this State. That is a relevant exercise because much of our tourism thrust, our lifestyle approach, and so on, is related to arts activities in this State.

Per capita, we fund the arts to a higher degree than does any other State in Australia. I think it is only right in those circumstances that we try to get some fairly precise measures of just what sort of economic impact that is having, aside from the social and cultural impact, and the data assessed so far certainly shows that if one looks at arts as an industry, it is in fact a fairly major contributor to the economy.

Mr OLSEN: Those are my only questions at this stage.

Mr HAMILTON: Given that 1985 is the International Year of Youth, can the Premier outline the expenditure allocated to arts education and youth involvement in those arts?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, Carclew will be getting \$473 000. We are providing art in education support funds of the order of \$250 000, with \$50 000 coming from the youth performing arts line, and then there is a whole series of project grants to various bodies which are specifically directed to youth, theatre or youth activities of various sorts. There is quite a long list of them. Some of those are companies that have been funded in the past, but in most cases, although not all, depending upon the programme, they are getting a boost in funds this year, some quite substantial boosts, in order to put on special programmes for Youth Year. That will total around \$300 000. That must be set off against about \$170 000 in that area last year. In addition, there is the support we give to various alternative theatres that will be mounting other programmes that will be relevant.

I might mention in this context also the Come Out 85, the Youth Arts Festival, which has been adopted nationally as a key project for Australia in the International Year of Youth. We expect that to be a mighty big event which will not only embrace Adelaide, but also country areas as well. Planning for that is well advanced. In fact, the Come Out organisation has recently established and registered itself as a separate entity. It was formerly connected with and acting under the auspices of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. It has now set up as an entity in its own right in preparation for Come Out 85.

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

Arts, Miscellaneous, \$20 355 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. Amadio, Director, Department of the Arts.
Mr K. Lloyd, Acting Senior Finance Officer.
Mr C. Winzar, Director, Arts Development Division.
Mr J. Mildrum, Chief Administrative Officer.

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

Mr OLSEN: Has the Central Arts Advisory body been appointed as yet and, if so, who are its members?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The answer to that is 'No'. The appointment of that body should be finalised within about six to eight weeks. Terms of reference and categories of membership have been developed, and I hope within a period of six weeks or so to be able to announce the body itself. At the moment we are looking at a broadly representative body which will not only have members at large, that is, directly appointed, but also representatives of some of the key arts committee areas, like the Arts Finance Com-

mittee, the Regional Art Facilities Committee and a number of those, so that we get a mix of the standing committees under the arts and other areas. When that body is established, it will have the role of making recommendations on general arts policies to the Government, monitoring the creative and artistic work of major arts organisations as opposed to the financial considerations, recommending the small grants programme (that is the function that is currently in the hands of the Arts Grants Advisory Committee), and as part of its brief, it will hold public meetings to generate discussion on the arts and gain the community's viewpoint on arts policy funding.

Mr OLSEN: What is the reason for the increase from \$2 377 000 to \$2 600 000 in operation costs for the Festival Centre Trust?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Basically, that represents the inflationary factor. There is extraordinary maintenance and extra maintenance of \$216 000 and capital replacement of \$150 000. I think they are the major ones. I think we are finding increasingly that the centre is now reaching that stage of life, about 10 years or so, where there is increasing replacement of facilities and increasing maintenance.

Mr HAMILTON: In relation to the South Australian Film Corporation, in years gone by the member for Hanson made a statement that it should be sold off to private enterprise. Can the Premier advise me as to the current financial position of the South Australian Film Corporation and the benefits that have accrued to South Australia as a result of the Government's assistance to that Corporation?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I have rejected that very strongly. It should be remembered that the South Australian Film Corporation was established not to be the sole producer or developer of films in South Australia but to provide the catalyst and drive to see an industry established around it, and it has been very successful in that. It has spawned a lot of commercial activity that would not have happened in South Australia without its presence. In terms of its financial brief, the marching orders (if one likes) that the Corporation was given was that over time it should attempt to become profitable through the sale and use of its services. Bearing in mind all the changes that have taken place in that industry and the developments that have often been pioneered by the Corporation, it has performed remarkably well.

The Corporation has not been a drain on the Government. Indeed, the South Australian Film Corporation complains constantly that some of the grants and advantages that its counterparts in other States which came on the scene later enjoy are not granted to it. However, equally its financial performance has been substantial. Of course, the Government provides assistance by a pretty healthy Government film programme and other means. In the financial year just ended, the South Australian Film Corporation recorded a profit and that is, as I said, a splendid achievement. It is a very small profit, admittedly, but it indicates the sound way in which the Corporation has been managed and, interestingly enough, fulfils the mandate that it was given to reach a period of stability or profitability within about 10 years of operation. It has done that and I hope that that continues.

Mr HAMILTON: One wonders why the member for Hanson wanted to sell it off. Can the Premier advise why it has been necessary to increase expenditure to the Australian Dance Theatre?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That is a sorry tale, and I was glad that the Director showed me an article the other day in which John Cargher, noted broadcaster, dance and opera writer and critic, had some very strong words to say about this matter. In doing that, he has joined a number of others who have been somewhat appalled by what has happened. The Australian Dance Theatre has been funded since its

inception on a tripartite basis by the Federal Government through the Australian Council, and the Governments of Victoria and South Australia. Its headquarters have been here, but it has divided its performance time and other activities between South Australia and Victoria, and it has developed a very formidable reputation both nationally and internationally.

Last year, without any prior warning, the Victorian Government announced that it was withdrawing from the tripartite agreement and, despite this, coupled with an across the board cut in arts funding for that State, it has created enormous problems in South Australia. We have appealed to the Federal Government to try to assist. Naturally we went back to the Victorian Government. The best that we have been able to do with it is a guaranteed performance figure that is a little more than about \$130 000—about half the grant that was paid. We were faced with either a substantial cutback in the ADT and its activities which would have robbed it of its ability to perform, its closure, or finding some special funds. We made an extra grant above the voted payment in order to try to cover that gap. This year we have provided extra money in order to ensure its survival. However, we cannot go on indefinitely funding it at that sort of level. Certainly, we cannot lift the funding above that sort of level. We still hope to receive some further support from the Federal Government because we believe it vital that the ADT stay in operation.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier explain how the programme of purchases of art for public places is being monitored? The amount allocated is \$56 000.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Recently, a committee was formed under the Chairmanship of Mr Tony Bishop, who is a practising artist and art lecturer and formerly a member of the Art Gallery Board, with various other persons who have interests and involvement in the arts, including the newly appointed Director of the Art Gallery, to monitor that programme and ensure that it has some impetus. It has been allocated \$56 000 this year, and it is hoped that that will be matched by sponsorship and other support so that the funds will go much further. One of the briefs of the committee is to try to top up those funds with support from the private sector.

Mr HAMILTON: The Premier might recall that I wrote to him in relation to a display of public arts at the Adelaide Railway Station at some time in the future, as I saw earlier this year in Sydney. It would be an ideal situation once the Adelaide Railway Station has been fully developed to make use of that facility.

Mr OLSEN: Does the Government intend to appoint a representative from the Adelaide Festival of Arts Board to the board of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to facilitate liaison between the two?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, it does, but it will require amendment to the Act. That will be done, but I am not sure when. It is not an urgent priority matter, but it is certainly something that we have given an undertaking to do.

Mr OLSEN: In the next six or 12 months?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Within the next 12 months.

Mr OLSEN: I note in the yellow book, page 158, that the Youth Performing Arts has had an increase from \$566 500 to a proposed \$823 000. What are the reasons for that considerable increase and does the Minister consider that with the TAFE and CAE expenditure to assist the South Australian Youth and Performing Arts, plus secondary school training in arts and education, the Government's proposed programme may duplicate the expenditure of resources in this general area?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That extra expenditure is connected with International Year of Youth: it bears on the question asked earlier.

Mr OLSEN: It is not a direct duplication of resources provided in those other areas?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: No.

Mr OLSEN: It is a different programme altogether?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes.

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister supply in due course individual details of the aggregated sums? I refer to Estimates of Payment, page 47, line 20 and details of the aggregated sums for actual payments 1983-84 of \$1 448 984 and the proposed payments for 1984-85. Obviously that detail is not available to date.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We can provide a schedule on that.

Mr OLSEN: Under 'Implications for Resources' there is reference to increased staffing and operating funds for an ethnic arts advisory committee. Does the Government intend to appoint an ethnic arts officer as promised at the time of the last election?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes.

Mr OLSEN: When is that expected to occur?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That will be done this financial year, and probably before the end of the year. Arrangements are in train for that appointment: it is an approved position in this year's Budget. Funding for the position is being shared between the Department for the Arts and the Ethnic Affairs Commission.

Mr OLSEN: A Community Arts Officer has been appointed to the UTLC. Who is the officer and who is paying the officer's salary?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Australian Arts Council and the Department of the Arts are contributing to the salary. It is an arrangement similar to that which we have in other areas with local government: it is a joint funding arrangement. This programme was initiated by the Australian Arts Council and we are happy to be a part of it. Mr Steve Cassidy is the officer who is operating, and programmes have been developed.

Mr OLSEN: How much Government money is being used to pay the Arts officer of the United Trades and Labor Council?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: We would be sharing the salary of the officer—\$9 400. There are three community arts officers and we intend to expand that this year on the same basis. The Australian Council provides funds for this purpose on the basis that we match those funds over a three-year period.

Mr OLSEN: Have any Government or agency films been paid for during the 1983-84 financial year directly by the department or agency involved? If so, how much has been spent?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: The Government film line is the chief source of funding for that area. There may be one or two examples. We will check and advise the Leader.

Mr OLSEN: Is the committee to help with grants to public radio at a cost of \$73 000 still operating?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes. That is one of the committees that we would see continuing after the establishment of the central arts advisory body.

Mr OLSEN: How was the \$52 000 spent on purchase of art for public places last financial year?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That money was allocated prior to the formation of the committee whose work I described earlier. For the financial year past, the money was allocated to the five cultural centre trusts (the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the regional trusts) for their expenditure. It was considered that to implement the funding of art in public places those were the appropriate bodies to generate activity.

As from this year, however, the new committee will deal with this as a central programme.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If not, I declare the examination completed.

Minister for the Arts, Miscellaneous, \$20 355 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr S.J. Baker
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr K.C. Hamilton
Mr J.W. Olsen

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. Amadio, Director, Department of the Arts.
Mr K. Lloyd, Acting Senior Finance Officer.
Mr C. Winzar, Director, Arts Development Division.
Mr J. Mildrum, Chief Administrative Officer.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the line open for examination. Are there any questions?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say what Loan works are involved in the expenditure of the sum of \$300 000?

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: This sum is provided for design and feasibility study of the Living Arts Centre. The Government expects to have the final report of that group for decision soon. A design study was commissioned and we have a steering committee comprising internal and external user groups which is supervising the feasibility study. We are now considering the financial feasibility of the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the examination completed, and adjourn the Committee until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 26 September at 11 a.m.