

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 September 1993

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood

Members:

Mr M.K. Brindal
 The Hon. D.C. Brown
 Mr P. Holloway
 Mrs C.F. Hutchison
 Mr I.P. Lewis
 Mr J.A. Quirke

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Legislative Council, \$2 620 000
 House of Assembly, \$5 023 000
 Joint Parliamentary Services, \$5 736 000

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Premier.

Advisers:

Mr G.D. Mitchell, Clerk of the House of Assembly.
 Mr A.M. Schulze, Accounting Officer to the Legislature.
 Mr H.F. Coxon, Parliamentary Librarian.
 Mr J.C. Sibly, Catering Manager.
 Mr K.R. Simms, Leader, *Hansard*.

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to allow the Premier and the lead speaker for the Opposition to make an opening statement, if desired, of no longer than 15 minutes. A flexible approach will be adopted with respect to the asking of questions, based on three questions per member, but with the possibility of a brief supplementary question to conclude the line of questioning. However, in doing that, I will have to be reasonably formal to be fair to all members of the Committee.

Mr BRINDAL: Is the opening statement for the Opposition and the Premier for the representatives of each department, or is it just for the beginning of the day?

The CHAIRMAN: One would normally expect that the first question on each examination to be perhaps rather longer and all encompassing than would otherwise be the case.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I take it from your interpretation, Mr Chairman, that each time we come to a new section we can make an opening statement.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Leader of the Opposition asks the first question, and if he wants to be a little more discursive on that question, that will be in order. However, I will keep my eye on the clock in order to be fair to all members. By the same token, the Premier may wish, as we move from line to line, to indicate changes to advisers, and that would not be seen as anything out of the ordinary.

Subject to the convenience of the Committee, a member who is outside the Committee and desires to ask a question will be permitted once the line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by the Committee. It is important that we be given an indication of that so that it can be slotted in.

Questions must be based on lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates of Payments and Receipts (Parliamentary Paper No. 9). Reference may be made to other documents, for example, the Program Estimates, the Auditor-General's Report, etc. Members must identify a page number in the relevant financial papers from which their question is derived.

As I have already indicated, in answer to an earlier question from Mr Brindal, the Premier will be asked to introduce advisers prior to commencement and at any changeover. Questions are to be directed to the Premier at the table and not advisers, though the Premier may refer questions to advisers for a response. Members would now have in front of them an erratum document, Financial Information Paper No. 1, Program Estimates and Information, 1993-94, which covers certain information which is not available in the original papers. I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Does the Premier have an opening statement?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I understand that it is traditional not to have anybody from the Legislative Council here. That is a matter that maybe the Parliament will seek to resolve in future years.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Premier wish to add to that statement?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This morning I received an erratum document for the Budget Papers, circulated by the Treasurer. It contains some pages that were incorrectly printed in the first volume of the Program Estimates that were tabled at the time of the budget. I do not believe that this has any effect on this Committee today, but I draw it to the attention of members who may be taking part in other Committees on other days.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer specifically to the Legislature. The budget allocation for *Hansard* this year is \$1.273 million. That is a reduction of \$624 000, I think, on last year. What are the reasons for the reduction?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The expenditure for 1992-93, at \$1.897 million, was \$71 000 less than the amount budgeted due to savings resulting from the implementation of new technologies within the Parliamentary Reporting Division. With the full implementation of new technology, which will be completed during the 1993-94 financial year, annual recurrent savings of about \$800 000 are anticipated. One half of this amount has been redirected to the Consolidated Account, with the remainder of the savings being made available to cover ongoing costs associated with the new technology and other initiatives as determined by the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. The proposed \$1.273 million for 1993-94 represents a continuation of the no policy change funding level introduced in 1992-93. As mentioned, the provision has been reduced by \$360 000 as a result of the balance of savings due to the Government resulting from the implementation of new technology.

A further reduction of \$120 000 to be funded from anticipated savings has been redirected to the Parliamentary Reporting Division salaries and wages budget to cover the cost of two additional *Hansard* reporter positions required to enable the servicing of parliamentary standing committees. A further reduction of \$215 000 has been brought about by a change to accounting treatment of publications, which are issued free either to or on behalf of members of Parliament, as recommended by the Auditor-General's Department and supported by Treasury.

Previously all costs associated with the provision of such materials were charged against the vote line 'Publications issued to members' and the cheque subsequently raised in

payment of these charges. The cheques were then paid back into general revenue and recorded as a receipt against a receipt line for sales of legislation. Audit determined that the above treatment resulted in a double counting of costs associated with the printing of Bills, Acts and regulations, the printing and publishing of *Hansard* and the overstatement of receipts where materials are in fact not sold but issued free either to or on behalf of members.

A new procedure has now been adopted whereby the amount that is recorded as expenditure against the vote lines for the printing of Bills, Acts and regulations, and *Hansard* printing and publishing will be reduced by journal adjustment, transferring costs for materials issued to members to the expenditure line established for that purpose. In addition, no provision has been included to cover the anticipated cost increases due to the effects of inflation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the installation of new centre doors going out onto North Terrace. First, when will the doors be opened; secondly, how will this improve or upgrade the security; and what has been the total cost of the upgrading of security of Parliament House in 1992-93 and 1993-94?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The total costs in terms of personal anxiety to members over the years as a result of the debate on the centre doors has been enormous. However, in terms of financial costs, \$115 661 has been budgeted for minor additions and alterations and \$345 661 was expended in 1992-93. During the 1992-93 financial year, the original minor works allocation of \$230 000 was supplemented by a further \$170 000 to enable the upgrading of security arrangements within Parliament House. This work involves the establishment of a security cylinder around Centre Hall and the installation of electronic access control equipment within that area. Washroom facilities on the lower ground floor level have also been modified to provide appropriate public access from within the security cylinder.

The non-completion of several minor works projects in 1992-93—most notably the replacement of the Parliament House security system and the carpet replacement within the House of Assembly Chamber—resulted in funds amounting to \$54 000 being carried over to the current financial year to finance the completion of these projects. I will ask Mr Geoff Mitchell to comment on the estimated time of completion of the security work.

Mr Mitchell: The work is substantially completed, except for some of the electronic work that needs to be carried out. We anticipate that it will be in operation by the end of the year. It would probably be better to do it at a time when the House is not sitting rather than in the middle of a session, so that argues for towards the end of the year, even if the works are completed slightly before that.

The CHAIRMAN: We have in front of us three votes—Legislative Council, \$2.62 million; House of Assembly, \$5.023 million; and Joint Parliamentary Service, \$5.736 million. If no-one objects, I will allow questions on all three and then close the votes once members have exhausted their questions.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I support that. In terms of how the security cylinder or cell will work, how will access be provided? Will people be required to use cards at every door in order to get through the system?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have absolutely no idea. I will ask Mr Geoff Mitchell to comment on that.

Mr Mitchell: Before answering the question, I should point out that one of the chief features of any security system

is that we do not publicly talk too much about the degree of security we have so that would-be transgressors do not have intimate details before they actually arrive. In answer to the Leader's question, there have been some comments about what seems to be an excess of doors not only around the security cylinder but also around the building generally. I think it is fair to say that the fire safety upgrading, which is something that has been planned for some time, particularly with smoke sealing of sections of the building, accounts for a good number of those extra doors that we see rather than solely for security.

The basis of the security cylinder is that anyone who is not issued with a security card, probably similar to the one which members have at present, will have to go to that Centre Hall security cylinder and once there will have to satisfy the attendants who are manning that area of their *bona fides*. The exact process of how visitors, once they reach that area, will then be conducted around the building has not been determined by the Presiding Officer at this stage.

Mr QUIRKE: I note (page 3 of the Program Estimates) that, for the Legislative Council, in 1992-93 \$2.511 million was earmarked and actual expenditure was only \$6 000 more than that. The allocation for 1993-94 has been increased by \$103 000. Will the Premier provide details?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It might be possible that the Council deflected costs to the House of Assembly; I notice that the increase above the figure for 1992-93 was somewhat more. On page 16 of the Program Estimates members will see the breakdown of that \$2.62 million and that reveals that there is an increase in salaries, wages and related payments over that proposed last year of about \$134 000, although it was an increase of only \$20 000 on the actual spent last year. There is a reduction in printing of parliamentary Bills, Acts and regulations of about \$40 000 on that proposed last year and about \$30 000 on the actual last year. Select committees have represented a major variation, notwithstanding the number of select committees in the Upper House. The estimate for last year of \$41 000 resulted in an actual expenditure of only \$7 500 but the estimate is back again at \$41 000.

Travelling expenses for members, ex-members and relatives was underspent last year by \$46 000, so the figure put in this year matches last year's vote. The allocation for accommodation allowances for members of Parliament last year was \$30 000 underspent but the vote figure has been put back in at last year's vote figure as it seemed that that was the best figure to use. So the major variation of the extra \$100 000 would appear to come under 'Salaries, wages and related payments'.

Mr QUIRKE: Under the House of Assembly line on the same page we see that there is roughly a \$200 000 increase in the 1992-93 proposed allocation and the actual expenditure, and for 1993-94 we see that there is a modest reduction of about \$37 000. What led to that \$200 000 increase and what are the factors that led the Premier and his department to assume that there will be \$37 000 less in that area for this year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The amount actually spent in 1992-93 exceeded the vote by \$179 154 due to members' superannuation contributions exceeding the amount budgeted following salary increases granted during the year, and to the inclusion of members in the SSBS fund from 1 July 1992; \$96 000 was the figure for that; engagement of Department of Labour personnel to undertake a review of the House of Assembly administration structure and procedures, \$25 000;

additional position created due to the return from extended sick leave of House of Assembly attendant now on a rehabilitation program, \$12 000; leave loading payments greater than budgeted due to higher level of leave taken when compared to the previous year 1991-92, \$3 000; additional overtime cost due to the extension of sittings, \$11 000; higher duty payments associated with the extended leave of the Clerk of the House, \$14 000; salary increases arising from the payment of automatic increments associated with the translation implementation of new Public Service classification structure, \$14 000; and advance of 1993-94 pays paid at 30 June 1993—that is just within that financial year—\$4 000.

The funding level provided for 1993-94 represents a continuation of the no policy change funding level provided in 1992-93. No provision has been permitted for increases in costs due to the effects of inflation or to cover increases in salaries and wages costs due to salary increases which may be granted during the year. This represents an estimated reduction in funding in real terms of \$32 000 and \$84 000 in the allocations provided for salaries and wages and goods and services respectively. Additional funding of \$120 000 has been provided to the House of Assembly 1993-94 budget to provide for improved clerical support services to the House. This will involve the creation of a new office of Administrative Officer and the provision of upgraded computing systems and associated staff training. It will be a tight financial year for the House of Assembly, but these are the same restraints that are being asked of departments elsewhere in Government.

Mr QUIRKE: Can the Premier give an update on certain works that are taking place in Parliament House? For instance, the Clerk mentioned the fire doors that are being installed around the place. Is it anticipated during this financial year that some moneys will be expended on recarpeting the House of Assembly and on a number of other things like that which have been in abeyance for the past few years, as well as on refurbishment of the air-conditioning system?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I remind the member for Playford that in the Meeting the Challenge statement the Government announced that further work on Parliament House would be deferred beyond that which was necessary for occupational health and safety matters, that is, things which could not be deferred at all. While it would be desirable to have earlier work done on the Parliament, that has not been possible given the restraints we have to see elsewhere in Government, but I will ask Mr Mitchell to comment.

Mr Mitchell: The fire doors are part of the security upgrade, albeit for a different reason. The carpets have finally been purchased and as soon as we have a reasonable break they will be installed. At this stage we are anticipating that that take place during the Christmas adjournment.

Mr QUIRKE: Will the red sword line that fascinates schoolchildren who come in here still be part of the recarpeting?

Mr Mitchell: We do not propose to change it.

Mr BRINDAL: The Premier is noted as being something of an expert on parliamentary procedures and the traditions of this place, and my first question is in that light. Does the Premier acknowledge that any Government is the creature of the Parliament and the servant of the Parliament? If he does, has he investigated whether the appropriation of moneys by the Parliament for the Parliament should be made separately

from the processes of Government? The contention is that Parliament has a right to appropriate to itself such moneys as it needs to function and this should be independent of the rest of the functions of Government. Has the Premier investigated that matter, and what conclusions has he reached?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly, an argument could be made that the Parliament should have a significant say in the actual spending of the moneys allocated to it, and it may seem somewhat unusual that the Premier is answering questions on the budget for the Parliament—perhaps it would be better if the Speaker or the President did that, but that is something over which the Parliament has control in terms of the motion that it moves for the Estimates Committees. However, while the principle outlined by the honourable member is correct, I do not think it is an efficient mechanism for the taxpayers of South Australia, or indeed for the Parliament, to have the Parliament effectively vote two separate budgets in isolation of each other: first, it votes a budget for the State Government and all its activities—that is not created just by the Government; it is proposed by the Government, but it does not become a set of expenditures and revenue raising measures until the Parliament has said so; so, the Parliament controls that; secondly, it votes a separate budget on the expenditures for the Parliament.

That is an inefficient procedure, and it is not unreasonable that the Government should have the obligation and responsibility of proposing to the Parliament an overall pattern of how moneys can be raised to pay for the expenditures to be incurred. It would then be up to the Parliament to make up its own mind about those proposals. So, while I accept that an argument could be made, at the end of the day it is the Parliament that votes on the whole budget not just on one or another aspect. However, as to the first point whether the Speaker or the President should answer questions on that line, that matter could be looked into in the future.

Mr BRINDAL: I wish to pursue that line of questioning in terms of the Meeting the Challenge statement, which as the Premier has acknowledged deferred upgrading on this building, and also the fact that this building is not subject to the normal laws of this State. The Parliament has got away with many of the things that are wrong in this building in terms of fire, occupational health and safety and many other matters, because it is not subject to the normal laws which the Premier and the Government enforce elsewhere in South Australia. In view of the fact that the Premier has said that the Government is responsible for the budget and therefore takes responsibility for the building, has adequate provision been made for the provision of occupational health and safety standards in this building, and when will those standards be reached?

I draw attention specifically to the two offices situated outside the Chamber doors near the Whip's office, which fire officers tell me are a fire hazard. They are totally made of wood and they are built in fire wells. There is a huge danger of loss of life if fire occurs because of the nature of the structure, yet they are still being used as offices. When will this Government get this building to a standard which it demands for all other workers in this State?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are two tiers to that question. First, there is the requirement of occupational health and safety measures and safety principles, such as fire safety and so on. Funds have been made available for fire safety work to be attended to. However, I cannot comment on those two particular offices. The honourable member draws attention to the fact that they are wooden rooms that have

been created out of space in the building. Perhaps Mr Mitchell can comment on that issue in a moment. The second tier to that question is: what are reasonable working conditions? I acknowledge that for many in this building there are not reasonable working conditions and that in Meeting the Challenge we deferred further work on that matter.

I accept that my decision brought criticism from various members on both sides of the House. That is fine, because at the end of the day there are many other issues on which money must be spent from the source of money available to us, namely, the taxpayer. My Cabinet and I did not believe that at this stage this was the top priority. We agreed that we should address fire safety measures and other basic safety principles, but as far as upgrading the quality of working space in this building is concerned—I agree that there is a priority for the staff, such as *Hansard*, catering and the administrative staff of the building—members of Parliament come at the bottom of the list. When better times return in terms of Government revenue, that will be the time to look at those issues.

Mr BRINDAL: Proposed expenditure for the library was \$565 000, but the actual expenditure was \$548 000. There used to be a computer-type record that enabled one to search for speeches using key words, and so on. When I went to look up some speeches I was told that that facility had been cut out because of budget constraints. I believe that that does not allow me as a member of Parliament and other members on both sides to fulfil our duties. I also was informed that this year's *Hansard* will have a different form of indexing. If the two areas are reviewed concurrently, it will become difficult for members of Parliament to do what I believe you, Mr Premier, have been an expert at doing, that is, knowing exactly what people have said in the past and quoting it back to them. It is an important tool for all parliamentary members but, for some reason or other, that tool seems to have been seriously blunted. Given that the library has under spent, why has that facility disappeared? Are the comments about *Hansard* and its index accurate?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Simms to respond after Mr Coxon has commented on the question in respect of the library.

Mr Coxon: The fact that several tens of thousands of dollars less have been spent in the past financial year than was provided for is explained by the fact that several positions were vacant during the year for certain periods as people left and positions were advertised. It is amazing what kind of savings that achieves. The issue of the availability of information via on-line systems is separate. The system to which the honourable member refers is the on-line *Hansard*. That was not an initiative of the library; it was completely separate from the library. It was an initiative of State Systems, some years ago.

Hansard was in a machine-readable format, for which State Systems had a compatible software status. It was able to match the two products and make them available for on-line access. Unfortunately it did not get much response. The major user of that system was the Parliamentary Library, but there was no take up from electorate offices and Government departments, and State Systems found that it was not a viable financial operation. State Systems can speak for itself, I suppose, but I understand that the software it was using is no longer licensed. *Hansard* is changing its system, and I do not know whether the software it is using is necessarily compatible with that which State Systems has now. That was a very unfortunate circumstance, and something should be done to

try to retrieve that situation, but it is out of the hands of the library.

Mr Simms: *Hansard* is instituting a completely new system of operation, and we hope that it will be completed this session. In line with our new system of operating, an on-line system will be much more easily installed. It is simply a matter of funding being made available for such a system. There will certainly be a new index format, which will rely largely on a word search operation. The previous *Hansard* format has been abandoned now that the new system is up and running. As I say, the provision of an on-line facility, which will be considered down the track, will rely on appropriate funding in the future.

Mr BRINDAL: I understand what both of you are saying, but it appears to me that there is a danger that, while the rest of the Government moves forward in respect of computerisation, we are running backwards at a rate of knots. I therefore seek the Premier's assurance that some sort of on-line access to *Hansard* will be made available as soon as it is appropriate.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Given the way the question was worded, I think the answer could be 'Yes', but defining 'as soon as it is appropriate' will depend on when the competing priorities can be taken into account. There is no reason why we should not try to make it as soon as possible, except for the amount of money that we have available for the various expenditure needs. I will report further on that after I have had that matter further considered.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to page 17 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts. Where is the expenditure incorporated into the *Hansard* budget for the training of the *Hansard* staff on the new system? I am aware that expenditure was allocated for that training, which occurred at the end of last session.

Mr Simms: That training has taken place in conjunction with the development of our new system and has been conducted largely by our consultant. It is funded through the two grants that we received from Treasury for the installation of the system.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That appears on page 18 under 'Capital payments, development of computing systems.'

Mrs HUTCHISON: Is that training now completed or is there still some training to be done?

Mr Simms: There is still some training to be done. As the development of the system evolves and reaches completion stage, there will be minimal training necessary for staff, but the bulk of it is behind us now.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to the Parliamentary Library on page 17 and the line 'Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries'. There is a small overrun on that figure from the estimated to the actual expenditure. What is included in that line?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Coxon to comment shortly but, as I understand it, the amount voted for 1992-93, which has been overspent by \$4 554, was due primarily to the increased cost of publications which are issued free to other parliamentary libraries under reciprocal arrangements when compared with the previous year. I will ask Mr Coxon to make any further relevant comment.

Mr Coxon: I have no further comment to make.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to the Catering Division and the line 'Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries'. What sort of equipment was necessary for the Catering Division?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Sibly to respond to that.

Mr Sibly: The administration area relates to many of our ongoing costs, including equipment used in the kitchen and the dining rooms. It also covers areas such as meal money for staff, but generally it is largely for running costs.

Mrs HUTCHISON: It is mainly administrative?

Mr Sibly: Yes.

Mr LEWIS: With respect to the nature of the functions undertaken in this building and their relationship to the Government, somewhat along the lines already alluded to by the member for Hayward, who controls various parts of this building? For example, is it the Premier who controls Centre Hall and, if not, who does? I also refer to the corridors around the Chambers, the members' offices, the toilets, the dining room, the library and the car park. Does it strike the Premier as quaint that there should be such a diversity of authority in determining what can be done in terms of behaviour as distinct from what can be done with respect to the incurring of expenditure? If that is not quaint, how is it that we still find the appropriations within the Premier's Department, even though it is the Treasurer and his officers who prepare the appropriations for all the parts of the Parliament and, in effect, we get told?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I refer the honourable member to my earlier comments on this matter. That is something that the House can determine. It may be that next year it will be appropriate for the Speaker and the President to attend before the Committee to answer questions on votes for the Parliament. It is my understanding that the Minister of State Services is the operative Minister, and the Parliament is a tenant of the building that is owned by the Minister on behalf of the people of South Australia. The Festival Centre car park arrangement goes back to the time of the construction of the Festival Centre and the special arrangement entered into when Parliament surrendered its car park at the rear of this building. Again, we are the beneficiaries of that arrangement, rather than the owners of that area. I will ask Mr Mitchell to comment.

Mr Mitchell: The Premier is quite correct in his summary. As to the detail of who has control over what within the building, there are clearly only three authorities: they are the Speaker and President in their own right and the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. I think the breakdown arrangement works reasonably well between the three. If there are any areas that are of concern, such as the corridors and the toilets, that is a matter for those three authorities to sit down and reconcile.

Mr LEWIS: Whilst the elements that the Committee has been given are not exactly inaccurate, they are incomplete, in that the President has control of the Legislative Council Chamber and the corridors around it, and the Speaker has control of the House of Assembly Chamber and the corridors around it. In their respective roles, they each have control of the areas adjacent to the offices of members. The Joint Parliamentary Service Committee controls the library, dining rooms, access to the car park and so on.

Centre Hall is the responsibility of the President and the Speaker collectively and, if they reach an impasse, they decide to do nothing because nothing can change from what was done yesterday and the day before that, and 10 years before that and 100 years before that. This arrangement, however, is fairly recent. It probably has its history in the fact that, when the Assembly moved into this Chamber, the Legislative Council assumed control of what is now called

Old Parliament House. As I understand it, the air-conditioning and plant room, which provides emergency back up for the electricity supply which is vital to the functioning of this Parliament, is not under the control of any of those elements to which I have just alluded but is under the control of the Minister of Labour.

Yet when we seek each year to consider the appropriations for Parliament, it is not competent for us to examine those aspects of control that affect the function of *Hansard*—if there is a power failure and the preparation of the record is dependent on that power—as well as that of the Library, the Catering Division and everything else, indeed the lighting in this Chamber. That is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety and delegated to somebody who works for a Government department: it is not under the control of any officer or committee of either House or representatives of members of both Houses.

It is therefore not possible for us as a Parliament to elect a Joint Parliamentary Service Committee to delegate to it the authority for the responsibility for the preparation of the *Hansard* record, the provision of research services in the Library and the facilities that serve both the people who work here and the members in the Catering Division. We have to simply accept the finances we are told we will get and we have no say in how to improve economies in those areas.

That is what I believe is quaint, and I am seeking not to cause embarrassment to anybody but, for the first time in its history, to place on record in this Chamber before these Estimates Committees that are supposed to consider the appropriations a better understanding of how things do happen as opposed to how things might better happen.

That leads me to my next question, and it is about the car park. It could be equally about the printing costs but I will choose the car park. It goes back further than the Premier intimated regarding the Festival Centre. The Festival Centre came into existence, as members would appreciate, on the proposition of this Parliament's agreeing in the process not only to establish for the arts a performing arts centre of excellence in South Australia but to cede to its administration as a matter of convenience the area that had been covered by the Parliamentary Mews when it was first established over 100 years ago. Members had to get here, so they rode horses and came in traps. There needed to be some means by which they were taken care of on arrival here. The space was also used by the Parliament and the Government to establish a printery so that records of proceeding could be published. It was still controlled by the Parliament.

The quaint thing now is that for administrative efficiencies of Government agencies—not the Parliament—the Government decided on the day that the parking facilities for cars there occupied by that building, which happens to be a car park, would be run by the associated administration of the centre. So we now find ourselves being billed \$40 000 as a fringe benefits tax by a rapacious Federal Government. That is an outrageous intrusion into the prerogative independence of this State Legislature by the Federal Government—the Federal Treasurer—or, more particularly, by that person whoever it may be from time to time that Bronwyn Bishop likes to put the political chainsaw through—the Commissioner of Taxation.

As I understand it, the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee has the responsibility to pay that fringe benefits tax. I would like the Premier to confirm this. I would also like him to indicate whether or not he is aware of the recent

judgment interstate relating to fringe benefits tax on facilities like that in circumstances such as we have here in this Parliament, even if we ignore the fact that the car park and the authority to administer it came into existence only because the Parliament of its own motion created it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The answer is 'Yes'; the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee pays the fringe benefits tax. I am not an expert on tax law, but my guess is that had there never been a Festival Centre it is highly likely that we would still not have needed stabling provisions for horses and we would still have a car park facility for members of Parliament, and that car park facility, had it been totally under our control because the Festival Centre had never been built, would, I guess, still be subject to the fringe benefits tax provision of the Commonwealth. But, as I say, I am no expert on tax law and it is hypothetical anyway, because the Festival Centre was built.

Mr LEWIS: At a later date I will provide the Premier with some information about the fringe benefits tax which I believe would enable him—or more particularly the Treasurer—to challenge the necessity for that tax to be paid, based on a recent judgment. I will leave it at that and pass on to the next matter in two parts: efficiencies in *Hansard* and the Library.

How do staff levels, services and pay rates of the officers working in the Parliamentary Library compare with those in other State Parliamentary Libraries where there are bicameral systems, such as in Western Australia, Tasmania or Victoria (because Western Australia and Victoria are our nearest neighbours)?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I cannot answer that question myself. I do not know the extent of those services in the other Parliamentary Libraries. The only other one I have actually had the opportunity to visit has been the Victorian Parliamentary Library. I call on Mr Coxon to comment on the services and conditions in those other libraries.

Mr Coxon: I suppose the answer to this question could be 'interminable'. It is not always easy to make direct comparisons between organisations which offer different kinds of services or which emphasise different services. Perhaps I could offer to provide to the member for Murray-Mallee some detailed information if he would like a comparison.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We might be able to prepare a tabular statement which has on one axis the various parliamentary libraries and on the other the range of services provided, and then do a tick and cross system of all the libraries as far as we can ascertain that information. So we will try to get that information as soon as possible.

Mr LEWIS: I would be grateful for that, because I believe it is important that the record now shows just how poorly the Parliament in South Australia is provided with that sort of service and the continued cuts which are made by Treasury to any proposal that the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee has made over the past 12 years to improve that service and make it comparable with other libraries in Parliaments interstate and in the Commonwealth. And we must all remember that backbenchers rely on the library to do what Ministers get done at public expense through their officers.

My last query relates to the production of *Hansard*. Over the last four years substantial savings have been achieved in that area. Can the Premier, Mr Simms or Mr Schulze indicate how much has been saved to date following the introduction of new technology to get the record together in camera-ready

copy form and the costs that were incurred in the same process in, for instance, Victoria and the Commonwealth by comparison with the costs that we have incurred here?

How much will we pay per copy for the printing of the *Hansard* record as opposed to what it might cost outside, page by page, to photocopy from that camera-ready copy form?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member made a comment about cuts being made by Treasury. Treasury does not make cuts: Treasury makes proposals to the Treasurer who makes proposals to the Cabinet in the framing of the budget. That budget is then proposed to Parliament and after its adoption by the Parliament is then administered by the Government. Treasury is one of the administering agencies, clearly with significant responsibilities for administering because of its key central Government role, but the decisions are not made by the Treasury Department. Mr Simms may wish to comment.

Mr Simms: I think all I can say about savings—and it is nothing specific—is that when we have completely installed our new system of operation we will be desktop publishing and merely presenting camera-ready copy to State Print for photocopying, as I understand it, possibly for imposing and then for distribution. That has certainly transferred a significant operation previously undertaken at State Print to the *Hansard* area. I believe it has made possible the offering of several separation packages at State Print.

Mr Schulze: One needs to appreciate that the cost of printing and publishing *Hansard* is rather difficult to determine because one needs to know for any given parliamentary session the number of pages produced, for example, and that number varies enormously. The total expenditure for *Hansard* last year was \$71 000 less than the amount budgeted. Whilst that may seem like a fairly insignificant saving against expenditure of \$1.9 million, nevertheless the Parliament did sit, as I recall, for a couple of extra weeks into May and I would expect therefore would have involved the production of a significant number of additional *Hansard* pages. I am sorry that I cannot say how many pages were produced and, therefore, I am not able to give an indication.

The honourable member asks, 'How much has actually been saved?' That would be extremely difficult to identify because, on the one hand, there is the cost of producing *Hansard* which is fairly easily established but, on the other hand, there is this rather variable situation in terms of how many pages were produced and how long the Parliament sat, and I do not have access to that information at this time.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I refer to the treatment of the accounts for the Legislature within the Estimates of Payments and Receipts. There is only one item under receipts on page 210, and that is the sale of publications for the Legislative Council. There are obviously other services provided in this Parliament for which income is received. I wonder why the only receipt listed is for the Legislative Council and then for the sale of publications? Why is the treatment of the accounts in that manner?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I understand that the reference on page 210 should refer just to the Legislature rather than the Legislative Council, but it covers the sale of publications by the entire Parliament.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I gather then that all the other figures listed under payments are really net payments rather than gross payments. Would that be correct?

Mr Schulze: The actual payments for printing and publishing of *Hansard* and printing of Bills, Acts and

regulations are in fact gross costs, if you like. I need to explain in a moment the treatment for publications issued to or on behalf of members of Parliament, which are now to be treated rather differently from the way in which they have been treated in the past.

With respect to the material that is actually sold, for example, through the State Information Centre, the current arrangement is that State Services controls that function. It sells that material on behalf of the Parliament. The receipts line here reflects the net proceeds from those sales after State Services retains a percentage for commission for handling and costs.

With respect to publications issued to members of Parliament, we have recently had—as the Premier has already referred to earlier—a change in the arrangement whereby previously we were actually invoiced for any materials issued on behalf of members, a cheque was drawn and that cheque was paid back into general revenue, and that amount also appeared under ‘Sale of publications’. Audit and the Treasury took the view that that constituted a double counting of that figure and the arrangement has therefore been amended so that the cost of materials provided to and on behalf of members will now be dealt with by way of a journal adjustment debiting the expenditure line ‘Publications issued to members of Parliament’ and crediting or reducing the expenditure shown for *Hansard* printing and publishing and for printing of parliamentary Bills, Acts and regulations.

Mr HOLLOWAY: As a matter of constitutional curiosity, I understand that the Auditor-General audits the accounts of the Legislature, but where do the accounts actually appear?

Mr Schulze: To be candid, I am not able to say. My understanding is that the Legislature’s activities are dealt with in the Auditor-General’s Report. We are audited by his officers annually. My contact with those officers is in a very direct sense. In terms of formal examination of the Auditor-General’s Report, it is not a matter to which I normally give my attention.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will take up with the Auditor-General as to where the matter appears. I cannot immediately see it.

Mr HOLLOWAY: There may be some constitutional reason.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Apparently it used to appear in the Auditor-General’s Report, but seemingly it does not now.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I refer to the library. How much is allocated to the purchase of publications and periodicals within the library? How much does this amount relate to the actual number of publications purchased now as compared with the past?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Coxon to comment on that. Perhaps we can provide a tabular statement over a period of years of the publications purchased by the library so that the honourable member can see a trend line. I will ask Mr Coxon to speak about how viable a proposition it is that some assessment can be given of the value of publications received by the library on deposit in terms of the requirement under State law that certain publications be lodged with the Parliamentary Library.

Mr Coxon: As is apparent from the Estimates of Payments, the library gets two lines: one for salaries and one for general expenses. It always seems to me remarkable that the Librarian is supposed to maintain collections out of a sum allocated for administrative expenses as well as incurring administrative expenses.

What this means is that the sums available for building collections are very restricted these days, and in the 1992-93 financial year only \$2 875 was spent on monographs. In total that was 87 monographs, which is library jargon for a book. In the previous year we bought only 65 books; in 1990-91, 108; 1989-90, 152; 1988-89, 137; and 1987-88, 244. So, you can see that the trend is increasingly downward. In terms of periodicals, which take the largest chunk of the library’s budget overall, in 1992-93 we spent just short of \$30 000 of the line on periodicals and serial publications.

Mr BRINDAL: I understand that in answer to a question asked by the member for Mitchell something was wrong involving gross receipts for the Legislative Council. As we have to report to the House, what procedure exists regarding mistakes in these documents? We have to pass these things, and we have to pass them as being accurate. If there are mistakes, Mr Acting Chairman, what procedure is there within this Committee to see that those mistakes are rectified and reported to the House such as the one that has just come up?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Quirke): As I understand it, any perceived deficiencies by members with respect to any of the examinations is a matter that needs to be reported to the House, if that member feels that is the case. In this instance the member for Mitchell asked a question, and I have no control over the asking of the questions or the accompanying material. It is within the Committee’s hands to determine the adequacy of that response, and I understand that is done in the normal procedures of voting for the budget allocations at the completion of these proceedings and when all outstanding matters have been resolved, which I believe will be on Friday 1 October.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have corrected that particular matter, and that now appears on the *Hansard* record as a correction. Just coming back to another matter, I did ask the Parliamentary Librarian to make some reference to the publications received on legal deposit.

Mr Coxon: Section 35 of the Libraries Act provides that every publisher in South Australia has to deposit materials with the Parliamentary Librarian as well as with the State Library. In 1992-93 we received 270 monographs on deposit and that compares with the bought figure of 87, so you can see where the balance is; we are living on freebies. In 1991-92 it was 288; in 1990-91, 160; in 1989-90, 257; and in 1988-89, 296. So, we are getting up to 300 monographs each year that are received free under section 35 of the Libraries Act.

We also receive periodical publications. Most of the country newspapers received in the library come on legal deposit, as do the suburban newspapers and one edition of the metropolitan newspapers. So, quite a large proportion of the library’s collections are received on legal deposit. Just to illustrate the point, the library has recently catalogued all its serials and we have something like 2 500 titles. Of those we actually buy something in the region of 80 and you can assume that the rest is made up of freebies of some sort or another. They may be simply *gratis* items but a lot of them are legal deposit items.

I will say one other thing about legal deposit and that is that it works both ways. While in a sense it builds up the collections of the library it also means that we get many materials which are of very marginal interest, and we get newsletters of hobby associations and the Rotary Club and that kind of thing. All of that has to be processed in one way

or another so there is a negative side as well as a positive side to the issue.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: To provide more information on this matter, there is a very interesting table on page 19 of

the annual report of the Parliamentary Librarian 1992-93 labelled 'Library statistics: some comparative data', which I put in the *Hansard* record for those who read it to see that those figures and further figures of interest can be accessed.

LIBRARY STATISTICS: SOME COMPARATIVE DATA

	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
BOOK ACCESSIONED										
Purchased	434	266	273	210	244	137	152	108	65	87
Legal deposit	289	327	366	348	302	296	257	160	288	270
CATALOGUING										
Totals	1 760 ^o	1 609	1 673	2 168	1 986	1 735	4 130	1 833	1 354	569
CURRENT READING										
Photocopying requests	2 092	2 006	1 458	1 712	1 796	1 498	2 195	2 718	1 678	2 757
Issues	40	41	37	43	41	31	45	44	43	48
Extracts	276	275	282	349	328	245	388	400	459	169
REFERENCE QUERIES										
Totals	1 795	2 922	2 355	2 456	2 267	1 921	1 973	1 845	1 417	1 179
Under an Hour	1 627	2 733	2 215	2 231	2 089	1 779	1 776	1 671	1 300	1 043
Hour and Over	168	189	140	225	178	142	108	174	117	136
Members	740	1 239	923	974	1 176	1 034	1 198	1 193	998	790
Others	1 055	1 683	1 432	1 482	1 091	887	775	652	419	389
RESEARCH QUERIES										
Less than an hour	34	15	25	49	20	10	12	1	2	3
Hour and Hour	211	71	121	162	102	156	165	89	108	104
Over a Day	142	53	87	71	45	60	67	74	53	49
Over a Week	23	20	26	9	11	11	10	9	4	4
Totals	410 ^o	159*	260	291	178	237	254	173	167	160
ONLINE SEARCHES										
Totals	49	42	58	57	76	149	156	160	124	61
INTERLIBRARY LOANS										
Inward	42	77	115	167	92	68	128	87	101	81
Outwards	6	40	44	41	34	32	64	162	150	167
Totals	48	117	159	208	126	100	192	249	251	248
LOANS										
Members	551	532	585	897	849	639	570	610	481	421
Others	804	626	535	578	607	420	463	538	601	477
Totals	1 355	1 158	1 120	1 475	1 456	1 059	1 033	1 148	1 082	898
FACSIMILE TRAFFIC										
Totals	-¢	243	1 306	829	2 026	1 976	650	676	684	1 106
TOURS										
Totals	137	157	70	46	45	25**	-	-	-	-

^o 1983.

¢ Machine not installed until June 1984.

* Service suspended for part of year.

** Tours throughout Parliament House became the responsibility of the Education Officer.

Mr LEWIS: Could we get the approximate costs of the introduction of new technology into the Commonwealth Parliament, including training costs and so on, as well as equipment, and also into the Victorian Parliament, set down in a table form so that the costs incurred here in South Australia can be compared? I refer to the technology costs as

well as the training costs for the introduction of that new technology and the preparation of the record.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will get that information for the honourable member. I am not certain that we will have it by 1 October but we will have it as soon as possible and it will be inserted in *Hansard*.

Mr LEWIS: What were the total costs of publishing *Hansard* in 1988-89? I would like the costs of both the preparation of the record and the printing set down in a table which compares with the operations we are now undertaking this current financial year, to see what outlays are being saved in the actual operational side of the budget. I am not interested in including in that the separation packages which may be offered in any other Government agency but just to see what benefits are coming to the taxpayers of South Australia through the sensible and efficient introduction and operation of the new technology involved in the new system of production.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will get that information of the actual costs of publication of *Hansard* for a number of years previous to this year and we will put in that same table information from the House of Assembly record for those same years that will list the number of sitting days and the length of sitting time. I can see what the honourable member is getting at: to try to see if we get a trend line coming through because, while in the last year the House sat longer than in previous years, there will be a trend line that should come through such a table. That will need more than just a couple of years for comparison purposes. We will certainly get that information put together.

Mr LEWIS: My estimate was that there would be about 16 million pages printed of the *Hansard* record, both sides, in an ordinary year if there is such a year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have no idea.

Mr LEWIS: For the sake of the record, on old costs, that would have cost us well over \$2 million to publish. Given that the camera ready copy now goes out of this building, the costs ought to be something in the order of 1.5¢ per page, because it is being done in bulk: it is simply a photocopying operation and that would run down the cost to a tenth of what it used to be, say, four years ago. Could the Premier ask one of the officers involved to provide us with a simple table covering three periods—1982-83; then five years on to 1987-88; and a further five years to 1992-93—of the number of kilowatt hours used by this building in each of those years and the dollar cost of those kilowatt hours, so that we may ascertain whether, as a matter of discipline from within our own ranks and the people who work with us in this place, we have managed to achieve savings?

Those are savings not only in the way we illuminate the building, other than with our ideas, but also the way in which we have been more careful with our air-conditioning and with our preparation of meals and the provision of other services, and so on. I think it would demonstrate what members of Parliament are prepared to do, if they are made personally responsible for what goes on in their own bailiwick. They might see an interesting trend whereby they indeed are responsible.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will arrange for such a table to be drawn up. I had not appreciated that the increasing tendency to salad plates was an energy saving measure, but perhaps it is one of the reasons why the bills have gone down.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: What purpose is served by the library's multi-million dollar rare book collection, which is uninsured? Hundreds of volumes, even those which are in glass cabinets, are possibly deteriorating because of the condition in which they are kept. How many millions of dollars worth of rare books are sitting in those cases, and how much would they realise on the market if they were judiciously sold in small quantities without flooding the market? Could

the proceeds be used to address some of the financial inadequacies that the library is encountering?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I take issue with the honourable member's comment that the books are never read. I have read some of the books on occasions over the years I have been in this place. They are a fascinating collection. They are part of the State's heritage and should be treated in that context. The appropriate way in which they should be cared for is a matter that this Parliament must decide as the trustee of that part of the State's heritage. I will ask the Parliamentary Librarian to respond.

Mr Coxon: As I was explaining before, with a very small line for general expenses, the various priorities that the library has means that the rare books tend to be a very low priority. I realise that there are concerns about the condition in which the books are kept and about their treatment and even their security. As the Premier says, perhaps there are other ways of looking at how they might be managed as a State responsibility. I certainly find the prospect of putting the books into the market place and using the funds to upgrade the library and its services quite attractive.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: My second question relates to the range of newspapers the library carries, which in general terms is quite adequate. However, there are a couple of inadequacies I believe could be addressed. One is that the Messenger Press publications tend to arrive a little late. It would be much more useful if some mechanism could be introduced to ensure that the paper arrives on the day of publication (Wednesday) rather than later in the week. Perhaps some arrangement could be entered into with the *Advertiser* to enable that to occur.

In addition, I refer to the Sunday editions of the major interstate newspapers, particularly those from Sydney and Melbourne—and I am not just thinking of looking at the Crows results on a Sunday. In terms of political matters, all elections in Australia at State and Federal level are held on a Saturday, so it is often rather useful to look at the write-ups in those newspapers on the following day. Perhaps we could afford to purchase seven editions of *The Age* each week, by including the Sunday edition, along with that of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Herald-Sun* and other publications. Perhaps we could have a survey of members to determine what minor publications and journals on annual subscription could be deleted.

Mr Coxon: We receive Messenger Press newspapers under section 35 of the Libraries Act. People who comply with that Act have 30 days to supply material. It seems to me that Messenger Press newspapers arriving on Thursday morning is well within that compliance. The newspaper always arrives regularly. We expect it on a Thursday morning as a job lot. I find the arrangement with the *Advertiser* to be very good, although I can see that people who receive the newspaper in their electorate office on a Wednesday or over their fence on a Tuesday afternoon might see it from a different angle. However, with respect to the administration of the library, I think the current arrangements are quite good.

I turn now to the question of interstate Sunday newspapers. Newspapers are a bit of an issue at the moment. One of the problems with newspapers, particularly those from interstate, has been the decision by the Commonwealth Government to cease registered post and printed paper rights. This has increased the cost of newspapers enormously. In my annual report I refer to this issue because for some interstate newspapers we have additional postal costs of \$500 a year. The *Courier Mail* from Queensland would cost us an extra

\$800 a year as a result of this decision by the Commonwealth Government. I do not think the impact of this decision on libraries has been taken into account. This means that the overall pressure on the library's budget to make new subscriptions has been increased even further. My answer would be that the money is just not there to put in the subscriptions that people would like.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: Could the librarian conduct a survey of members as to some of the lesser read magazines and periodicals that we have on the racks that are not perhaps as widely read as we may believe? It may be found that there are several that are not widely read and could be deleted in favour of more useful publications.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I refer to an answer the Parliamentary Librarian gave some time ago during the session whereby many of those publications are received free anyway, either on deposit or as 'freebies', to use his word, so we would not save anything by asking them not to send us copies. In fact, if we did that with the legal deposit publications we would be breaching our own law. With respect to the question of Sunday papers, perhaps when an election is held interstate once every four years the Parliamentary Library could take some money from petty cash and buy a copy of the *Sunday Age*.

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

State Governor's Establishment, \$1 330 000—
Examination declared completed.

Premier and Cabinet, \$10 550 000

Membership:

Mr Olsen substituted for Mr Lewis.

The Hon. H. Allison substituted for Mr Brindal.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. O'Flaherty, Director, Corporate Services.

Dr Peter Crawford, Chief Executive Officer, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr G. Foreman, Director, Cabinet Services.

Mr T. Kent, Senior Finance Officer.

Ms Jayne Taylor, Women's Adviser to the Premier and Cabinet and Director, Women's Information and Policy Unit.

Mr J. Ellis, Director, Strategic Planning Unit.

Mr J. Shepherd, Director, Information Policy Unit.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Following the change of Premier last year, Mr Bruce Guerin, the former head of the Premier's Department, was appointed Special Adviser to the Premier. What has been the cost of maintaining Mr Guerin as special adviser since then, what specific administrative support did Mr Guerin receive in terms of secretarial assistance, office and other equipment and other expenses, and what did he do during this period?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can supply the honourable member with the exact cost of that administrative support. Mr Guerin had an office with secretarial support and he continued to receive his salary, but I will have the exact figures

inserted in *Hansard* later. He performed a number of jobs, one of which was an examination of our representation in Asia with particular reference to Japan. As the Leader knows, further changes have been made to that representation in the past financial year.

Mr Guerin has worked in a number of areas. He worked with the MFP in its early stages and has, as required, performed other work for the Government during his time as Special Adviser to the Premier. There have been a number of exchange visits with Okayama over the years, and Mr Guerin did a fair bit of work to promote that relationship. A return visit to South Australia will take place later this year, and a visit to Okayama took place in May of this year with a fair bit of work being required on that occasion.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I presume that Mr Guerin received his full salary as former head of the Premier's Department of approximately \$160 000 a year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My second question relates to Mr Guerin's appointment to a position to head a new public policy division at the Flinders University. What contribution will the Government make towards Mr Guerin's salary; will it pick up the entire cost of about \$160 000 a year; what additional payments will be made to Flinders University by the State Government to establish this policy unit; over what period will Mr Guerin take up this position; will the taxpayers of South Australia provide Mr Guerin with his full salary over the entire five-year period which has been talked about publicly; and, if so, what will be the total cost to the taxpayer of the employment of Mr Guerin and any additional support which he will need to take up this position of Professor of Public Policy?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Mr Guerin has ongoing employment rights with the South Australian Public Service in accordance with the transitional arrangements under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985. When that Act was introduced Mr Guerin was given those transitional rights. He is not retiring from the South Australian Public Service but is being made available to Flinders University to set up a public sector management centre at that university. The South Australian Government will continue to pay, as it is legally obliged to, until such time as Mr Guerin chooses to retire from the Public Service, the salary to which he is entitled, to assist with the establishment of that centre over a period of five years.

The South Australian Government, in addition to the guarantee of Mr Guerin's salary for a five-year period, has provided a one-off establishment grant of \$100 000, and this is provided for in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's budget.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Is that an amount of \$100 000 per year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, it is a one-off grant. An amount of \$250 000 for 1993-94 is included in the interagency support services line under 'administration expenses'. A letter from the Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in July states:

Thank you for your letter of 6 July confirming the basis on which the South Australian Government will support the establishment of the Institute of Public Policy and Public Sector Management at this university. The university is pleased to accept the Government's support on the terms outlined in your letter and will immediately commence the process of establishing the institute. On behalf of the university I wish to thank the Premier and the Government for this

generous level of support and commitment to a proposal which has the potential to bring benefits to the State of South Australia.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Are the finances of South Australia in such a healthy position that we can literally blow almost \$1 million on parking a former head of the Premier's Department at the Flinders University as an academic when so many other Government services have been cut, and why has the Government decided to use our precious dollars to install Mr Guerin in this out-of-the-way position rather than have him actively involved in performing an essential function within Government? On the figures just supplied to me, the total cost would be at least \$900 000 without taking into account oncosts of at least 30 per cent to cover superannuation, long service and any other leave entitlements and WorkCover. We are looking at a total cost to the taxpayer of about \$1.3 million for Mr Guerin to have the luxury of sitting in an academic institution.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There has been a significant amount of public sector reform over the past 12 months since I became Premier. A number of departments have been restructured, a number of former CEOs have left the employment of the Government, and significant savings have or will come to the taxpayer as a result of those procedures. By reducing the number of departments and heads of agencies significant real savings will be incurred by the taxpayers of South Australia.

In the context of those changes there have been some situations where people have no longer been required in their former position. When I became Premier I wanted Dr Crawford to head up the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and I made that announcement at that time. Other activities were pursued by Mr Guerin in the intervening period, and he will continue to perform consultancy work for the Government when required as a result of his working with this institute at Flinders University. So, in other words, there will be a benefit to the Government from Mr Guerin's being located at Flinders University: this is not a lost cost.

The point I make is that you must look at this matter in the overall context of the restructuring of the public sector that has brought and will continue to bring significant savings to the taxpayers of South Australia. It is not unusual for public officers to be relocated. This has happened over many years; indeed, it happened under the Government of which the Leader was a ministerial member. For example, there have been people on redeployment lists at various times, and that is not a unique feature. They could be regarded in one sense as a lost cost as long as they draw a salary and are not actively involved in the various programs of Government. That matter has been of considerable concern to me, to my Treasurer and to the Government generally as we have sought to move on people in that situation.

The targeted separation package scheme and the various separation package schemes we have had over the years have been designed to free up those situations to avoid lost cost to the taxpayer. As the honourable member knows, we have had an active program of targeted separations. So, if somebody has ongoing rights of employment—I do not believe that the Leader is suggesting that we should breach those rights, because we would be subject to legal challenge if we did—this would use his talents in the most effective way at this time.

Mr QUIRKE: According to page 11 of the Program Estimates, the total proposed expenditure, both recurrent and capital, for 1992-93 was \$20 729 000. The actual amount

spent was \$13 773 000, which is a very significant shortfall. What is the reason for that, or has it been transferred over to a different department?

Mr O'Flaherty: The overall reduction in the actual expenditure was due to a combination of factors. During the course of the financial year, a number of transfers of functions occurred out of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The disability function was transferred to the Minister of Health, and the Port Centre Project, for example, was transferred to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. That accounts for the overall reduction in the figures.

Mr QUIRKE: So, it is a transfer of programs over to other areas rather than savings?

Mr O'Flaherty: Some savings were made as a result of the collapsing of functions that went to the Office of Public Sector Reform, as well. In other words, some functions were no longer proceeded with.

Mr QUIRKE: The same table has the average proposed full-time equivalents for 1992-93 as 159.5; the actual was some considerable number less than that, namely, 149.8. I note for 1993-94 the proposal is for 119.4, which is a significant reduction. Is that an economy that is being achieved or, again, does it involve the transfer of programs to other areas?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, I will ask Dr Crawford to comment on that and then Mr O'Flaherty.

Dr Crawford: A mixture of the two is the answer. A number of programs have been transferred. In the transfer of those programs, the personnel who have carried out the roles and functions that Mr O'Flaherty described have been transferred. At the same time, as we move into a tight management period we are trying to use our resources most effectively and to channel them into the new demands of Government. So, for some little time we have deliberately held some vacancies and had some reductions during the course of this financial year. While we will see that reduction process continue, we will redirect some vacancies to new positions. So, you have a mixture of transfer plus reduction.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would like to return to Mr Guerin's taking up his position in the hallowed halls of Flinders University. What qualifications does Mr Guerin have to take up this position on public sector management, as Mr Guerin had the overview of the justice information system which blew out to an additional cost to the taxpayer of \$11 million, as he had responsibility for the Information Utility, which has collapsed around the ears of Government, as he has had responsibility for the overall management and chairmanship of the MFP board up until the appointment of the formal board—and we all know what happened to the MFP for three years—and as he had some direct involvement in the whole of the State Bank collapse and debacle in South Australia? What are his very specific qualifications to take up this learned position on public sector management?

The decision to park Mr Guerin out at Flinders University did not even go to Cabinet, even though it involved expenditure of about \$1.3 million. Did the Premier have no other need anywhere in Government for Mr Guerin, therefore making it necessary to put him out at Flinders University and park him away from the centre of Government where any activity would take place?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, I will obtain a copy of Mr Guerin's *curriculum vitae*, with particular reference to his work with Government over many years. He has worked in a wide number of areas for the Government, including during

the time of the Tonkin Administration. He was chosen to do various works at that stage; in fact, at the time I think the Tonkin Government put him in charge of the Data Processing Board. So, that is the calibre of support given by the Leader, when he was a Minister, and his colleagues for Mr Guerin's work in charge of information technology generally in Government.

Mr Guerin has had a number of things to do with Government over many years across a breadth of activities, not only in the area of the Premier and Cabinet and information technology but also in the Health Commission and as a central agency person in terms of dealing with individual Government departments right across the spectrum of Government. He is very well placed to be able to comment on the public sector. To do this from Flinders University is a key point.

The other point I would remind members about is the Guerin review, as it is referred to, which led to the GME Act. That was a substantial overhaul of public sector administration within South Australia and a significant contribution. That is an indication of the breadth of his experience. I believe the Leader's comments about Mr Guerin today are very derogatory, so I believe it is appropriate to look at what the Leader said last year, because he seemed to have an entirely different point of view. In fact, at that time the Leader said:

I think it is appropriate formally to record the Liberal Party's appreciation of the very hard work by Mr Guerin as head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet over so many years. Very few people understand or know how hard the head of that department works. He is, if you like, the behind the scenes silent worker. I should like formally to record that and show my appreciation for what he has done for this State and Parliament over the years.

That is the Leader's comment to this Committee last year.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I remember making that comment and I stand by it, but that does not in any way excuse parking Mr Guerin, at a cost of \$1.3 million, out at Flinders University, when I believe there are far greater needs within Government. I refer to the inter-government relations line, which involves the area of the Premier's Department that deals with communication between the State and Federal Governments. What representations were made by the South Australian Government to the Federal Government before the Federal budget about an increase in the wine sales tax? On what date were those representations made and by whom? From which budget line is the Government funding its promised \$250 000 study this financial year in relation to the impact of the wine tax on the wine industry?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will obtain a chronology of the events relating to the State Government and its view on wine tax over many years. We have had a long-standing public opposition to this tax and its increases, so it will not be just a matter of dealing with the situation this calendar year: it will go back to when the first tax was imposed. I think that is the only fair way to answer the Leader's question, so he does understand that this is a long-term position taken by this State Government, dealt with not only by Premiers of the day but also by appropriate Ministers in the economic and agricultural areas. So that will all be detailed.

The sum of \$250 000 will be a combination of things. I refer the honourable member to point 9 on page 24. There is an estimate of \$300 000. Clearly that is dependent upon what work is required. It may well be a line that is overspent. It is also the case that there may be funds coming from the Economic Development Authority for that same matter and

likewise appropriate funding support from the Department of Primary Industries, because all those agencies have an interest in this matter. The Leader would understand that it has been important that we commit these funds. The industry has certainly appreciated the support we have given, and I believe these research funds are already showing value.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I continue with the wine industry and remind the Premier that on 16 October last year the Premier said that the Government would spend an initial \$1.5 million to support an export wine strategy, and this would include the appointment of a full-time promotions manager in the United Kingdom. Has that promotions manager now been appointed? If so, when, and how much of the promised \$1.5 million for last financial year has been spent?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That money was to be provided to the export promotion of the Australian Wine and Brandy Corporation. I forget exactly the acronym of the export focus. I will obtain that information for the Leader. The funds were made available to the industry to expend. I am not certain what the industry's situation is in terms of its using that money, but the money has certainly gone to it. It has been used by the industry also to attract funds from other industry support, but that is being monitored by the Economic Development Authority. I will advise my colleague the Minister of Business and Regional Development of this question so that, when he comes before the Estimates Committee, a more detailed answer can be provided on how the industry has used that \$1.5 million.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My first question relates to page 24 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, under 'Program 3-Mobile Radio Network'; I note that there is no estimated figure, but it shows an actual expenditure of \$254 648 with an ongoing \$72 000 allocated for the 1993-94 year. Can the Premier expand on what the mobile radio network does and what the allocated \$72 000 is for?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Shepherd to answer this question.

Mr Shepherd: That was a project that was not included in the Estimates prior to the beginning of the year because the project had been at a very preliminary phase prior to that. However, the department provided to Cabinet a proposal for a major feasibility study to be undertaken. Approval was given to that by Cabinet, and total funds of \$446 000 were voted to the project by Cabinet. That represents the expenditure during that financial year of the project out of those sums.

Mrs HUTCHISON: What does the mobile radio network entail?

Mr Shepherd: The mobile radio project is proposed to be a project which replaces the individual mobile radio systems that are currently operated by some 28 agencies with one whole-of-Government system. It is being driven partly by the initiative of the Commonwealth Government to reallocate the scarce radio frequency in what is called the very high frequency range, which is overcrowded. It is very difficult for new users in the private sector particularly to gain access to that. It is relocating the Government use of that, and the best technology to do that is a trunk shared system, which is what is being planned now.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I might add to that that the mobile radio systems of the various agencies at the moment, notwithstanding what the Commonwealth has done in any event requiring further action but, even if that had not happened, the existing systems of some agencies, including

fisheries, are completely inadequate. The proposed new system that is being put in place will meet agency requirements for service reliability and coverage, and in almost all cases will do so at a lower cost. Major user agencies, such as the police and the to be created Southern Power and Water, will benefit from significantly lower costs. It is estimated that the net present cost of the proposed total system is \$21 million cheaper than the alternative of seeking to comply with the Commonwealth legislation through an agency-by-agency set of solutions.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to page 23 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts; with respect to the centenary celebrations of women's suffrage next year, \$200 000 has been allocated and \$63 230 has been expended. First, will the remainder of that amount be carried over into the next financial year? I do note that this is now part of arts and heritage in the ongoing situation.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The answer as to whether it will carry over is 'Yes.' I will ask Ms Jane Taylor to comment further.

Ms Taylor: The reason the money was not spent is that \$100 000 was allocated to community grants, and that had not been fully taken up or allocated at that stage. That has now been done and a much smaller amount has been carried forward.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My other question regarding women's suffrage refers to page 210, 'Other Receipts'. Under Department of Premier and Cabinet, \$163 000 has been allocated for 1993-94. What does that sum involve?

Ms Taylor: I would have to investigate that, but I assume that it relates to the transfer to the Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I come back to the mobile radio network that we talked about earlier. What would be the total cost of this mobile radio network if the feasibility study cost was \$430 000? Is this to set up another Optus? Will we have three networks in Australia? The amount of \$430 000 appears to be a very high study cost, without setting up the network. If so, what will be the total cost of the network itself if it was to go ahead; and what are the projected savings to the Government by the establishment of this network?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Shepherd to comment on that.

Mr Shepherd: The proposed project, similar to the projects that have been proceeded with in New South Wales and Victoria, is a major project, and the first estimate that was approved by Cabinet for the feasibility study was supplemented later by a further approval. So the total cost is somewhat higher and we can provide that figure. But the total capital cost of the infrastructure would be about \$35 million. In addition to that would be the cost of the mobile equipment itself, which I suspect would be in the range of \$15 million to \$20 million. The total present value of the system and the net present value of a whole of Government radio system would be about \$135 million over a 15 year period. If agencies proceeded to continue with the present single agency-centred radio systems on their own, the net present value of that would be \$155 million. So the total savings to Government would be \$21 million.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I now turn to the Program Estimates (page 13), Inter-agency Support Services items. I highlight the fact that the Premier's office this year has 19 full-time equivalents compared with 16.3 full-time equivalents last year, resulting in payments exceeding the budget by \$319 000 last year with additional costs this year. Where and

what are these additional positions? An extra position has also been provided for in the Premier's ministerial office this financial year—that is over and above the 19.3, I think—with an additional budget allocation of \$105 000. What is this position, who is filling it and what will the person do at \$105 000?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is nobody in the office on \$105 000. When I became Premier a number of changes took place in Government. We have had the public sector restructuring exercise. Obviously, while there is a Minister of Public Sector Reform I, as Premier, have a significant involvement with that process. As I have established the new directions, it has been very important to see that my office has good links right across Government at a period of enormous change. There have been some new appointments. There have been some other appointments where people have left the office as well and over a period of time some new people have come into the office.

I will have a tabulate statement prepared on the positions and levels of people in the office previously compared with the positions and levels of people in the office now, with a total as to the salary costs of those offices. Mr Geoff Anderson left the office during the year; Mr Alexandridis left the office; Barbara Deed actually left the office before I became Premier; and Cathy King left the office after I became Premier. A series of new appointments were made: Mr Foley, my previous Executive Assistant in my other ministry, came across to the office; Mr Kouts, my media adviser, came across and joined the existing two media people in the Premier's office, but now the Premier's office has a much bigger coordinating role on media matters with media advisers across Government. If we take the full total of media advisers across Government, I do not believe there has been an increase there.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will get all those figures for you. Then in terms of other appointments, Ms Reardon and Ms Campbell have joined the office. The most recent appointment was a transfer from the office of the Deputy Premier. So there was a reduction in that office of Mr David Cox who transferred across to my office. So in terms of the actual establishment, there was no change, because plus one was matched by minus one.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What does he do in your office?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: He has taken over the coordination of the entire ministerial office, the Premier's office as such, as opposed to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and has responsibilities for liaison with other ministry officers in the Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What is his salary?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: His salary is \$71 750—an EL2 position. One other person has gone, Mr Andrew Scott, who was brought into my office initially on my becoming Premier. He has since moved from the office.

[Sitting suspended from 1.2 to 2 p.m.]

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer to intergovernment relations and, in particular, the Mabo High Court decision. Can the Premier say whether South Australia has yet drawn up the appropriate legislation on Mabo to be introduced into State Parliament? Can the Premier be fairly specific about when he intends to introduce that legislation? Will the Premier uphold his commitment that all advice given to

Government on Mabo will in fact be tabled in the Parliament, and when will he do that? I think it is only appropriate that we have that advice well before the legislation is formally debated in the Parliament. Will the Premier identify those departments and agencies that have actually prepared formal advice for the Ministers on the Mabo decision?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I take it that the Leader is referring to advice other than the Implications Document and the supplement to that document, which I have already tabled in the Parliament. Of course, there would have been occasions when advisers to Ministers or to the Premier would have given advice to those Ministers or to the Premier on matters related to Mabo, and I do not intend to table that advice to the extent that it is written, anyway—a lot is verbal advice.

However, I do not know that there is much more information outstanding on Mabo, except for commentary on the present Federal Government legislation. Given that that matter is the subject of ongoing consultation between the States and the Commonwealth, I think it is more appropriate to see the outcome of those discussions. I have already indicated that we do have some disagreement with the Commonwealth on some matters in that legislation.

First, the Commonwealth Government has in my view taken a recidivist view on compensation. At the end of the Melbourne meeting of the Council of Australian Government the Commonwealth had agreed that it should pick up the compensation responsibility for native title extinguished between 1975 and 1993. It has now gone back to a situation of talking about a 50:50 responsibility with the State. We reject that and will continue to do so.

Secondly, the Commonwealth Government has again gone back on the way in which it changed its view in Melbourne on the matter of the right of objection to developments on native title land. The State Government view was and is that there should be no prior right for native title holders for objection over and above that which exists for other title holders in Australia. In its new legislation the Commonwealth has now gone back to a position of allowing some degree of discriminatory preference and we do not agree with that.

We will continue to discuss that matter with the Commonwealth and all relevant advice will be made known to the Parliament before the matter is to be debated. Of course, the Leader will know that legislation is tabled and then it sits on the table for at least a week before it is debated. So, if we table relevant information at that stage there should not be a problem. However, I come back to the point that certain advice will not be included within that; that is, advice that has been given to Ministers or to the Premier from the Ministers' or Premier's office.

As to when the legislation is to be introduced, I am advised that it should be in the week beginning 27 September 1993. As I do not think we are sitting that week, I think it will be introduced the week after.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Premier said that the Federal Government had offered 50:50 compensation: in fact, from my reading of the Prime Minister's statement it is quite clear that if in fact the native title has been cancelled by a State Government it is the State Government that has to pay the compensation: it is not on a 50:50 basis. Following on from that, the State Governments in fact have cancelled just about all of the native titles with the exception of any defence lands or Woomera, because on all the other lands native title would have been cancelled either with a freehold title or some

other possible Crown lease issued in the name of the State Government.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The position taken by the Commonwealth Government at the start of the Council of Australian Government was that it wanted to share the responsibility with the States. We got it to go back on that position so that towards the end of the meeting, before the talks fell apart, it accepted that it should take full responsibility for compensation. The advice that I have had since that time is that the Commonwealth view—at officer level—is that it wishes to get to a kind of 50:50 situation with the States. We do not accept that. We believe this is a compensation question for which the Commonwealth should take full responsibility, regardless of the origin of the reason for extinguishing native title.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I also refer to intergovernment relations on page 17 of the Program Estimates. We know that New South Wales and Victoria have been actively pushing for an end to fiscal equalisation grants, which are obviously very important to small States such as South Australia. Can the Premier give his assessment of the current State of this push by those larger States and the Commonwealth's reaction to it? In addition, what action is he taking through this unit to ensure that those larger States are not successful?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, some years before the last Federal election members may recall that the Prime Minister, before he assumed that position, made some comments that could have been seen to be somewhat equivocal on horizontal fiscal equalisation to the extent of indicating that maybe there should be some move away from that particular way of funding the States. South Australia has always argued against that line. What we were particularly keen to hear from the Prime Minister before the Federal election was that he accepted our point of view, given that he had made some equivocal statements about that earlier.

The statement he made in Adelaide was certainly unequivocal on that issue. Before the Federal election he indicated quite firmly that he now accepted the value of horizontal fiscal equalisation as a legitimate and just way of distributing the resources to the various States of Australia. That was before the Federal election and we were keen after the election to follow up that matter as quickly as possible. Both the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister have confirmed their pre-election view on that matter.

So, when New South Wales and Victoria started to raise this issue as something that should be discussed at the Special Premier's Conference in July this year, we were able to cite the Federal Government's own words and pre-election commitment on this matter. We were heartened by the fact that they kept to that commitment.

There is no doubt, however, that both Jeff Kennett and John Fahey and their respective Treasurers will raise the matter again at next year's Special Premier's Conference; they have indicated that they intend to do so. We have to keep on our opposition to any change to this matter. It is worth a large sum of money to South Australians.

That is not to say that we are getting any special deal by virtue of the fact that we pick up an amount that some could call a subsidy of more than \$300 million: rather it is a recognition that a small population State with a large geographical area has higher costs to meet in terms of providing a reasonable level of services to South Australians wherever they may live compared to a large population State in a small geographic area. That is what the whole issue comes down to.

I know some ploy is being used by New South Wales and Victoria to try to get Western Australia and South Australia on side if we all agree to have a go at Queensland. The issue is, however, that when Stockdale, the Treasurer of Victoria, raised that matter he talked about South Australia being a beneficiary 'for the time being' of such arrangements.

I have been here a long time and I know what he is actually saying. He is saying, 'Join with us and knock Queensland off and we'll look after you for a year or two, and then when we have all the States lined up against you we'll knock you off, too.' I think we, as a Parliament and as various Parties of this Parliament, ought to strongly oppose any such activity.

Mr HOLLOWAY: In relation to intergovernment relations, now that the Mutual Recognition Bill has passed through this Parliament how does the Premier believe that will accelerate moves towards greater clarification of the respective roles of the levels of government?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I think it is obvious, from the matters that were introduced into the debate in this Parliament reflecting the views of community groups, industry groups and professional associations in South Australia, that many in this State recognise that mutual recognition is a sensible thing to do. Participation in the mutual recognition scheme will produce economic benefit to the State; it will reduce the cost of regulation through its ability to process registrations from interstate practitioners more easily; it will enable South Australia to adopt or recognise standards which already exist in other States and Territories, therefore negating the need for South Australian standards to be developed in some circumstances.

Where it is necessary that there should be some special South Australian character to regulations or circumstances then the opportunity exists in that legislation for that to be the case. What the legislation seeks to remove is the unnecessary requirement on States to do their own individual providing of regulations or standards which has cost us dearly. It comes down to whether or not we are going to end this century with the same diversity of rules as applied at the railway gauge level in the last century. Fortunately the Parliament has now decided its opinion on that matter, and that opinion I think is a very sensible one.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Further in relation to intergovernment relations, the unit has responsibility for the Mabo decision. It was pointed out earlier that the staff of that unit have obviously been considerably reduced because of the transfer of the local government program, but does the Premier believe there are sufficient staff resources there to deal with all the complexities of Mabo given the highly complex legal nature of that matter?

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Ms C.L. Treloar, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms Treloar: A number of staff have been transferred from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. That is the group known as the State/Local Government Relations Unit. There are, however, a small core group of staff remaining in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to deal with Commonwealth/State relations. These officers work closely with members of the Cabinet Office and where appropriate utilise their expertise. In addition, new resources will be brought to the unit in this financial year. Those two positions

are currently being developed and should be recruited for within the very near future.

Mr HOLLOWAY: What other resources are you able to draw on given the enormous complexity of Mabo?

Ms Treloar: Constantly across Government with agencies such as the Office of the Crown Solicitor, the Department of Mines and Energy, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and with other agencies where necessary; obviously, also with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and that constant collaboration allows us to draw upon their expertise formulating the whole of Government perspectives on this in our dealings with the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Page 220 of the Auditor-General's Report reveals that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet spent \$536 000 in 1992-93 on consultancies. That was an increase of \$130 000 over the previous year. Can the Premier provide an itemised list of the consultancies, indicating their cost and their purpose? In addition, the Auditor-General's Report shows that grants made to various organisations in 1992-93 totalled \$421 000. Will the Premier provide an itemised list of those grants?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, by 1 October.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I come to the line on policy advice and management improvement. Last year more than \$445 000 was spent on various committees of inquiries and consultants. Will the Premier give an itemised breakdown of this expenditure, indicating where that money was spent and who received it, and will he indicate whether any of this allocation was spent on commissioning market research; and, if so, will the Premier provide details including the questions asked in the market research? With regard to the allocation of \$300 000 under this line for 1993-94, how much has been spent so far and is any of this money due to be spent on the commissioning of market research for the Government?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, none of it will be spent on market research and none has been spent on market research. In terms of proposals for the current financial year I will get more information for the Leader. In 1992-93, \$90 341 was spent on the Government Agency Review Unit, which was wound up in October 1992; \$18 275 was spent on the GMB review of the Public Trustee; \$4 200 was spent on the GMB review of the State Government Insurance Commission; \$32 718 was spent on the GMB review of Marine and Harbors; \$289 266 was spent on the GMB review of the SA Financing Authority; \$7 000 was spent on public sector initiatives; and \$3 423 was spent on miscellaneous items: that is a total of \$445 218.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Under program 3—'Policy Advice and Management Improvement'—last year \$604 800 was allocated for the information utility but only \$132 000 was spent. The Premier told the Estimates Committee last year that during 1992-93 the corporate framework would be established for that information utility. Can the Premier explain why spending last financial year failed to meet the budgeted targets; was the corporate framework established for the information utility, and what is that framework?

Mr Shepherd: With regard to the expenditure, during the year funds were transferred to the Office of Business and Regional Development for expenditure on the information utility project. So, during 1992-93 the amount spent on the project within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was \$131 994 and the expenditure within the Office of Business and Regional Development in that year was \$1 305 000. That compares with the total allocation combined for the two

departments during the year of \$2.205 million, so there was a saving in the order of \$600 000.

Mrs HUTCHISON: On page 16 of the Program Estimates and Information, in '1993-94 Specific Targets and Objectives', it states:

Promote SA's regional economic standing and industry policy positions (e.g. Industry Commission inquiries) and facilitate investment and economic development in cooperation with other agencies.

What has been done with regard to that objective?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, the Government has, for a long time, had a view that we should have a coherent across Government response to national Government inquiries and we should be putting in that the impact of various national Government decisions or proposed decisions on a regional economy such as South Australia's. For example, many industry commission hearings have an impact upon an economy like South Australia's and we have a process whereby the Economic Development Authority assesses how best to coordinate responses from different areas of Government to industry commission submissions.

There is a further matter; sometimes we realise that industry commissioned matters are recommendations to the national Government, and perhaps our best way is not so much putting our energies into submissions to the industry commission but directly to the Federal Government. There have been a number of occasions over recent years where, while we have had a submission to industry commission hearings, we have put most of our energies into the later, more political process of Federal Government consideration of industry commission reports. I could highlight the tariff regime for the automotive industry as a key case in point.

The industry commission to which we made a submission came out and finally recommended a 10 per cent tariff regime by the year 2000. We had made our submissions about the impact of that on the automotive industry. We indicated that a tariff regime of somewhere between 20 and 25 per cent was actually needed. When the industry commission nevertheless still made that 10 per cent recommendation, we then lobbied very hard with the national Government and indicated again more firmly that a 25 per cent regime was needed to see the industry grow in this State.

The Federal Government heard that and did not accept the industry commission recommendation of 10 per cent. In fact, it finally went to a 15 per cent figure along with export support. That amounts to effective Government assistance of some 35 per cent to the automotive industry. We would have been happier with a tariff regime of 25 per cent by the year 2000. We were certainly happy that the national Government listened to our submission.

In terms of 1993-94, we are very keen to see exactly what the national Government is going to do with its task force on regional economies. This was announced by the Prime Minister before the last federal election. It was for that period of time given over to Laurie Brereton. It has now been handed over to Alan Griffiths as the Minister for that area, and officers are already in discussion between the State Government and the Federal Government on how best to advance regional economies, particularly economies such as South Australia and Victoria. I will ask Dr Crawford to make further comments.

Dr Crawford: The efforts within the department are directed at trying to create coherent strategies and consistent positions for the Government across the various agencies and authorities. The principal vehicle in recent times for coordi-

nating this effort has been the State Development executive, which now has all the portfolio coordinators or leaders of merged authorities as well as the central agency heads. We are able not only to explore what are the policy positions that the Government would wish to adopt but, as the Premier said, whether or not it is in our interests to make submissions. When the industry commission, COAG and others produce reports, there is a natural place for these reports to come back and to be assessed. In recent times there have been a large number of reports from the Industry Commission, and its Chairman has shown some greater interest in talking to this and other Governments about the direction of those inquiries. They have dealt with some fairly useful things from our point of view in terms of timber, transport, utilities and their general direction and, while we have not always found the process to be particularly helpful, quite often the reports have been.

Mrs HUTCHISON: In a similar vein (page 17 of the same document) one of the objectives is:

To play a leadership role in negotiations of innovative and effective relationships within the federation. . .

The Premier referred to the Federal Government task force which, I presume, was the one that Bill Kelty and some of those others were involved with; is this along similar lines to that? What input will we be having with regard to this, particularly looking at regional economies?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are a number of issues. One is the regional task force under Alan Griffiths. The next issue is the set of discussions that, I announced last week, would be taking place in South Australia as a result of the Republic Advisory Committee of the national Government. That advisory committee has sought State Government submissions on whether or not Australia should be a republic, and the State Government has made a submission to it. However, at the same time we understood that there were a large number of other issues which need further examination and about which there should be an intelligent debate. One of those had to do with the role of State Governments and the relationship of State Governments to national and local government. That has an impact not only on South Australia as a regional economy but also on regions within South Australia. I see that as an important part of the process of fulfilling that objective.

Then we come to another matter, that is, the outcome of the Special Premiers Conference a few years ago when a number of issues were discussed by the then Premiers and the then Prime Minister with a view to a better nationally coherent set of policies on a series of matters. We are actively participating in each of those, at all stages ensuring that South Australian interests are being protected so that we are not giving away things unnecessarily and that we are always seeking, where things are perhaps conceded, that there is a compensatory element—in other words, that it is in our interests to do something. It is not unlike the issue of the abolition of State preferences for Government purchases back in the 1980s when we took an enlightened view supporting the abolition of preferences, but quite frankly our enlightened view was one of enlightened self-interest, because we knew it was better for South Australian companies to be able to access Government purchasing power in all of Australia rather than be given some protected environment in an economy of just 1.5 million South Australians.

In terms of these other issues that are coming up, the issues in which we are involved are the fair and free trade in

gas, mutual recognition of standards and regulations (and we have already discussed that), the national competition policy, the national electricity grid, the national strategy for ecologically sustainable development and the greenhouse response, the review of ministerial councils, the VEETAC review of partially regulated occupations and the water industry reform area.

Mrs HUTCHISON: What is the current position with regard to negotiations on the national electricity grid?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, there has been some pressure, I guess, on South Australia to divorce its generating authority from the transmission aspect of the authority. At all stages we had opposed that. We believe that there is a reasonable case to be argued that it should be, in an accounting sense, a separate entity within the electricity utility (now the electricity and water utility). We think it makes sense for it to be treated separately in an accounting sense so that the real costs can be properly allocated to generating electricity as opposed to transmission of electricity, but we do not support the total hiving off of the generating capacity as a separate corporation from the distribution capacity. The matter was again discussed at the Council of Australian Government a couple of months ago, when an agreement was reached, as follows:

A national competitive electricity market is to be operational by 1 July 1995. There is to be the establishment of an interstate transmission network separate from generation and distribution interests, subject to certain key issues being resolved, namely, market trading, grid pricing and regulatory issues, tax compensation issues and budgetary impacts. It was further agreed that the States would adopt the multiple network corporation model for the establishment of an interstate transmission network. However, South Australia and Tasmania accepted this position with reservations.

It was further stated and accepted by the heads of Government:

That South Australia will consider the use of a subsidiary structure pending the resolution of cost issues associated with separating transmission from its vertically integrated authority and resolution of these issues will enable it to adopt will enable it to adopt the MNC model.

Mr OLSEN: In a press statement last October the Premier referred to the need for a 500 metre extension of the runway at Adelaide International Airport because it was essential for South Australia's international air trade. What commitment has the Premier received from the Federal Government or the FAC on the proposed extension?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Some months after that announcement there was an exchange of views through the media between the FAC and me on the need for that extension. An officer of the FAC said that in his view it was not important. He said that he had not received submissions from airlines saying that they needed this runway extension to make their operations more viable or to help promote growth of their operations into and out of South Australia. That was contrary to advice we had received from airlines and current and potential exporters from South Australia, which indicated that airlines do need that extension. We are continuing to push for that extension. We believe that it is a Commonwealth responsibility; however, we are prepared to provide some support in order to help with that process.

We regard the upgrading of Adelaide Airport as a key priority, and we have detailed to the Commonwealth the urgent need for a five gate international and domestic terminal plus—and this is the key point—a 500 metre extension to the main runway to support the transport hub and provide direct access to markets for South Australia's export

industries. Cabinet has endorsed a strategy to accelerate efforts on the airport, and we have indicated our willingness to put \$10 million into supporting that large scale project, which will cost about \$100 million.

Mr OLSEN: In his Meeting the Challenge statement the Premier said that, if the Commonwealth Government failed to understand, appreciate or support the priority of the Adelaide Airport upgrade, the Government would consider alternative arrangements to ensure the provision of appropriate and much needed facilities to service tourism and business needs. What are those alternative proposals? Are they the ones that have just been outlined, or does the Government have additional alternative proposals apart from a 10 per cent commitment to the capital infrastructure?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is an alternative proposal. Obviously, other proposals could be considered depending upon the willingness of investors to be part of the process. We are open-minded on that matter, and we are willing to work with potential investors to see the airport upgraded. We have no ideological bent one way or the other on what could happen in terms of financing improvements at Adelaide Airport. Suffice to say, our starting point is that the Commonwealth is obliged to do this, but if it will not accept that responsibility we are prepared to examine other alternatives with industry.

Dr Crawford: The Government employed Maunsell's to work with the Office of Transport Planning to develop an overall strategy in this regard. It became clear that a number of options were available in terms of mobilising local business and investor support. Discussions have taken place on a number of occasions with local consulting firms that are interested in trying to develop consortia arrangements that would range from the takeover and redevelopment of the whole airport in the event that nothing satisfactory happens through the FAC to much more limited options that relate to private and Government partnerships which might utilise airspace, for example, on the airport site. An example of where a totally different approach has worked successfully can be seen in the Cairns airport where the local port authority manages both the port and the airport. The authority believes that that airport will be the second busiest airport in the whole of Australia by the turn of the century. That is an example of where a more lateral thinking approach has been quite successful.

Mr OLSEN: I note in the Estimates of Payments an allocation of \$13 000 for Bank of Tokyo expenses. What are those expenses?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That figure relates to an agreement to do with cultural promotion that was set up some years ago by the Bank of Tokyo. That agreement has been around for some years. In 1984, the Bank of Tokyo provided South Australia with a grant of \$100 000 to initiate a series of cultural exchange programs known as the Bank of Tokyo, Japan and South Australia Cultural Exchange Program. The policy of the board of trustees is that only the interest on the grant of \$100 000 should be used for the exchange program, the principle being left intact. Recipients of the program over the years 1986 to 1992 received a total of \$91 204.44. The status of the fund as at 30 June 1993 was: the initial grant of \$100 000, plus Treasury interest of \$153 396.64, less grants to recipients of \$91 204.44, other outgoings of \$2 658.38 and promotional pamphlet design and printing costs of \$3 306.25, leaving a balance held in trust as at 30 June 1993 of \$156 227.57.

A grant of \$16 000 was paid in 1993. I am advised that the \$13 000 mentioned in the Estimates of Payments is the amount that has been paid out of the trust for the grant this year. In fact, in August this year, \$16 000 was paid to Mr Ron Rowe for environmental art construction and design. If my advice is correct, that figure should be \$16 000 not \$13 000, and in the Estimates of Payments and Receipts there should be the transfer of that amount of funds into the Government. It should be a cost neutral exercise. We will confirm the accuracy of what I am saying or make a further explanation if that is not correct.

Mr OLSEN: Who have been the recipients of these awards in recent years?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In 1986, Mr Ian McPherson, artist, received \$17 617; in 1988, Mr Gerry King, glass maker, \$11 854; in 1989, Ms Ruth Creedy, the art of Washi papermaking, \$10 000; in 1989, Ms Angela Valamanesh, inlay ceramics, \$5 000; in 1990, Ms Catherine Truman, jeweller and woodcarver, \$15 365.64; in 1991, Ms Mary Moore, theatre designer, \$16 367.80; and, in 1992, Mr Russell Fewster, theatre practices and mask making, \$15 000.

Mr OLSEN: What is the expiry date of this program?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I presume that, because the capital has been put in trust and the interest has been used, this program is without limit.

Mr HOLLOWAY: Does the State Statistical Priorities Committee, which is mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report, still have an ongoing function and, if so, what is it? I note that last year it had receipts of \$79 000 as against payments of \$110 000; what exactly is the source of its receipts?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Ms Carol Treloar to comment on that matter. My understanding of this issue is that the State Government accepts the Australian Bureau of Statistics as the provider of key statistics for this State, and we accept the Commonwealth statistician in South Australia as our own statistician. It is an example of the one person fulfilling two offices. The one requirement we make is that we have some input into the types of statistics that are collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics to ensure that they are relevant to us. This is an enormous cost saving to us because, if we established our own statistics capacity to meet the kinds of statistics we need as a free-standing unit, it would cost very much more than the kind of use we make of the ABS and the local Commonwealth statistician duplicating as our own statistician.

The committee, as I understand it, meets four to five times a year. Its current membership is: Carol Treloar, who is the Chair; Peter Gardner, the Deputy Commonwealth Statistician for South Australia; Frank Morgan, Director of the Office of Crime Statistics; Eveline Tyndale, from FACS, representing the human services area of Government; Lindsay Oxlad, Director of the Transport Planning Office, representing physical infrastructure; Neal Coffee of the Department of Environment and Planning; Stewart Hocking of Treasury; Murray Arthur-Worsop, of the Economic Development Authority; Bill Furse, representing tourism; and Tony Bammann, Chief Statistical Officer, who is Executive Officer from the ABS. This committee makes annual recommendations to me and to the ABS on the topic for the annual ABS State supplementary survey and provides a forum for the discussion of policy priorities to the State Government. The State supplementary survey in 1993 is to be conducted on the means of reducing the number of single occupant vehicles on South Australian roads.

Ms Treloar: There is nothing to add on that unless the honourable member wants more details on the charging arrangements between the ABS and the State Government.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: A new charging arrangement between the State Government and the ABS was reached this year. While the agreement is based on the principle of revenue neutrality—the principle which historically has underpinned the agreement between the Commonwealth and the States on the establishment of the ABS—State agencies are now charged for all services and products with a refund provided to the State Government for the quantum.

Mr HOLLOWAY: On page 221 of the Auditor-General's Report reference is made to the history of the *One and All* training ship. What is the current state of negotiations relating to the settlement of the debt referred to by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There have been further discussions during the year and further agreements were made between the Government and the *One and All* that I believe now finally close off any further State Government assistance to the *One and All* enterprise. The balance of outstanding loans as at December 1992 was \$479 277. No reductions of this amount were received in the 1992-93 financial year. In December last year, Cabinet resolved to accept an amount of \$150 000 as full and final settlement of the debt owed by the *One and All* Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia. While the figure has been agreed, no moneys have been received.

Before the trust was able to arrange the finance to meet this settlement, the ownership of the vessel was required to be transferred from the old owner, the *One and All* Sailing Ship Association of South Australia, to the current owner, the Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia, which organisation came into effect following the public appeal for funds in 1989. Some minor costs are associated with that. The Sailing Ship Trust has now arranged the necessary finance subject to the clearance of mortgage documents, and approval has been granted by the Treasurer for *ex gratia* relief for the stamp duty, and the Commissioner has agreed to remit any penalty that might have been associated with that. So we believe the matter should proceed to settlement very quickly.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I refer to 'Support services' at page 21 of the Program Estimates. One of the listed achievements for the previous financial year was that contacts with the Federal Government and other States in the visits and hospitality area were further developed. Would further coordination between the State and Federal Governments provide an opportunity for cost saving or better results from those visits and hospitality areas?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I believe we do this effectively between the two levels of Government, the most recent example being the visit to South Australia of His Excellency, Dr Richard von Weisacher, the President of the Federal Republic of Germany. That visit was under the auspices of the national Government, but it did involve the protocol office of the South Australian Government. A number of the issues were handled by the national Government, but for the State portion of the visit a number were handled by the South Australian Government. I do not believe there was any evidence of duplication of costs.

Likewise, in terms of other visits that we get to South Australia, there is appropriate, maximum effort to ensure that they are handled in a cost efficient way. Of course, matters such as the protocol visits to South Australia by ambassadors and high commissioners on their initial visit and, indeed, on

their final visit before the end of their appointment, are handled by the State Government. But, again, the experience has been that we handle this very cost effectively.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I refer to 'Issues/trends' at page 20 of the Program Estimates. I assume the appointment of Mr John Ellis is connected with urban and strategic development within the Premier's Department. Does Mr Ellis have any special planning qualifications, and was the position advertised? I note Mr Ellis is here with the Premier's team.

Dr Crawford: The Premier's office has a strategic planning unit, which deals with integrated planning, be it economic, social or spatial. That unit has two primary roles, one of which relates to the issues of strategic planning outside metropolitan Adelaide—because, after all, a large amount of effort has been put into creating the right planning machinery and framework for metropolitan Adelaide, and we are in the process of progressively developing the machinery for the whole of the State.

Its second role is to assess major projects which are brought forward for the Government to consider. These major projects are tested against two criteria: first, whether the project is in the State interest; and, secondly, whether the sorts of proposals put forward are feasible. It is not the intent that this organisational unit should be a successor to the urban project unit of the past. Urban projects and urban development now come under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. So, this unit carries out a rather specialised role. In those terms, Mr Ellis is highly qualified in both engineering and planning, and his support team comprises a number of people with economic capabilities so that that integrated process can be carried through. Mr Ellis has come through into this process as a result of the earlier planning review process, so he is a contract officer.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I feel the question was not specifically answered. I asked about personal qualifications and whether the position was advertised, specifically in the areas of engineering and planning. That is rather a vague answer. I feel qualified to do a lot of things, but I do not have much paper to support that.

Dr Crawford: I spent some little time explaining the role so we would understand what the qualifications should be directed at. I will be happy to turn to Mr Ellis so he can comment on his own personal qualifications.

Mr Ellis: My qualifications are as follows: I have a Bachelor of Technology degree from the University of Adelaide. I have practised in engineering for about 14 years and then went to Pak-Poy as the project coordinator for the Monarto development studies. I have a recognition from the then Minister of Planning, David Wotton, that my qualifications were acceptable under the Planning Act and under its predecessor, the Planning and Development Act. I have been accepted as an expert witness in front of the tribunal and courts over a number of years. I was a senior consultant to the planning review for the entire duration of that exercise. I was appointed by the Premier to this position as a result of that involvement.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I refer to page 21 of the Program Estimates and to page 25 of the Estimates of Payments, Intra-Agency Support Services. It is stated that 'the specific target for this financial year will be to achieve all works related to the refurbishment of the State Administration Centre. These works must be completed within the current approved budget and within associated time frames.' However, in the Premier's Meeting the Challenge statement made in April, he announced that a major part of the fitout of

the State Administration Centre, including refurbishment of the offices of the Premier and Treasurer, would be deferred. Has the Premier changed his mind on this project which involves expenditure of \$18.5 million in capital works funds this financial year and, if so, why?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: On 4 May 1992 the State Cabinet approved expenditure of \$18.5 million for the refurbishment of the State Administration Centre. Subsequently, on 13 July 1992 Cabinet approved an integrated fitout of the State Administration Centre at an estimated expenditure of \$9.399 million. On 9 July 1992, Cabinet approved the relocation of the E&WS Department from the State Administration Centre to the Australis building. E&WS was totally relocated by July 1993.

In a minute signed by me on 11 June this year, I directed that priority be given to the relocation of the State Taxation Office from the Torrens building. That was for the purpose of allowing community groups to backfill that building following an earlier commitment that had been made to allow the Torrens building to be used for community group accommodation. A sequence of works was required to the Premier and Cabinet Department accommodation early in May 1994 followed by Treasury and Deputy Premier in late May 1994, and the direction also gave a revised total project cost of \$28.679 million. This was a variation on the economic statement position which gave effect to most of the economic statement undertakings, but the program is being undertaken over a shorter construction timeframe to minimise contractual and other cost penalties, matters that were canvassed in the public domain about two months ago.

The economic statement commitments that will be met are as follows: to give priority to the lower floors, ground to level 3, to permit the Torrens building to be vacated and subsequently occupied by voluntary organisations; to defer occupation by Premier's Department until early May 1994 and the Deputy Premier's and Treasurer's office by late May 1994; and to allow occupation by the rest of Treasury in late May 1994. The Cabinet direction of 30 August 1993 has allocated floors as follows: floors 13 to 16, Premier and Cabinet; 12, Office of Public Sector Reform; 10 and 11, Auditor-General's Department; 4 to 9, Treasury and SAFA; and 1 to 3, State Taxation Office.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As a supplementary question, does the project remain within budget? It is early days but, in view of the fact that the program seems to have been accelerated in order to prevent future budget blowouts, will it remain within budget during the current financial year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I think we will get a detailed response. We do not have any specific knowledge as to whether there has been a blowout on cost.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I refer to the Estimates of Payments (page 23) and The Budget and its Impact on Women. Last financial year it was announced that, under this program, a register would be established showing the names of women interested in representation on Government boards. The paper this year shows that \$20 000 was spent on that work last financial year, and a further \$20 000 has been allocated during the current financial year. How many registration forms have been distributed in accordance with the promise to devise a registration form and, since it was to be for wide community distribution—I am quoting from last year's document—what criteria have been applied to determine to whom those forms were to be distributed? How many completed registration forms have been received?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The women's register was launched by the Minister for the Status of Women in March 1993. The women's register software has been installed in a computer that is specific for that purpose in the Women's Information and Policy Unit, which has responsibility for promoting and maintaining the register. Register forms have been distributed widely in the community and approximately 300 women have completed and returned them. To date, requests for nominees have been received in relation to vacancies for some 15 committees. All Ministers have been advised of the women's register, and an instruction for the use of the register has been included in the recently released Cabinet handbook. A Commissioner's circular outlining the Government's policy and procedures for the use of the register has been prepared.

Publicity for promotion of the register has included the *Advertiser*, women's organisation newsletters, consultation with ministerial officers, and an advertisement in the news publication of radio 5EBI. The estimated cost of the establishment, maintenance and management of the register for 1993-94 is \$20 000, representing approximately two-fifths of an ASO4 salary plus one-fifth of an ASO1 salary, and administrative expenses of approximately \$1 000. The State Services commitment for 1993-94 is approximately \$3 000, comprising basically software modification and maintenance. I will ask Jane Taylor to comment further.

Ms Taylor: The honourable member might like to know that 5 000 forms have been distributed widely since the register was set up. We are about to have the form reprinted because we continue to get requests for it.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I refer to page 16 of the Program Estimates. One of the specific targets and objectives for 1993-94 is 'to continue to extend the work of the planning review beyond the metropolitan area on a region by region basis, coordinated by the strategic planning unit'. Has a program been set as to what regions are being covered and those to be covered first, and what is the program? Further, when is it anticipated that the work will be completed?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Government has accepted the planning review recommendations to extend the planning strategy to the whole of the State by 1995. In the meantime, the planning strategy for non-metropolitan areas will be based on established policy expressed by the Barossa Valley and Mount Lofty Ranges plans and the regional sections of the old development plan for all other areas of the State.

Strong interest in regional communities and Government agencies has led to strategic planning in the Northern Spencer Gulf in conjunction with the Department of Mines and Energy and the Economic Development Authority; the Riverland in conjunction with the Economic Development Authority and the Riverland Economic Development Board; Kangaroo Island in conjunction with the local community and the National Farmers Federation of South Australia; and the Eyre Peninsula in conjunction with the Regional Development Board and the Department of Primary Industries. Other initiatives are now being followed up, and it is anticipated that the establishment of the planning strategy will occur more quickly than originally planned.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I have a supplementary question. When you say 'more quickly', how quickly is that?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask John Ellis to comment on this.

Mr Ellis: There is no fixed timetable to the end of the task at this stage. We are attempting to develop that at the moment, but we are very much dependent on the resources

from other Government agencies, as we feel that this should be a cooperative effort that involves all the relevant agencies within Government and, more particularly, the local communities. So, while we have the overall aim of finishing in 1995, there is no direct program at this stage.

Mrs HUTCHISON: That concerns all the areas. I have a particular interest in the Northern Spencer Gulf area.

Mr Ellis: Yes, the Northern Spencer Gulf area is well under way. The work has been under way for three months. It is intended that the resource processing strategy, which is the first output of that combined effort, will be completed by December and the planning strategy for that area within another two months. So, by February/March it will be completed.

Mrs HUTCHISON: My next question relates to the same page and the dot point which states:

Work with EDA on ways to prevent wasting information and promote the State's infrastructure.

What sort of work has been done on that, and what infrastructure is being referred to there?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Economic Development Authority has the responsibility for the economic development funding that was announced first of all last year and the repeat funding announced this year. That does include some funding, for example, for tourist infrastructure, and that allocation will be spent in conjunction with the Tourism Commission in South Australia and also with my office and Government generally.

There is also responsibility for other areas of infrastructure, as is envisaged under the Economic Development Board legislation passed by this Parliament. That provided that there should be some economic understanding taken in the provision of infrastructure in this State. In other words, attention should be paid to the extent to which the development of infrastructure will help the economic development of this State. That is something where the board is responsible to the Minister, but also, through the Minister, to Cabinet generally, and of course the Premier's Department plays a role in that. It is all about creating the right business climate that was foreshadowed in the *Meeting the Challenge* statement that I released in April.

The CHAIRMAN: I have probably been over-generous to the honourable member in allowing two supplementaries on her question. I will allow the third and be miserly later on.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I appreciate that, Sir. My last question relates to equal opportunity within the departments—and I have a tendency to ask this question. What has been happening with equal opportunity within the department in terms of staffing?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask the Director of the department to respond to that.

Dr Crawford: Within the department there are a number of areas, such as the Cabinet office, the strategic planning area and obviously the women's affairs area which seem to be areas of intense policy development that attract the interest and applications of large numbers of highly qualified women. The consequence is that within the Department of Premier and Cabinet we have more than equal representation—very strong representation—in those areas which we continue to build upon and utilise and which is one of the reasons why I believe we are effective, not only in dealing with equal opportunity issues across the wider public sector but also in dealing with a whole set of policy issues where the question

really is: what are the implications of these programs in terms of what they deliver for women?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I direct a general question to the Premier, and I do so under this line before leaving it because I think this is the last question under this line. I would ask that it be applied to all the areas under the Premier's own responsibility. I do not expect the information now, but I would appreciate its being explained later.

First, in relation to boards and committees, for what boards and committees and councils does the Minister have responsibility and, for each one of those boards, committees or councils, who are the members; when do the membership terms expire; what is the remuneration of each of the members; who appoints the boards; on whose recommendation or nomination is the appointment made; and what is the role and function of each of those boards, committees or councils?

In terms of public sector reform under the Premier's areas of responsibility, how many officers are on contracts of service rather than permanent employment and at what levels are they serving; who, if any, of those officers is subject to performance reviews; how is performance measured; who measures it; who reviews performance; and what is the consequence of failure to perform? Are any performance bonuses paid; and, if so, what are they and how are they measured?

What, if any, savings have been identified from the restructuring of departments under the Premier; and where are those savings being made? Do the savings involve a reduction in staffing numbers? If they do, how many staff will leave, in what areas and at what stage of the restructuring? What, if any, improvements in efficiency have been made? How are they measured; what is the reward for improvement or the penalty for failing to improve; and what problems have been identified as a result of restructuring under the Premier's area?

For each department or agency for which the Premier has responsibility, how many positions have been proposed for abolition under the targeted separation packages; what is each position; how many persons have so far applied to take the take the benefits of a TSP; how many targeted separation packages have so far been accepted; and what has been the payout under each TSP?

For each department again under the Premier's responsibility, have any performance indicators been established; what are those performance indicators; how are they measured and who measures them? How frequently has the Minister been involved in the reviewing of performance for each department and what has been the result of any performance reviews? What is the salary and benefits package of the Chief Executive Officer of departments under his responsibility; what is the total cost to Government of that package; what performance measures are incorporated in the contract of the CEO; who assesses performance; how frequently is it assessed and what are the consequences of failure to perform and the rewards of good performance; and what are the termination provisions? Finally, what are the salaries and conditions of service of each of the ministerial officers under him as Premier, and what are the job specifications of each of those ministerial officers?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Because that question nearly took until 1 October to finish reading, we may be pushed a little bit to supply all the answers by that date, but I can assure you that a lot of the information is already available in the annual report of the department and some of that

information has been made available to Parliament in other ways at other times. Nevertheless, as a coherent response to the series of questions, we will provide answers thereto.

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

Premier and Minister of Economic Development—
Other payments, \$38 149 000

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Kennan, Chief Executive Officer, MFP Development Corporation.

Mr R.H. Keller, General Manager, Environment and Operations.

Mr B. Speed, Senior Finance Officer.

Mr D. Ryan, Secretary.

Mr T. Tysoe, General Manager, Business Climate Coordination, Economic Development Authority.

Mr J. Shepherd, Director Information Policy, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that, under Standing Orders, I should insist that questions intended for the Premier should be directed through the Chair, if only because otherwise we will fall into error when the House is back in session. I declare the proposed payments open for examination.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: During public evidence given to the Economic and Finance Committee, Mr Kennan revealed that he had been assisted by former Senator John Button, who we all recall was the Federal Minister responsible for MFP Australia. I understand that Mr Button assisted in introducing Mr Kennan to a number of targeted companies throughout Australia. Was Mr Button acting in his capacity as a consultant to the MFP? If so, did he receive payment for this work? How was his fee determined? How many days was he engaged on this work and what fee did he actually receive?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Kennan in a minute to make some comments on this. Of course, the Leader knows that John Button has had an active interest in the MFP for a long time. As the relevant Federal Minister he took a close personal interest in the project and it was quite clear that he would want to maintain that interest after he left politics. He is about to be appointed to the international advisory board, and I think that is an excellent appointment.

Mr Kennan: The activity in which Mr Button was involved with us was associated with the Australia Asia Business Centre—the executive development consortium that we are pulling together. He was acting as an independent consultant. We approached Mr Button seeking his support and we negotiated with him—and I did so with the help of one of my board colleagues—a fee of \$AUS10 000. That amount covers the work that he has done, involving a period of three weeks working with us and going around Australia; and, indeed, it has a follow on component as we now move into the Asian arena. As recently as last week, I was in further consultation with Mr Button, as we are now very active in regard to the Asian component.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Does that \$10 000 fee include travel and accommodation costs or are they additional?

Mr Kennan: His travel and living costs are covered separately; I have taken those directly into MFP Australia. As we were travelling together, I covered those costs when we were travelling.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer to page 30 of the Estimates of Payments. The Premier is quoted in the *Advertiser* of 12 April this year as saying that \$127 million would be spent on stage 1 of the MFP. What is the current schedule for the spending this year of that \$127 million? Furthermore, in his economic statement on 22 April, just a few days later, the Premier said:

The construction of up to 70 medium density low-cost houses on a site at Osborne is scheduled for the end of the year.

Is it still scheduled to have those houses constructed by the end of this year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I would like to correct the statement that I made that \$127 million would be spent on stage 1. At about Easter, a press announcement appeared in the *Sunday Mail* stating it was anticipated that the Government would announce in the April statement Meeting the Challenge that \$127 million would be allocated for the MFP in the budget with which we are now dealing. That was corrected as being, in fact, an incorrect figure, and it related to the cost of stage 1 over the life of stage 1, not within this current financial year.

On the matter of the village development, I was involved with the MFP in announcing—in fact on the day the Federal election was called—a competition for the design of housing for the MFP and that competition was to result in some later consideration of design proposals. I will ask Mr Kennan to advise progress on that matter.

Mr Kennan: The BHP MFP housing competition is proceeding on schedule. The expectation is that a winner will be announced in the very near future. The final judging has occurred and I am obviously not aware of who the final winner is; that is knowledge available only to the judges. But it is indeed on schedule and will be announced prior to the end of this year. Of course, the houses in the Osborne area are projected to be commenced thereafter.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That answers neither question. I did not say that \$127 million would be spent this year: I said \$127 million would be spent on stage 1 of the MFP. What is the current schedule for the spending of this money? If \$127 million is spent on stage 1, how much will be spent this year, how much next year and how much the subsequent year? How many of the 70 medium density houses will be built this year, which is what the Premier said on 22 April?

Mr Kennan: Let me comment on the second part of the question first. No houses will be built this year as far as the Osborne activity is concerned. I would suggest that a misunderstanding has been communicated because there is no way that you could have a design competition and arrive at building in the same year. I turn now to the first part of the question with respect to spending on stage 1.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: While Mr Kennan is looking for that information, I refer to the statement I made on the construction of those houses commencing by the end of this year. Every estimation is that that will continue to be the case.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is no misunderstanding on my part in terms of when these houses will be built—I was quoting the Premier. On 22 April this year the Premier said:

The construction of up to 70 medium density, lower cost houses on a site at Osborne is scheduled for the end of the year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is quite right; the start of construction on those 70 houses is scheduled for the end of the year.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have heard that no houses are to be built by the end of this year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The finish of construction is not the day after the start. Any reasonable assessment of the competition process that has been put in place would not expect 70 houses to be finished by the end of the calendar year. It is quite a naive understanding on the part of the Leader to think otherwise. Construction starting at the end of the year is what was said and, by all accounts, that is what will happen.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The statement was—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I need to bring the Committee back to a formal way of examining these things. The position is this: the Leader has been given two questions at this stage and he has a further one to go. I have given some latitude with supplementaries. We are still waiting on a response from the Premier's officers, which can come now or at a later stage, or the Leader can ask his third question in whatever way he wishes to do so.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will wait for the answer to the first point, which was about when the \$127 million would be spent on stage 1. What is the schedule this year, next year and the supplementary year?

Mr Kennan: The Leader's earlier question related to what is to be spent in this year and the plan that we have for activity in stage 1. I assume that the Leader is referring to activities specifically on Gillman with respect to geophysical testing. The engineering total for geophysical testing this year is \$1.56 million.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Leader's question has now been answered.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I do not think they have answered my question, Mr Chairman. I asked: what is the schedule for the spending of the \$127 million?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I was just about to make the point that I understood that is what the Leader was asking for. We will provide a schedule of how all moneys on stage 1 will be spent or when they will be spent. As I understand it, stage 1 should be completed by 1996-97, so we will provide a schedule of how that money will be spent not just this financial year but in subsequent financial years.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the confusion about the way that last question was asked or answered, I am prepared to give the Leader a further question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I understand that \$127 million is to be spent on stage 1 of the MFP and that \$1.56 million is to be spent in 1993-94. I clarify that point and note the fact that, even though it has been announced that \$127 million will be spent on stage 1, at this stage we have not been given a year by year schedule as to when the rest of that money will be spent.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I just take issue—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is that the Leader's question?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, Sir, I am coming to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you had better ask your question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am making the point because the answer was given and I have picked up the information from the answer. The answer was that we will be spending \$1.56 million this year, but at this stage no schedule can be given on how that money will be spent in subsequent years. My third question is: what was the cost last financial year of engaging executive search consultants? How many positions were filled through a contracted executive search company? How many persons does the MFP development

corporation currently employ? How many positions remain to be filled? How many of the positions still to be filled have a general manager classification, and what salary will be offered to each of these positions? I understand that the Premier may need to supply some of that information later, but I think at least the base information should be supplied now.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Before handing over to Mr Kennan, I point out that I again take issue with this matter of stage 1 and the \$127 million. I remind the Leader of what happened. There was a press report—not issued by the Government—saying that \$127 million was going to appear in the April economic statement for the MFP. That was not something that came from the Government; it was media speculation about which I was asked. At the time I said that it must refer to stage 1 of the development but that people would have to wait until the economic statement came out. As the Leader will recall, when the economic statement came out, that did not appear for the very simple reason that we did not see it as a significant thing to talk about because we could not give full details about it at that time. So, there was a response to a media story rather than something initiated by the Government.

There is an indicative schedule of funding for stage 1, which I can now detail. The figures that appear in the report to the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee indicate the development cost of stage 1 as follows: stage 1A, \$169 769 000 and stage 1B, \$70 100 000. At this stage we can see the anticipated costs spanning over a period from this year through to 1997-98 for stage 1A, and stage 1B starting in 1997-98 and going through to the year 2001-2.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Could you repeat those figures?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: They are on page 14/4 of the report given to the Economic and Finance Committee. During stage 1A, \$169 769 000 will be spent over the period 1993-94 through to 1997-98. During stage 1B, \$70 100 000 will be spent over the period 1997-98 through to 2001-2. During stage 2, \$114 600 000 will be spent over the period 1999-2000 through to 2004-5. The total development costs of all stages is \$354 469 000. The land sales income (residential and commercial) from stage 1A is estimated to be—and I presume that it is in this year's dollars—\$80 884 000. That revenue stream will come in from 1996-97 through to 2001-2. During stage 1B, \$43 254 000 will come in from 2001-2 through to 2002-3. During stage 2, \$97 888 000 will come in from 2002-3 through to 2006-7. This provides total land sales income of \$222 026 000, which means that the development costs in total exceed the land sales income costs, in total estimated, by \$132 443 000 in current dollars.

[Sitting suspended from 3.33 to 3.48 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Premier or one of his officers has an answer to the last question of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We were supplying information on stage 1 and other stages. One point that needs to be made about that information is that the figure I quoted for stage 1 did not sound like \$127 million, which is the figure that was floated earlier in the year. I just want to put that into context so that people can understand that when we find the page. I will ask Mr Kennan to comment on that in a moment. The other thing which most members would not be aware of—although members of the Economic and Finance Committee

would be—is that stage 1A in 1993-94 lists a figure of some \$17 million. The figure that Mr Kennan quoted a minute ago was \$1.7 million for geophysical works. In addition to that, and as part of stage 1A funding, there is land acquisition costs of the order of \$9 million, and the balance of the \$17 million is committed for environmental rehabilitation work in the surrounds of stage 1A.

Regardless of what people think about the development needs of Gillman, I remind members that that is work that has to be done. It is essential not only for the MFP project but for the environment of that whole area, including the significance of that area to the fishing industry and aspects like that. That \$1.7 million is only a part of the total money to be spent this year that can be related to stage 1A. I will ask Mr Kennan to do the reconciliation between the \$169 million and the \$127 million.

Mr Kennan: To clarify the \$127 million, our recollection is that that was the net present value calculation of about \$145 million, which was our original figure for stage 1A activity. Since then we have brought forward one component in particular, which is the Wingfield or Barker inlet wetlands activity. During the technical studies it was found necessary to do that in order to carry forward the remediation work. The overall total has not changed. We have simply shifted money from one stage to another, and thus the \$145 million went up to \$169 million. We can provide a break-down of those details if required.

Mr QUIRKE: Much of the discussion about the MFP in recent times has centred on whether or not the Gillman site should be the prime goal, or whether indeed the investment potential for the MFP in South Australia should be the prime goal. Can Mr Kennan provide some of the information that he gave the committee I chaired the other week about the reorientation towards investment that the MFP people seem to be heading towards.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Before asking Mr Kennan to comment, I remind members of the comments I made soon after I became Premier. It has always been my view that the MFP is a very complex project involving a number of locations. It involves not just the Gillman core site but the Science Park site and the Technology Park site. It also involves the city of Adelaide as part of the MFP. I always had the view that various areas of the MFP should develop in parallel fashion in terms of the physical development, and that we should be doing work at Gillman just as we should be building onto the achievements of Technology Park and the new Science Park.

In addition, there is another important aspect, which the honourable member has correctly identified, and that is that the MFP is not just about urban or residential development: it is designed to attract investment. One of the messages that came through strongly from my visit to Japan and from meeting with members of the MFP Cooperation Association of Japan is that they want investment opportunities to be identified. They want to know what they can invest in, because it is quite clear that they are keen to support the MFP, but they need more work to be done on investment proposals.

Looked at from that point of view, two issues travel in parallel. First, there is the need to develop the physical aspect of the site, but in parallel with that and not behind it there needs to be investment development of the site, in other words, the development of investment opportunities. I had those views before I became Premier, but I certainly expressed them after I became Premier. When we say that 1993 is the

year in which the MFP must come to something, we mean that we must have investment opportunities that we can talk about now as well as the physical infrastructure development. Some of the physical work must be done no matter what happens, because the environmental rehabilitation of the area would have to be done by the Government at some stage even if the MFP had never been heard of.

Mr Kennan: I think it is fair to say that the focus of our activities has shifted: we are directing 45 per cent of our budget this year into economic development and job creation. The work we are doing is clearly focused around the creation of the consortium in the areas of ITMT, education and environmental management. Those activities are not strictly South Australian: they go across Australia and internationally as well. As the Premier has commented, we are now working actively in Asia, in particular, discussing with our potential consortium members involvement in several of these consortia that are being formed. I think the honourable member would be aware that we already have one consortium in the environmental services arena. I indicated to the Economic and Finance Committee that we have added a further member to that consortium from Korea, and that is the Posco Iron and Steel Company.

Mr QUIRKE: The Leader and other members have suggested that the name 'multifunction polis' is confusing. Over the past couple of years there have been discussions about whether that name should continue. Do the Premier or his officers associated with the MFP project believe that the project should be renamed?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Like many others I had some earlier concerns about the utility of the name; 'multifunction polis' sounded awkward. However, when I, as an individual, asked myself what were the alternatives, I realised that the MFP is an internationally focused project that is receiving interest from right around the world. If the name is to be part of that scene, many other names that might sound better here would not have any benefit in an international sense. We could choose to name it after a distinguished South Australian of the past or a distinctive geographic feature of the area, but that would not mean anything to potential international investors. On the other hand, 'multifunction polis' could mean something to anyone anywhere in the world wherever it was heard, whereas if it were to be called Gillman, for example, that would not mean anything.

My view has come to be that, if there had been another name which could easily have been used and which would have met the international awareness potential of the project and local expectations, that would have been a good thing, but no name of that sort emerged. The name has been around for so long now that people no longer use the full name: they more often use the shorthand version of MFP. It is settling down as a name with some degree of acceptance, and I personally am much more comfortable with that name. I will accept the advice of the MFP board or the international advisory board on this matter, as will the Federal Government, but I have no problems with the project's continuing to be called the MFP.

Mr Kennan: The name 'MFP Australia' is now entrenched. Given that it is entrenched, it is somewhat like my own surname: I might not like it but I am stuck with it.

Mr QUIRKE: I understand that the acquisition of the Wingfield dump is on hold but that it is still seen as part of the Gillman site together with the Dean Rifle Range. With regard to land contamination, I would have thought that the rifle range would not be too much of a problem because

taking a couple of inches of soil off the surface should pick up all the base metals, but the Wingfield dump must contain tens of millions of rubbish bags holding all sorts of garbage of one type or another with a fair amount of chemical and other contamination. I would have thought that that would involve a fairly major environmental reconstruction job. What research has been done on the Wingfield dump, in particular? Is it planned to clear the site totally after its acquisition or to do something more innovative and use the land without going to the enormous expense of completely clearing it up?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member is correct: the timing of the acquisition is not quite as it needed to be, and that will help all parties in this matter. It will help the Adelaide City Council in terms of its capacity to use the area for waste management purposes and it will help the MFP in terms of cash flow issues and the ultimate acquisition price.

Mr Keller: The honourable member is correct in that to clear the tip completely would involve enormous cost. There is certainly no intention to do that, because the material would have to be taken away and put somewhere else, and that would cause a similar problem. There are world-wide accepted practices for closing down landfill operations which then allow the land to become available for restricted use, not for building or for people being there 24 hours a day, but if closed down properly it is quite legitimate to use the land for recreational purposes such as golf courses, parklands and so on.

However, there are two ongoing problems. First, there is the potential for spontaneous combustion because of heat generated and methane given off. That has usually more to do with tipping practices at the time. By removing the methane that problem is eliminated. The idea is to continue to use the methane from that tip and to maximise its production. It is probably worth noting that that tip was one of the first in the world to be used for continuous methane production, and that has been going on for a long time through Falzon.

The second problem is leachates. That is a potential problem in this case because the tip now abuts the Magazine Creek area. We are continuing studies to determine the exact extent of that leachate problem. We have done some groundwater studies, so we know what is happening at the moment, and we suspect that the problem will increase. There are some relatively simple engineering techniques for capturing leachates and putting them back onto the tip for watering purposes, and so on, and allowance has been made in the budget for those engineering solutions.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In 1992 it was announced that agreement had been reached between the Commonwealth and the South Australian Governments for the contribution of \$40 million from the Federal Government over a three year period to fund essential infrastructure at the Gillman site. How much of that money was received by the South Australian Government and spent in the year up to the end of June 1993? How much is budgeted to be spent this financial year? Is it a requirement of the Federal Government that all the Better Cities funding be allocated to the MFP site at Gillman or is there some flexibility as to where that money can be spent? Can the Better Cities money be spent elsewhere? Is the Better Cities money being spent on the houses at Osborne and, if not, who is paying for the 70 houses at Osborne?

Is the level of State funding of the project tied to the level of Commonwealth Government funding? What other

Commonwealth funding is likely to be available for the MFP? When was the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State Government signed for the payment of this \$40 million and, if it is not spent from last year or this year, is it simply sitting there and being carried forward in some form of deposit account?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That question has many facets and, at the outset, I want to give the assurance that, if we miss any in the answer because they were fed rather quickly, we will either take them on a repeat with the understanding that we are not deliberately not answering them or we will take them on notice and get back with information later. In a few moments, I will ask Mr Kennan and then Mr Keller to provide responses to various aspects of the Better Cities money. First, there have been delays in the program expenditures, and that occurred for several reasons, one of the most significant being the Commonwealth delay until February this year in improving the environmental impact statement which directed much of that spending.

Furthermore, other factors, including the length of time before the board was appointed—and that has already been acknowledged—and the time necessary for the board to develop strategic objectives did contribute. The program for the use of those funds is being redrafted in consultation with the Commonwealth. The Minister for Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Services, the Hon. Brian Howe, has advised the MFP that he favours a focus on environmental works rather than supporting the fragmentation of the program funds to this State. We expect that a revised program should be completed and agreed within the next month.

Mr Kennan: For the period of the last financial year, we did not spend any of the Better Cities money in the MFP Australia activity. We do have an understanding from the Federal Government that the moneys are still available but there is a requirement to spend—not just to have it allocated but to have spent it—under the Better Cities program by June 1996. As the Premier has indicated, we have reworked the specific activity to be identified under the Better Cities program and given correct focus to that now, and it is particularly focused around the environmental remediation, as the Premier indicated.

Mr Keller: No Better Cities money is going to Osborne. At present, the program would indicate that approximately 10 to 15 per cent of the houses would be built for the Housing Trust. There are commitments from various builders to build three or four exhibition houses on the site. So, it would progress under normal commercial arrangements. It is just that the design is preset, if you like, and the participating builders have been participating in the judging of the various designs to make sure they can be built and that it is a commercial venture.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: When was the agreement with the Federal Government signed?

Mr Keller: That really would involve just a recollection.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We had better take on notice the balance of questions unanswered and come back with information.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Has the agreement been signed?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It was signed just before the last Federal election, but obviously we are having trouble recalling the date.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Was any specific commitment made that State funds had to match Federal funds? When I had a briefing from the MFP team last year—almost

exactly 12 months ago—I was told that the State Government had to put in \$80 million to match the \$40 million from the Commonwealth; is that still the state of affairs? There had to be a two-for-one commitment from the State.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Kennan to comment on that.

Mr Kennan: I have had discussions with the Minister, Mr Brian Howe, and his staff indicated to us there was no set formula for that. Apparently, a requirement has been applied to Federal Better Cities funding that would link with State funding. However, it was clearly the understanding, in response to the question I asked, that no strict formula applied. It was a memorandum of understanding (that was the phrase used), and I was advised that, given that things had slipped, there would be a redrafting of that memorandum of understanding, and that is precisely what we in MFP Australia are involved in for our part, together with the South Australian Government for its broader part right now.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Can we have a copy of that memorandum of understanding? If it has been signed, it is a public document, so can we have a copy? Does all of the \$40 million have to be spent on the Gillman site or can some of it be spent off the Gillman site in other Better Cities programs? If it is now to be spent on environmental work, what sort of environmental projects are we looking at that that \$40 million would be spent on? Most people would have the understanding that the \$40 million would be spent on the Gillman site in terms of starting to establish the MFP. Now it appears as though it is for environmental work. It is pertinent for us to know whether it must be spent on that Gillman site or elsewhere.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Regarding the memorandum of agreement, I have no personal problem with that being released, but I would obviously have to leave that to the discretion of the board and also to the Federal Government. We will make the appropriate approaches to them on that matter as the other signatories of it, but from my point of view there should be no reason why there could not be. As to the matter of the Better Cities money, how and what it can be spent on and where it can be spent, I will ask Mr Kennan to comment.

Mr Kennan: It is my understanding that the moneys do not have to be spent on the Gillman site. Specifically, however, they are required to be spent in accordance with the agreements that are struck with the Federal Government, and the basis of discussions that we have held with the Federal Government in that area has been focused on what I would call the north-west crescent and the environmental remediation activities that in essence surround the Gillman site *per se*.

It is that particular focus that the Premier referred to earlier concerning which we have an understanding from the Deputy Prime Minister that that would meet with the better cities requirements as he has outlined to us.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I come back to the recurrent payments on page 30. We have \$6.7 million allocated in recurrent payments and \$27 million allocated for capital payments this year. The figures given a moment ago do not add up anywhere near the amounts we were talking about. I understood that, immediately after afternoon tea, you indicated that in 1993-94 \$17 million would be spent, not \$27 million as allocated in the budget papers. I also want to know where the \$6.7 million in recurrent expenditure is being spent this year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: My advice is that the expenditure of the MFP Development Corporation involved salaries and related payments of \$3.13 million; administrative and operating expenses \$3.3 million; accommodation charges \$.4 million; interest costs \$.36 million; property charges \$2.09 million; consulting \$.7 million; contractors \$.19 million; and overseas representation \$.24 million—making a total expenditure of \$10 447 000.

However, there is an additional income that comes to the corporation: rental \$3.1 million; interest \$50 000; and other \$.55 million—making the recurrent grant requirement \$6.74 million. There are capital payments of \$13.7 million. I will ask for some detail on the makeup of this capital figure. With capital receipts of \$.65 million, there is a net capital outlay of \$13.04 million. These figures are recurrent expenditure;

however, some elements of those—salaries, administrative and operating expenses, accommodation charges, relocation costs, etc.—appear on the capital line; so, the figure there of \$817 000 for salaries comes under capital, \$768 000 comes under administration and operating expenses, \$1.1 million comes under relocation costs, \$1.8 million under consulting, and \$4.59 million under contractors/projects. That brings the total capital grants required to \$22.135 million.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Could we get a copy of that now?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I seek leave to have that incorporated in the *Hansard* record of the Committee.

Leave granted.

MFP Development Corporation
93-94 Budget Summary

	Business Development	Planning & Development	Communications	Corporate Office	Total
Income:					
Rental Income	3 111 000				3 111 000
R&D Contribution					0
Interest				50 000	50 000
Other	548 000				548 000
Total Income	3 659 000	0	0	50 000	3 709 000
Expenditure:					
		(Capital)			
Salaries & Related Payments	1 306 000	817 000	861 000	970 000	3 137 000
Admin/Operating Expenses	1 736 000	768 000	438 000	1 166 000	3 340 000
Accommodation Charges				399 000	399 000
Relocation Costs		1 100 000			0
Interest	360 000				360 000
Property Charges	2 090 000				2 090 000
Consulting	110 000	1 820 000	550 000	40 000	700 000
Contractors—Projects	185 000	4 590 000			185 000
Overseas representation				236 000	236 000
Total Expenditure	5 787 000	9 095 000	1 849 000	2 811 000	10 447 000
Recurrent Grants Required	2 128 000		1 849 000	2 761 000	6 738 000
Capital					
Capital Payments (2)	4 252 000	8 800 000	0	638 000	13 690 000
Capital Receipts (3)	650 000	0	0	0	650 000
Net Capital	3 602 000	8 800 000	0	638 000	13 040 000
Capital Grants Required	3 602 000	17 895 000	0	638 000	22 135 000
Total Funding Requirement	5 730 000	17 895 000	1 849 000	3 399 000	28 873 000
Add back receipts per note 1. & 3.	4 309 000	0	0	50 000	4 359 000
Total MFP expenditure	10 039 000	17 895 000	1 849 000	3 449 000	33 232 000

Mr Kennan: You will see in the document being circulated that we have identified expenses which, under the definition used within the normal works definition, are called capital. After discussions with the Auditor-General's Department, however, we are identifying them as recurrent expenditure, because they are in the component of activity that would not normally be capitalised, so the latter component that the Premier identified are those expenditures that for us are classified internally differently. It is the Auditor-General that has agreed to do that.

I also indicate that there was a difference between the total capital that the Premier identified and the figure on page 30 which was from the original estimates that were pulled together and provided to Treasury. At that point we had not completed a total review of budgets. After my arrival, one of the things we did was to complete that, and we have now come forward with these figures.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is one other matter on the capital side. There is another set of figures that we will have circulated today, on the capital works program, which details

various aspects of the capital funding. I seek leave to have that incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

MFP Development Corporation 93-94 Budget Summary					
	Business Development	Planning & Development	Communications	Corporate Office	Total
Capital Works Program:					
Technology Park					
Ian Wark Institute	1 000 000				1 000 000
Office Equipment	77 000				77 000
Car Park—Endevour House	80 000				80 000
Science Park					
Office Construction	210 000				210 000
Car Park—Sir Mark Oliphant	100 000				100 000
Compaction	100 000				100 000
Sale of Land	(650 000)				(650 000)
Environment					
MFP Services Consortia	300 000				300 000
Biomass Project	250 000				250 000
Cleaner Production Centre	100 000				100 000
Global Atmospheric Research	50 000				50 000
IT&T					
Intelligent Precinct Project	300 000				300 000
Media Project	100 000				100 000
International Software Services Co.	200 000				200 000
Education					
Aust Asia Business Centre (AABC)	405 000				405 000
Aust Training Products (ATP)	280 000				280 000
Environ.Manag.Education Program	200 000				200 000
Planning & Development					
Environ./Social/Design & Plan. O/head	500 000	9 095 000			9 595 000
Environmental Management					
Wingfield Wetlands		800 000			800 000
Design & Engineering					
Land Acquisition		8 000 000			8 000 000
Corporate Support					
Office Automation				238 000	238 000
Office Fitout				200 000	200 000
Site Related Legal Costs				200 000	200 000
	3 602 000	17 895 000	0	638 000	22 135 000

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the funds allocated this financial year for the upgrading or development of buildings at both Science Park and Technology Park which now come under the MFP board. Whilst we have been looking here at figures for the whole of the MFP, I presume the rental income we have been talking about, \$3.1 million, is rental income from Technology Park and Science Park; is that correct?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What proposals do you have to upgrade or develop new buildings at Science Park and Technology Park? I think I heard a figure of \$400 000 for rental accommodation: is that the cost for the accommodation over in the Myer-Remm building for the MFP task force or group office?

Mr Kennan: I will go backwards, if I may, with your several points. The total of \$247 000 is the rental cost for the Remm building for this current financial year. The earlier questions pertained to the upgrading and additional buildings for the Technology Park/Science Park area.

In the Technology Park and Science Park activities there is approximately \$550 000 (I have just quickly added some figures) that we have identified as works to continue to enhance and upgrade those properties.

I would add also, however, that we are for specific tenants, in conjunction with the Economic Development Authority and the appropriate Minister, working in tandem with them to provide additional facilities, given that we can work to bring the additional tenants on board. So, we have in fact identified alternative ways now of going forward to fund that

sort of major development, given that we are in our pursuit of these tenants successful—and I believe that we will be.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I would like to pursue the PR work which was done in 1992-93 and then continued into 1993-94. I think we spoke previously in terms of the Economic and Finance Committee about the emphasis which has been placed in the Asia-Pacific region in order to promote the MFP, but I note on page 18 of the Program Estimates that some work was done in Europe—in the UK, Germany and France, and in Scandinavia. What was the result of that work, and has there been any follow-up in this current financial year with regard to promoting the MFP in those areas?

Mr Keller: I believe what has been referred to there are some market surveys that we did in Europe and the UK through a consultant just prior to the appointment of the board; and, no, we have not done any follow-up to that work. It was something that was put on hold once the board met for the first time.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Is there any intention to continue with that work, or will the main emphasis and thrust continue to be in the Asia-Pacific region?

Mr Kennan: Our work in Europe now is very focused. The reference was to a broader awareness campaign that I think was probably appropriate at that time. Right now, working with the South Australian Agent-General in London, Mr Walls, we are very focused on specific companies to participate in consortium activity, and in that context we also have the International Advisory Board membership becoming actively involved with us, which I think is a great asset that we have. We are now starting to, I will say, exploit, if that is a reasonable word, what I think it can bring in the dimension of investment potential to this whole arena.

Mrs HUTCHISON: When you say you are focusing on companies, is that mainly in the UK or is it in other countries in Europe as well?

Mr Kennan: We are not limiting ourselves to the UK. Largely, it is across Europe. I would indicate, obviously, that we have a preference for a country where an IAB member is located. We think we have more horsepower there right now, and with their help I think that gives us a very broad coverage, because certainly in Europe we have a very good coverage from the IAB participation and I think that is one of the key roles that the Federal Government has to play in supporting the whole MFP Australia project. So we are not constrained: we will target specific companies in the industry sectors on which we are very focused.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I would like to ask again a question that I asked in the Economic and Finance Committee, because I think it would be good for that to be recorded here as well. The question relates to the work that was done with the Korean delegation and the results of that work from the delegation's visit to Australia.

Mr Kennan: The development of activities in Korea obviously has been spanning a number of years and I did indicate to the Economic and Finance Committee that we have arranged for Posco to join with the Environmental Services Consortium. That was a specific action that is now concluded. The additional part to that, as I believe I indicated, was in reference to the Asia-Australia Business Centre, the executive development consortium that we have together with the Australian Embassy Commercial Council up there, and indeed the Ambassador is supporting us.

Contact has been made with at least 10 of the major corporations. We have also had our North Asian representative calling to visit those people and I will follow that up in

the middle of October to aggressively pursue their commitment into that area. So, I am delighted with that. But it extends beyond Korea now. We are starting to get very good support from a number of the embassies, and I am very pleased to see that happen.

Mrs HUTCHISON: On page 32 of the Capital Works Program there is a run-down of some of the work that is being done. I refer to the work that was scheduled to commence in September-October on the compaction of the site and investigating the strength and compactibility of the soil, and so on, and the analysing and testing of that: is that work still on track to be done in September-October?

Mr Keller: We have in recent weeks shortlisted the tenderers on that project. We have asked them to come back with some revised bids by the 29th of this month and we hope to award a contract some weeks after that. So, within two months I guess work will be commencing on site.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My question is directed to the Premier. What specific commercial commitments have been given to us for commercial operations to be established in the MFP at the Gillman site so far; and, for each one of those commitments, what is the name of the company, the nature of the commitment and the nature of the agreement reached?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Kennan in a minute to make some further reference on that matter. Mr Kennan will answer this question, but remember that it has been answered as MFP Australia, not just in terms of the Gillman location.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My question was specifically about Gillman.

Mr Kennan: To answer your question, the Gillman location, to my knowledge, has only one commitment, which is what I will call it, although I have not personally seen the document or any document—but I am advised by other board members that the BHP company has indicated its commitment to participate on that site when the right opportunities are identified. I would quickly add, however, that the work that we are doing is not restricted to the Gillman site. I clearly understand that the Leader's question was posed in that way, but my answer would be that as MFP Australia we are working very broadly, recognising opportunities through Technology Park and Science Park as well.

In that context we are not limiting ourselves just to South Australia: we are seeking to bring investment opportunities into Australia, and through that it will then come to the States. Currently we have a commitment from about 25 companies. That information was made available to the Economic and Finance Committee. They are involved in areas of the environmental services company and in the formation of the Australia Asia Business Centre, and we are actively pursuing other corporations, seeking their interest in some of the consortia activities. Clearly, the economic development component—and I think that is really the key point—is very significant in the positioning and focus of MFP Australia activity at the moment.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have spoken to BHP about its commitment to Gillman. I do not think I am breaching any confidences when I say that when I asked BHP quite specifically what its commitment was—and I think it was made on 16 April last year and reported in the *Advertiser* at that time—the company said it was a commitment that it would invest in the MFP, but it is a commitment without any specified amount, obligation, requirement or anything else. The company said that it believed that the project should go

ahead but, frankly, nothing had been put to it to invest in at that stage—and I spoke to the company fairly recently. I think we need to put in context the so-called BHP commitment, without decrying it in anyway. However, I think that BHP can speak for itself.

How many applications has the Government received for assistance under the enterprise zone package for the MFP site, and also for Technology Park and Science Park, because in the Premier's April economic statement he put out a specific offer to establish the special enterprise zones? There is to be one at the MFP site, one at Science Park, one at Technology Park and one at Whyalla. I am not sure how Whyalla came into the grouping of four, except that it is in the Deputy Premier's electorate—no other connection has yet been found. What specific applications have been received by the Government for an enterprise zone?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I just remind the Leader that when the first two enterprise zones were created we indicated that we were not closed to further zones being established. At Whyalla we had potential for locational activities in the petrochemical and general chemical area that could take advantage of infrastructure, land availability and feed stock to supply those industries. It is not as if Whyalla does not already have some work in that area. So, I think the bemusement of the Leader is ill-founded. There is a lot of logic in creating such a zone in Whyalla.

We are considering propositions from other areas of the State, and this could be more properly commented upon by my colleague the Minister of Business and Regional Development, because this comes under the Economic Development Authority area in terms of the creation of new enterprise zones.

The other enterprise zone was the MFP 'sites'. In fact, the economic statement refers to 'MFP-approved sites'. Immediately that takes into account Gillman, Technology Park and Science Park. But, given the view that I have always had that the MFP is about a much broader concept, there ought to be the capacity for the MFP to consider other sites of high technology within South Australia that might be eligible for inclusion in the zone. One area on which I know we have received a submission is the University of Adelaide facility at Thebarton. That is something that will be left to the MFP board to decide.

The rules for enterprise zone approval were only promulgated on 1 July, so we have only just started. The work on developing them was done from April through to June and July. They were announced on 1 July and now, as the MFP goes out and seeks investment, this is part of the thing they talk about when they seek that investment.

Members should remember what I said earlier today and on other occasions: the MFP does have the obligation this year to get out there with investment proposals. What the Government could do was to indicate how it would support those investment proposals, and the enterprise zone idea was one way we could support it. I might say that the idea was very well received by the MFP Corporation Association of Japan and other business people in Japan with whom I have talked. They were very pleased at the initiative of the State Government in creating an economic zone and in establishing tax incentives for companies within that zone. It now becomes part of the marketing arm of the MFP as it goes out and attracts interest. I expect that we will see growing interest in the time ahead.

Without specific investment proposals, it does not matter what incentives are offered. If there is nothing to invest in,

the incentive does not amount to much. The MFP's obligation has been and is to develop investment proposals that can be canvassed with potential investors. Mr Kennan wishes to add something in relation to the previous question, but he may wish to make some comments on this question, too.

Mr Kennan: In relation to the enterprise zone benefits, we have received several comments from different companies already indicating positive interest as a result of that action, and we have found that very encouraging. I would also add that I believe that the positioning of the enterprise zone benefits, done strategically, is a very important overall component of attracting investment into South Australia.

I refer to the Leader's comments in relation to BHP. I would not want there to be a difference of record. I would agree very much with what the Leader has said in terms of the commitments from the management of BHP. My comment, broadly stating it as I did, was to indicate that that did exist prior to my arrival. Like the Leader, I have been to BHP recently. I asked the company whether there was still a commitment, and it assured me there is. However, as one would reasonably expect, its investment would be directed towards a specific business proposal. We are having discussions with BHP around two different consortia opportunities. One of those is in the AT&T arena and the other is in the education arena.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have also been advised that discussions are currently being held with two major companies with a view to investing in the MFP enterprise zone. Discussions are still progressing. However, if they were to progress to a successful conclusion, they would have the effect of almost doubling the employment levels of companies at Technology Park. The proposition is that the enterprise zone concept has been conducive to those discussions.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I refer the Premier back to his economic statement in April, in which he said:

The State Government will approach the Commonwealth with a view to providing a complementary package of assistance.

Has an approach been made to the Commonwealth Government to get this assistance package for MFP Australia and, if so, has a response been received from the Commonwealth with respect to tax incentives for the MFP and, if so, what specific offer has the Commonwealth made?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: At the special Premiers conference I raised the need for special incentive arrangements for particular types of investment in Australia, and particularly for certain locations that have the opportunity to catalyse further development. I have specifically identified, not just this year but previously when I was Minister of Industry, on a number of occasions with the Federal Government the MFP site as one such site where the State Government strongly supports these incentives. We have put our money where our mouth is, so to speak, by doing that with State taxation incentives. The matter has also been raised by officers at Federal level, and I know that the MFP board has itself met with Federal Ministers.

Mr Kennan: The discussions that we have held with Federal Ministers have not resulted in a specific arrangement, but they have focused on the very points that the Premier has addressed to try to get incentives in place that would support and enhance what the States are willing to do in order to encourage international investment into Australia. The investment that the Federal Ministers referred to initially is around Better Cities funding, and that usually comes up quite

quickly. In addition to that they are providing funds, as I think we have openly indicated, and it is there for people to follow around the overall support of the MFP Australia thrusts. That includes what we refer to as the MFP branch in Canberra, which is run under the Ditard ministry.

Mr HOLLOWAY: As the accounts of Science Park and Technology Park are now consolidated within the whole MFP, it is hard to get a picture of their individual budgets. Is it possible to give an indication of how spending on those two parks compares with previous years? How many clients are in Science Park at the moment? I am interested in this because it is in my electorate. In the budget that was handed out a few moments ago I note an item in respect of the sale of land at Science Park. Can I have some details on that matter?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Auditor-General's Report contains some information on this matter, but the information I now give does not completely answer the question. Upon examination of the *Hansard* we will supply further information, and this means in comparison with previous years, for example. This information relates only to this year. Technology Park Adelaide Innovation House is 46 per cent leased with 12 tenants; Innovation House West is 74 per cent leased with 11 tenants; Endeavour House is 83 per cent leased with 10 tenants; Endeavour House phase two is 100 per cent leased with four tenants; and SUPRI (Signal Processing Research Institute) is 80 per cent leased with three tenants. Science Park Adelaide as at 30 June this year had 13 tenants occupying space in the Mark Oliphant building, representing 26 per cent of lettable space. The only figure for last year that I have is in relation to science in the Mark Oliphant building where there were 9 tenants instead of 13 last year. We will supply a year by year comparison at a subsequent time.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The final part of that question was in relation to the sale of land.

Mr Keller: The land was sold to the Sizzler facility on the edge of the property.

Mr HOLLOWAY: This is the 1993-94 budget. I would have thought that that sale was proposed for this current year.

Mr Keller: I am sorry; I thought the honourable member was referring to previous sales of land. Unfortunately, the one in this year's budget was entered into in confidence.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I refer to the MFP Gillman site, and particularly the Penrice Australia salt fields. Along with other members of the House I visited those fields at the invitation of the Australian Chemical Industry Council earlier this year. What is the current thinking towards the future purchase of those fields, as they obviously have some importance with respect to the continuation of Penrice's Osborne operations? What is the current state of negotiations in relation to that matter?

Mr Keller: The Penrice salt fields have always been shown in stage 2, which is 10 or 12 years down the track, so obviously it is not an immediate concern to the MFP. However, it has always been a bit of a concern for Penrice because it takes quite some time to consolidate its fields or to establish new fields. We have been working very closely with Penrice because of these concerns. It has a by-product which at present is dumped at Pelican Point. That area is almost full, so it can no longer take that by-product. It also draws water from an aquifer that is under stress, I guess. There are some problems with its operations. We have been working with it generally to try to solve those problems and at the same time potentially free up some of the existing crystallisation ponds for future development. We are looking

at that as a total picture rather than pieces in isolation. We are jointly funding a consultancy at the moment to look at how Penrice can best re-arrange the operations of those salt pans.

One proposal is to move the crystallisation ponds up towards St Kilda, which is the lowest point, and take water from the power station. At the moment the discharge water going into the estuary has some effect on the estuarine environment and, because it is recirculating, it starts to have an effect on the efficiency of the power station. However, by taking that hot water, if you like, and moving it towards St Kilda you can potentially improve the efficiency of Penrice's operations quite significantly. That is one of many options we are working on with Penrice so that in time we can solve the problem of whether or not we should take over any of those salt pans. It is with the full cooperation of Penrice.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I have a question in relation to Commonwealth assistance. On page 210 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts there is an item under Commonwealth Specific Purpose Recurrent Grants amounting to \$1.65 million. We had some discussion earlier in the Committee about other Commonwealth capital assistance and Better Cities money. In relation to those specific purpose recurrent grants, what further commitments do we have from the Commonwealth and what conditions apply in relation to those grants?

Mr Kennan: I believe the honourable member is referring to the Better Cities money. We are having discussions with the appropriate Federal department. We are focusing our activities around the environmental remediation work in the northwest crescent, and that activity is in line with the strategy that it seeks to invest funds in. That is consistent with what I think we ought to be doing in terms of the activities of the overall MFP Australia thrust. I understand from my colleagues that nothing is shown in the estimates about this. I made the same challenge as the honourable member and asked 'Why not?' It is basically because the Federal Government asked some questions which had to be answered before it was willing to clarify its commitment.

Mr HOLLOWAY: On page 210 of the receipts there is no item under 'building better cities program' but there is an item of \$1.65 million under 'specific purpose recurrent grants'. I assume that was in a different category and it is just for funding the administrative operations of the MFP. Was that a separate grant and, if so, were there any conditions or different conditions relating to it?

Mr Kennan: My apologies to the honourable member: I misunderstood and went to the capital grants line because that was where my attention went when I first saw this document. There are no conditions attached to the \$1 650 000 in general terms. The sorts of dialogue we have with the Federal Government do relate, I think, as one would responsibly expect, to ensuring evidence of the correct planning and appropriate documentation that anyone would want to see in a proper business sense. I do not see anything special in that circumstance: it is a normal request.

Mr OLSEN: What was the result of last year's survey of 28 major European companies and their attitude to the MFP in Adelaide?

Mr Keller: I guess the basic summary of that survey was that not a lot of companies around Europe were really familiar with the project. When it was described to them, a significant majority said that they would probably be interested in hearing more and might be interested in investing in the project.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I refer to the real priority objective this year and that is to focus the investment attractiveness of the MFP. It is a point I have made time and again since becoming Premier: that there has to be the developing of these investment ideas. That is precisely what the board and the corporation are now running with. The kind of response that has come from those companies is not dissimilar to the response from many Japanese companies that have maintained their active interest in the MFP Corporation Association of Japan, a group that represents some 60 leading Japanese companies—that they are waiting for specific investment things in which they can invest. That is why investment attraction is such a key part of the work of the corporation.

Mr OLSEN: What results have been achieved in attracting investors as a result of that promotional campaign, other than expressions of interest?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: To save the time of the Committee, I refer the member for Kavel back to an earlier answer this afternoon when that matter was dealt with. I also refer the honourable member to the previous comments made on the need for the corporation to develop investment ideas to take to these companies. Mr Kennan also referred earlier on to expressions of interest by companies generally, regardless of source, in the MFP.

Mr OLSEN: What is the position in relation to plans for setting up a multi-bilingual film and video production facility under the media and entertainment section of the MFP?

Mr Kennan: The work we are doing in the media area right now, which is very much interrelated with the underlying software technology thrust that we are looking at through many of our activities, is heavily focused around a post-production capability. It would be in addition to the feature film production capabilities that exist in Australia. That is a particularly good example of where MFP Australia is coordinating functions across several States, in this particular case working in South Australia and Queensland. Our activities are seeking to identify specific business interests. We have a consultant working in that particular area with us (Cooper and Lybrand), the funding of which was supplied through Canberra. Right now they are in the prefeasibility study and are about 50 per cent complete. We will be getting another report from them in about two weeks time. We have been very focused on, once again, indicating to them that what we are seeking to do is extend the competency of Australia in a quickly growing industry and, indeed, to do that across Australia.

Mr OLSEN: As a point of clarification, have we gone past the project steering committee stage? Has the project now involved the Pacific Film and Television Corporation and the Commonwealth Department of Industry, Technology and Regional Development, or is the MFP still negotiating through the EDA with the original steering group that involved Southern Television Corporation, Austereo and Network Nomis? Have we gone past that group and are we now dealing with the group that you referred to? When you referred to Queensland, did you mean that it is now being taken over by the Pacific Film and Television Corporation plus the Commonwealth department?

Mr Kennan: On my understanding the activity has always had an MFP Australia involvement. Pacific Film and Television Corporation is a key member of the consortium activity, together with Ditard. In addition, and this is very important, we are working with the EDA here to identify the participation and involvement of the South Australian

industry in that arena of post-production. Beyond that we are also working with other States because it is broader than just Pacific Film and Television Corporation and Ditard: it is an Australia-wide consortium activity.

Mr OLSEN: MFP Australia has entered into an agreement with the project team, as I understand it, incorporating Pacific Film and Television Corporation, which is Queensland based, and the Commonwealth department. Is that consortium now progressing the media bilingual film and video production facility to the next stage—is that how I understand the position now?

Mr Kennan: It is that consortium, but not on a bilingual film. They are looking at post-production capability. One you left out specifically is South Australian EDA involvement, and in addition we are now talking to other companies about coming into that consortium. We are currently talking to people who are potential investors because they are in the video end of post-production. So, we are expanding the idea. I am trying to give you a current perspective of where we are, not where we were.

Mr OLSEN: What were the reasons for not proceeding through the EDA, Southern Television Corporation, Austereo, Network Nomis and a range of South Australian companies that were part of the original project team looking at putting this project together? Why was that project team rejected, and then the EDA, Pacific Film and Television Corporation and Ditard put in place?

Mr Kennan: I have no knowledge of anyone having been rejected, but I was not there at the beginning. There may be some confusion about objectives. The group to which the honourable member refers is doing other things with EDA. We have been actively working with EDA to ensure its participation in our media project. We could be confusing more than one activity. Over the past three to four months we have had dialogue with EDA to bring some of the companies mentioned by the honourable member into the activity that we have identified as our media project.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: If we can advise further on that matter we will obtain more information, but it may be appropriate that these questions be answered by the Minister of Business and Regional Development. I will let him know that this matter has arisen.

Mr OLSEN: What is the current status of the proposal to establish the National Environmental Protection Agency within the MFP as proposed in the draft EIS issued in February 1992?

Mr Kennan: We are working with both the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) and the Commonwealth Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA). I put them into the same category, but right now we are working with the Federal authorities towards their participation and involvement with the ultimate intention of establishing a centre of excellence around the north-west crescent environmental activity. To my knowledge, the NEPA activity has not, at this point, resulted in any specific commitment to locate here.

Mr Keller: I believe that the announcement to which the honourable member refers concerns CEPA, the Commonwealth Environmental Protection Agency. At that time, there was a commitment to locate any research and development activities of that agency at Gillman as part of the MFP. There will be no research and development activities in that area for a couple of years. In a visit to our offices, the Federal Minister reconfirmed that, as time progressed, as research and development activities became necessary as part of the

Commonwealth Environmental Protection Agency, they would be located at the MFP as part of our yet to be formed environmental management centre or centre of excellence in environmental management. NEPA, the National Environmental Protection Agency, is in the final stages of formation, and we have been advised at this stage that the secretariat of that agency will be sited in Adelaide.

Mr OLSEN: I seek further clarification. Mr Keller has advised that in the fullness of time it is intended to establish an agency here. It seems to me that we have a range of generalities but very few specifics or tangibles in terms of establishment, which we understood would be achieved through the multifunction polis.

Mr Keller: There are two different agencies. CEPA is concerned with policy setting, and there was a commitment by the Federal Government to place research and development activities as they developed at the MFP, and that commitment is still current. The projection is that moneys will be forthcoming from the Federal budget in a year from now. That is all we can say about that. Regarding NEPA, the true Federal agency that is compiled of all the States, it is my understanding that agreement has been reached basically and is in the final throes of being signed. Part of that deal is that the secretariat will be sited in Adelaide associated with our environmental protection authority, but it will employ a limited number of people—only three or four.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Has the Better Cities scheme been terminated and funding ceased? I am under the impression that it has; and, if so, with what has it been replaced?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Questions regarding Better Cities funding were answered before. I refer the honourable member to the record. I have not been advised that the program has ceased. It is an ongoing Federal Government project, and I will seek advice on that matter.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the housing that is to be constructed sooner or later at Osborne be situated on MFP land or on land outside the boundaries of the project?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This is a key point of the whole MFP Australia project. MFP Australia involves a series of activities. Before I became Premier I held the view, and I have certainly put this view forward a number of times since becoming Premier, that the Gillman site is not the only part of the MFP development. There are other aspects of the MFP, and we commonly refer to Technology Park and Science Park as part of the project. Indeed, they are part of the enterprise zone of the MFP. The MFP has stimulated activities that can take place in a number of areas. The site at Osborne is on South Australian Housing Trust land, but it is part of the MFP project. It is not part of Gillman, although it is not far away, but it is part of the MFP.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I find this a little eccentric, because we have an MFP Act that clearly defines the boundaries of the current MFP scheme. There is a difference between the MFP Osborne housing scheme, Technology Park, Flinders and other projects, because they are defined in the schedule to the MFP project as areas A, B, C and D. Since the Housing Trust funds 15 per cent, as we were told earlier, plus we assume the rest being committed by speculator builders, the Housing Trust project at Osborne could in all probability have taken place in any case.

I say that because South Australia is sitting on \$30 million worth of Better Cities funding. The Housing Trust is crying out desperately for funds to house tens of thousands of South Australians who are currently on the waiting list and, from memory, it is committed this year to building approximately

1 000 new homes but to selling just under 900 new homes with a net gain to the State of only 100 homes for rental or new housing accommodation. I sense that we are using the Osborne housing scheme with its 70 houses, which may be started at the end of this year, as one of the MFP's credits, yet it is something that is desperately needed by the State. That is a comment rather than a question. It seems to me that when the State needs housing and when we are sitting on \$30 million it is little short of criminal, particularly when the whole of the State could benefit from a better cities program as do interstate communities. South Australia seems to have a different concept.

Looking at last year's and this year's Estimates of Payments, I have some concerns about the information utility and the line 'Information Technology Central Management Fund—\$4.1 million' referred to on page 30. Last year the Premier during the Estimates Committees said that a vista of companies had come forward for the information utility involvement, and he mentioned NEC, NTTI, BHP and Deca. What is the relationship of those companies with our information utility, particularly since the Government appears to have downgraded that service to a Government data service now under the auspices of State Services? What is the relationship of those companies, which were part of a vista of companies last year, to the concept of having the information utility and world university integrated on the Gillman site?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The information utility can more fully be dealt with in connection with the Minister of Business and Regional Development. I will ask John Shepherd to make some further comments on this matter. Strategic alliance negotiations have been undertaken with seven potential alliance partners. Memoranda of understanding for strategic alliances have been signed with four organisations, and the foundation contracts are under way or are about to commence with all four. Memoranda of understanding of potential foundation contracts are under discussion with the other three. They include: Digital Corporation, a signed memorandum of understanding, and the foundation project is network management; Lane Telecommunications, a signed memorandum of understanding, which is a project managed, integrated network project; BHP IT, memorandum of understanding signed on consultancy services in evaluation and/or implementation of electronic data interchange; Telecom—we intend to sign the memorandum of understanding, and minor changes have been finalised to that (that is for basic carriage services and nexus marketing); and Anderson Consulting, concerning which it is intended to sign an MOU on changed management in relation to financial systems. Two other sets of strategic alliance negotiations have taken place with major corporations, and I will ask Mr Shepherd to comment on that.

Mr Shepherd: The Premier has described those three that have been signed with Digital, Lanes, and BHP IT. Two further negotiations are being undertaken, one with IBM Australia, which was an early participant in the information utility, and that has gained status as a result of a registration of interest on information processing that was called in September 1992. Negotiations are also proceeding with EDS Australia Pty Ltd, which gained status under the same registration of interest, and a memorandum of understanding has been signed with EDS Australia Pty Ltd. Negotiations are continuing with IBM. Therefore, four memoranda of understanding have been signed, and the role of State Systems as the body that is being corporatised to undertake

the activities of the information utility is to administer the relationship between the State Government and most of those organisations with which those memoranda of understanding have been signed.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I note that IBM's name was mentioned as having an expression of interest. I have watched IBM with considerable interest at a personal level because in France IBM was a key component of the Montpelier multifunction polis, yet shortly after I visited the MFP Montpelier, in 1991 I think it was, IBM announced massive standings down and world-wide IBM has gone into tens of thousands of retrenchments. How confident are we that IBM could still be a key player?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is certainly true that it has reduced its work force by an enormous number from a work force that is many times more enormous—I forget the exact size of its work force but it is of the order 250 000 internationally. The figure it has reduced is of the order of 400 000 to about 300 000, but it is still a very large company.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: About a 100 000 reduction world-wide over the past two years, including this year: I just felt a little ill at ease over that.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is a valid point.

Mr Kennan: We are having discussions with members of IBM Australia about getting involved in the consortium activity. We must clarify that people will not necessarily put 1 000 or more jobs in place immediately, given the current economic environment, but that does not stop us from working with them to identify ways in which we can bring five, 10, 15 or 20 jobs, each one of which is an important commitment. So, there is a dialogue on our side, but it is quite separate from information utility discussions; we are talking in the consortium area.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This financial year \$410 000 has been allocated for a capital works program at Science Park. Why is this money being spent when Science Park has an occupancy level of only about 27 per cent, which is a pretty low level? In the Auditor-General's Report it is stated that the value of Science Park has been downgraded from \$10 million, which it cost almost two years ago, to about \$3.1 million—by about \$7 million in a two year period—but we are about to spend \$410 000 when it is only a quarter full.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It has to be acknowledged that the take-up rate of the Mark Oliphant building at Science Park has been slower than would have been desired. It is slower than most of the multi-tenant buildings at Technology Park, although even some of those buildings had a slower rate of take-up than other buildings. Notwithstanding the slower take-up rate, we are confident that it has enormous potential, being located where it is in the southern area and also next door to Flinders University—and also, because of its collocation with Flinders University, being very close to the centre being developed by Flinders University and CSIRO on information technology, there are possibilities for increasing this kind of activity in that area. I will ask Mr Kennan to comment further.

Mr Kennan: The moneys in our budget for 1993-94 are really directed toward attracting more companies to come into that area. So, under those circumstances generally we have picked up on the past practice, which I think is a current market situation, of having fit-out moneys in our budget because that is the sort of encouragement that usually has to be provided in order to bring in tenants.

Those areas are covering some car park work that has to be done in addition to the actual office fit-out. I would add

that from the time we picked this up, 1 July (so it is not very long), we have had discussions with the Flinders University Vice-Chancellor and some of his management team to, as a team, really collectively go after increasing the occupancy in that facility. To me it is an asset that should be better utilised than it is today.

As far as the market value on the property is concerned, what you are referring to there is a matter of not really tenancy occupation but the reality of the market. That is a concern that we all have, that assets like that have fallen back in value. It is still very important in my mind that from our responsibility we are aggressively in pursuit of tenants, and I intend to do that, very tightly coupled to Flinders University, because they have a very big responsibility in this also.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In the draft EIS which was published only last year, so it is still fairly current, many statements are made about the MFP and the development that will take place at the Gillman site. I could go through and talk about some of those; I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee, but they certainly outlined a number of things that would be done. Are we now to accept the fact that that draft EIS is no longer a relevant document?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: As I understand it, it certainly is a relevant document. The State Government recognised it in November 1992; the Federal Government approved it in February 1993. The EIS set up an ongoing evaluation process requiring environmental management plans to be prepared and works undertaken and reviewed. The first environmental management plan was approved in 1992. Work undertaken is being reviewed and in accordance with the EIS results, together with the next environmental management plan, will be received by the Government in November.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: From that draft EIS, we see that the Government is about to establish an MFP academy, and in that academy there will be an education service, an international management centre, a centre for research into urban environmental management, and an information and technology communications training centre. This is all at Gillman, because the EIS was all over Gillman, not somewhere else. It will also include the Asian Institute of Language and Culture. I draw attention to the fact that here are very specific proposals in that EIS and the Premier says it is now still a very relevant document, approved this year by the Cabinet. I see no proposals whatsoever for the establishment of those things within an academy down at Gillman. I also refer to the May 1991 management report on the feasibility of the MFP. Is that a relevant document?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First of all the EIS refers to the environmental impact of activities proposed under the MFP over the life of the MFP. It is not anticipated that all these things would happen in the first year. It was always going to be a 20 to 30 year project. Some of the aspects will happen in the later stages, some will happen in the middle stages and some will happen in the earlier stages. You do not design an EIS that is just current for the present period of the project. You look forward to how that area that is under the scope of the EIS will cope with development upon its environment for more than just a few years. You are looking at the long-term situation. That is the whole purpose of the EIS, to see whether or not the activities are sustainable. It is a current document that will have relevance for the development life of this project, a development life that will last a generation. On the matter of the next feasibility study—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The 1991 management report on the feasibility of the MFP?

Mr Keller: That report is still current. Obviously many of the projects examined in that document have been updated or replaced by other projects as you go on, but the majority of the information in there is still relevant.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The draft EIS has some very specific commitments about time. I know it is over the life of the project but, for instance, it refers to site clean-up and greening projects in the second half of 1992. They have not occurred. The principal site works, stage 1, 1993-94 were there and not occurring. The commencement of the first village, 1994-95, has not taken place. I refer under that management report, produced just on 12 months ago, to the setting up of a centre for aquatic toxicology. Discussions have been held with an investor. How is that going?

There was a proposal to set up a centre for environmental law. Several major law companies have expressed an interest in funding such a centre. Have those companies now committed in the past year to that centre? There was to be a centre for research into urban environmental management. A feasibility study was required. Has that feasibility study been undertaken? There was a proposal for an international management centre; a feasibility study had to be completed and a business plan was required urgently. Has that been done? These are commitments made 12 to 15 months ago and we need to know what sort of progress has been made on this. We are literally pouring the money in and we wish to see what is coming out.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Leader is under some misapprehension as to what an EIS is about. The EIS refers to the development proposals that will take place in an area and examines whether or not those proposals are consistent with maintaining or enhancing the environment of that area. It is an impact statement, in other words, upon the environment, of development proposals. The actual uptake of those development proposals is for the board and corporation to do as they plan best, but the question that comes from the EIS is whether or not special environmental work needs to be done. As the tables that I have circulated already to the Leader and other members of this Committee show, work is being done this year on that matter of the environmental management of that area. I can mention just the wetlands for a start, but also the environmental social design and planning overheads of the project are being funded in this financial year.

The aspects of the cleanup costs for Gillman and the current total of environmental works needed there all come from, in the first instance, the environmental impact statement and, in the latter instance, the environmental management plan. We will be in a stronger position this year when the second environmental management plan comes out to tell us more about the staging of those works, but the first part of those works is programmed in this financial year.

Mr Kennan: Let me indicate as I did earlier that the major components of our budget for 1993-94 are economic development and environmental management activity. Even the works that we are doing in terms of the geophysical testing relate to environmental remediation activities, so there is a very definite project activity under way now that is in accordance with the environmental impact statement. As we indicated earlier, the authorisation of the environmental impact statement was not forthcoming from the Federal Government until February 1993, so clearly some of the dates that you have indicated had a slippage at that point.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to move the following motion:

That the Committee expresses its lack of confidence in the Premier over the planning of the MFP and in particular draws attention to:

1. The continuing concentration on urban development at the Gillman site;
2. The lack of commitment by commercial interests to that site;
3. The long lead time to 1996-97 before any commercial land will be available for sale; and
4. The expenditure of \$16.7 million to June 1993 on the MFP with no tangible benefits available.

As a consequence, this Committee calls on the Government to stop further development of the Gillman site and to refocus its efforts to the development of high technology industries which will guarantee jobs and investment in the immediate future.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is in order in the sense that it can be debated. I call on the Leader to speak to his motion.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move this expression of a lack of confidence in the whole of the planning of the MFP as a result of the answers that have been given this afternoon. Of course, it is not a new issue. The Economic and Finance Committee had a hearing on this issue several weeks ago, and I understand that the answers given to that committee were less than precise. I have been particularly concerned about the lack of detail given this afternoon by the Premier and his advisers. However, in particular I focus the attention on the Premier, because the Premier is the Minister responsible and must carry the ultimate responsibility for this.

I would like to raise several matters at this point, Mr Chairman. First, it was the Premier himself who earlier this year said that 1993 was the year of the MFP. We are now well into 1993, yet we have not been given specific details this afternoon as to what else will be completed for the MFP in 1993. One could argue, quite rightly I would think, that it will be very little. I refer to the promised 70 houses on the Osborne site. This has been promoted as the first major development of the MFP. We find, first, that the houses will not be constructed by the end of this year, as stated by the Premier in his Economic Statement in April this year.

Secondly, as my colleague the member for Mount Gambier quite rightly pointed out, the Osborne site is no more than a Housing Trust site. Of the 70 houses to be built there, about 15 per cent will be paid for by the Housing Trust. Sure, it won a design award, but we could have had the design award with respect to the Osborne site and the construction of the 70 houses without the MFP. It has nothing to do with where we are seeing the funds being spent in terms of the MFP this year and into the immediate future.

Thirdly, I was disturbed to find that Mr Button, a former Federal Minister who was involved in the establishment of the MFP over a number of years, is now out selling the commercial contacts he apparently developed in his position as Minister. I am particularly disturbed to find that we as taxpayers are putting \$10 000 of our money into paying for Mr Button, a former Senator, to spend three weeks introducing the MFP's Chief Executive Officer to companies that Mr Button obviously knew when he was a Federal Minister. We are paying him \$10 000 plus the on-costs for accommodation and travel. I find it unacceptable that a former Federal Minister is using the contacts he established as a Federal Minister and is now charging the South Australian taxpayers \$10 000 for those introductions over a three-week period.

However, I became really concerned when, immediately prior to afternoon tea today, I asked some specific questions about the expenditure for stage 1. After some delay I was told

that \$1.56 million would be spent this financial year—1993-94—on soil tests for the Gillman site, and that was the only allocation in terms of stage 1. After a 20-minute tea break we were given figures which threw a little more light on this. I have no doubt that there was a lot of soul searching during the tea break to find what other moneys might be spent. We found that the \$1.56 million suddenly increased to \$1.7 million over the tea break. We found that \$9 million was to be spent on land acquisition, which was not mentioned earlier, and \$6 million on environmental rehabilitation. I suspect that most of that is coming from the Better Cities money, although that has not been specifically earmarked this afternoon.

I was then concerned to find that no Better Cities money was spent on the MFP in 1992-93 whatsoever, despite an announcement and a commitment by the Federal Government that South Australia had \$40 million to spend. I am not trying to suggest that that money has been lost, but we find that that \$40 million, which has been talked about time after time as bringing immediate benefits to South Australia, will not now be spent until the end of June 1996. Again, I find that unsatisfactory.

We also found that stage 1A, stage 1B and stage 2 of the MFP project at Gillman will cost taxpayers \$354 million between now and the year 2005, with a very small part of that being spent this year, \$167 million of it being spent by June 1998, a further \$70 million being spent in stage 1B by the year 2002 and a further \$114 million being spent by the year 2005.

We found that the return from the sale of that land is projected to be only \$222 million, leaving an overall net deficit of \$132 million to the taxpayers of South Australia. We found that apparently very little of the Commonwealth's Better Cities money is likely to be spent on that project, because most of the \$40 million is to be earmarked for environmental projects yet to be negotiated with the Federal Minister. We are in a very grey zone, to say the least, in relation to that aspect.

We found that almost the entire concentration of the MFP is still locked into the Gillman site—\$354 million of South Australian taxpayers' money is to be allocated to that Gillman site. We also found that no company has made a commercial commitment to the Gillman site. I find it unsatisfactory that we are committing \$354 million to that site without one single commercial commitment.

We heard earlier about BHP, but we all know that the BHP commitment is no more than a statement of intent or goodwill: there are no dollars attached and no project is involved. We heard that there was some interest in other areas: in fact, 25 companies have expressed some interest in commercial developments outside of the Gillman site. That is the very point I have been arguing for months—there is a far greater attraction to commercial interests outside of the Gillman site than in the Gillman site, so why plough \$350 million into that site?

I am particularly concerned to find that total expenditure to the end of June 1993 on the MFP project in South Australia is now \$16.7 million. I would have to argue that there are no tangible benefits to the residents of South Australia from the spending of that \$16.7 million—none whatsoever. I find that unsatisfactory. We could have attracted quite a number of significant commercial interests, and we could have established a large number of commercial jobs if we had gone out to companies and said, 'Here is \$17 million: come and invest in South Australia but outside

of the Gillman site.' No; the State Labor Government has locked us into the Gillman site. We are locked into a very difficult site.

A draft EIS was handed down last year, and the final EIS was approved by Cabinet earlier this year. The Premier says that it is still a valid document but, when we look at the promises made in that environmental impact statement, we find that they have not been adhered to and are nowhere near being adhered to.

I highlight again that the EIS states that the site clean-up and greening projects would be finished in the second half of 1992 and that the principal site works would be carried out in 1993-94. However, we find from statements made this afternoon that that is not the intention at all. We believed that the first village would begin in 1994-95, but this afternoon we found that is not the case. We found that the first commercial land will not even be sold until 1996-97, I understand. So the proposal in the EIS has slipped by at least another two years, compared to the statement made in the EIS only a few months ago.

I refer to the management report that was produced on the MFP in May 1991. A feasibility study into the MFP set out a whole series of very promising statements about what could be achieved.

It mentioned a centre for aquatic toxicology, a centre for environmental law, and a centre for research into urban and environmental management. There was also a proposal for an international management centre. These statements were put out to whet appetites and give the impression that companies were out there ready to sign on the dotted line—companies that were holding firm discussions with the Government with a view to investment.

However, we find that we are years and years away from any such commitment from those companies. In fact, I would guess that any interest has dissipated. Having been in the commercial world, I know that, if something drifts by year after year the way the MFP has, commercial interest evaporates pretty quickly and they go elsewhere. They would go on to something with a time frame much shorter than that of the MFP.

I am not against the MFP; in fact, I have been the strongest advocate in South Australia for the establishment of high technology industry. After all, I was the one who put up the whole proposal for Technology Park Adelaide. I put the commitment behind it, through the former Liberal Government, to invest \$7 million. Suitable sites are already available where we can establish high technology industries. We have the nucleus in Science Park and Technology Park and in our universities and other centres around Adelaide.

Why waste \$354 million on the Gillman site—a very difficult site and one that has attracted no commercial interest whatsoever—when we could spend much less than that and achieve far greater tangible benefits? We are after high technology industries that will guarantee jobs and investment here in the immediate future. We are not able to wait until 1996-97 before seeing the first commercial sale of land with, of course, any commercial job years after that. We all know that once you have sold the land you have still have to put up the facility and establish the company and commercial opportunities.

I guarantee that there will be no commercial jobs at the Gillman site this side of the year 2000, and South Australia cannot wait that long. Therefore, I move this motion condemning the Premier over the fact that the MFP project is still focused on Gillman and the commitment for funds is still

being made to Gillman—that is where the money is being spent—when, instead, the money should be focussed away from the Gillman site towards attracting high technology industry elsewhere.

Mr QUIRKE: I must congratulate the Leader on one thing: at least this year's stunt is typed. When he pulled this caper last year it was handwritten, it was in bad English and no-one could understand it, including his own troops. At least this year it is properly typed so that we can address all the issues he raises. It comes as no surprise to me or to anyone else around here that the Leader has made these statements about the Gillman site—no surprise at all. When he was elected Leader of that crowd opposite, one of the first things he said was that he believed in the MFP but that he did not think too much of the Gillman site. It comes as no surprise to me that after 18 months or so—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: —we are still getting the same cracked record. However, this afternoon it is being dressed up with a few more fancy clothes. We have had a series of very boring, less than penetrating questions from those opposite and, in fact, where—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: —this is concerned it was typed up some time ago ready for this stunt. It was going—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind members that the normal Standing Orders of the House apply in Committee.

Mr QUIRKE: I think it is a great pity that members opposite are not prepared to extend the same courtesies that we extended to them when we listened to the Leader's speech. In fact, we have done it twice, because we did it last year in relation to the SAFA motion—same time, same channel, same arguments. The only thing that is different is that last year it was SAFA and this year it is the MFP. It was the same way of addressing the issue—the lead-up time, the whole bit. In my view there is no sincerity in this stuff at all, but there is a lot of contradiction. On the one hand we are told that there is too much concentration on Gillman and then, on the other hand, we are told that nothing is happening there.

I will deal with each of the four items in turn. The Opposition is pulling a stunt to try to undermine one of the few projects nationally that can bring some benefit to this country in the next decade. I think it is very sad that it is not receiving bipartisan support but is getting the same treatment that was displayed during the early days of the submarine project. I think it is a real shame. I will say this: if the land is sold in 1996 or 1997, or whenever there is anything down there to be opened, these same people in the Opposition will be in the front row, all ready for the big opening and all the rest of it.

The motion refers, first, to the continuing concentration on urban development at the Gillman site. If one looks very closely at the Gillman site and then a short distance away at the very successful West Lakes project, one can see that some things can be learnt.

I think even the Opposition could handle a trip down there to have a look at it. The reality is that the Gillman site right now is not the prettiest land in Adelaide; but it is a magnificent development site under conditions there which the MFP people have been carefully putting in place. In particular, we know the degradation of land down there and the dumping of materials on that site, some of which was the subject of

questions on this side of the House here this afternoon, needs to be addressed. But at the end of the day the MFP needs a place, it needs a spot, on which to concentrate the effort, and Gillman represents that spot. We should remember that, during the argument on whether it was going to be in Queensland or in South Australia, at the end of the day the question came down to the provision of an adequate amount of land that could be usefully developed in the future, land close to the centre of the city, near an international airport and near Technology Park, and a range of other factories. As far as this argument is concerned, the MFP people have made in public evidence before the Economics and Finance Committee a commitment where that was concerned that they are not just concentrating on the Gillman site, that they are looking at the broader investment questions and at the wider involvement of a whole range of other parts of South Australia in this project.

Secondly, in relation to the lack of commitment by commercial interests to that site, I think the one concession that I will make where this is concerned, and I have made it in a number of other places, is that the MFP is very slowly coming together. I think there was no doubt from the public hearing of the Economic and Finance Committee that much opportunity has not been seized in the way that it should have been. I think that point has been conceded by the MFP people and by the Premier himself. The project is behind schedule at this point but to suggest that commercial interests are not queuing up at this point is indeed to misunderstand the development of a project that is going to take many years to come together and is typical of the attitude of the Opposition where this is concerned. We had this same argument over the submarine.

In relation to the long lead time to 1996-97 before any commercial land will be available for sale, there are a number of environmental problems down there. The argument in this House a couple of years ago was that it would take longer than that to clear up some of the land down there so that significant parcels of land could be made available. The expenditure of \$16 million to June 1993 on the MFP with no tangible benefits at all is a small investment. I would have thought that for the purpose of properly putting together the building blocks for a project of this scale—and we are talking about the project of hundreds of millions of dollars, potentially billions of dollars, over the next two or three decades—it is a small investment. I would also have thought that the issues that the Opposition is talking about, and in particular why the Leader does not like the Gillman site, need to be addressed and it takes resources to do it.

As to the Button question, I do not want to spend a lot of time on that. I do not have to carry a torch for ex-Senator Button but I will say this: it is the same old story. When it is one of ours that is going around as a consultant after he has finished a time in Parliament, or wherever it is, then what we get from the Opposition is that the bloke is not worth it, should not be using his contacts and should not be using all those things that he is supposed to have picked up in Federal Parliament, that he should not be using those sorts of contacts and that there is something improper in the whole thing. We could give you lists of some of your blokes and quite a few of them have lost—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member remember to direct his remarks through the chair.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Chairman, quite a number of them have lost their seats over the years and have then gone around

and hawked themselves as consultants. There are one or two of them in here right now.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Well, if the member for Mount Gambier wants to I will—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: —go into the gutter; we can do that. If you want to do that we can go into the gutter, but do not hawk yourself around here as Mr Clean, if you want to start making interjections like that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must not use the word 'you'.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: We are dealing with the substantive motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask honourable members not to interject and I ask the honourable member not to respond to interjections.

Mr QUIRKE: This is the same old story—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When I am giving directions to the Committee I do not expect anybody to speak. I ask honourable members not to interject and I ask the honourable member not to respond to interjections.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Are electronic devices permitted in the chamber?

The CHAIRMAN: No, they are not. I do not know to what the honourable member is referring.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member's telephone has been ringing.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Chairman, it has been turned off. However, I might say that I have seen the Leader with one of those devices in here, too.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No you have not.

Mr QUIRKE: Yes, I did. I saw you walk out of here the other day with one.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: The argument that comes up here about a \$354 million commitment down there at Gillman and that nothing has happened where this is concerned is simply a stunt by the Opposition to undermine one of the few projects that we as a State have that will provide a chance to generate employment over the next ten years. Unfortunately they have not learnt anything from the submarine project. What they have learnt since last year is how to spell, how to put sentences together and how to get it typed up in plenty of time to pull on the usual 5.30 stunt on a Tuesday afternoon.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are examining the proposed payments 'Premier and Minister of Economic Development—Other Payments', and as part of that process the Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion which honourable members have before them. I should explain the procedure. It is necessary to distinguish between the people who are sitting on my left and on my right who with me are members of this committee and the Premier, who is here under Standing Orders to answer the questions of the Committee. Because of that slight distinction, the normal procedure in a debate like this is that members of the Committee are given an opportunity to speak in debate and, once that has been exhausted, save for the summary that is accorded to the mover of the motion, the Premier is invited to speak if he wishes to do so. Then the mover has the right

of reply and the vote is put. My recollection is that the member for Playford was speaking.

Mr QUIRKE: At issue here is a very important project for South Australia. I think the concession needs to be made that it is a project that has more slowly unfolded than a number of members would like to have seen. There is no doubt that putting the board in place, employing the Chief Executive Officer and doing a number of other things have led to delays which in many respects underline the fact that in the next 12 months, as the Premier has made clear on many occasions, we will not only have to see things on the ground down at Gillman but we will also have to see some other concrete developments in the MFP which warrant the support that the House has given to the MFP Australia project. I think it is very important for South Australia that we do not muff this and that we do not make cheap political points and jump in on a project such as this and kill it off.

At the end of the day, with Federal outlays running at the tune that they currently are, the problem we will have in South Australia is that the amount of resources that will be necessary for this project will have to be hard fought for, and they will not all come from South Australia. Indeed, there will have to be a large Federal component in this project. I suspect that if this motion is carried tonight, it will put the nails not only in the Gillman coffin but also in the MFP Australia project. It is my view that if this statement we are debating here tonight is not passed, it will cause irrevocable damage to this particular project. If this motion is not passed it will provide people, particularly in Canberra who are very dismissive of this project and who at the end of the day do not have the vision to see this project come into existence in South Australia, with ammunition to bushwhack this project and cut its throat.

At the end of the day we know what the Leader of the Opposition thinks because he has been consistent throughout the past 18 months, making it clear that he believes the concentration on the Gillman site is not what MFP Australia should be on about. I suggest to him that, if we move away from the Gillman site in that fashion, we will not only kill that project but also ensure that any new investment which we can snare as part of that MFP project will die and certainly not provide jobs in South Australia.

I suggest that in this respect the Leader has made quite clear that this is his position and that, as I understand it, when the election takes place within the next two to six months, or whenever that will be, this will be one of two issues. He has made it clear that is his view on the whole matter. I suggest that that needs to be put to the people of South Australia. My fervent hope is that the people of South Australia will see the importance of doing something about the land degradation down there at Gillman; that they will see through this project; that in fact we can bring about those environmental clean-ups that we believe are necessary; and, more importantly, that we will be able to get not only private sector involvement but also involvement from Canberra in very substantive ways so that we can see the development of our State which I think over the next 10 years will be absolutely crucial to the future employment chances of the kids in S.A.

I have always said in the House that one of the great dangers facing South Australia if we do not have projects like this, the submarine project and a number of other projects which in many respects emanate from the Federal level, we will run the risk of running down our manufacturing base and a number of other things as well as a brain drain in South Australia—a flight of expertise to other States, particularly

to Queensland and even overseas, to such a point that it will take us two or three decades to reverse that process. I therefore say that this motion is nothing more than a stunt, and that this Committee needs to reject it in its entirety.

Mr OLSEN: I support the motion moved by the Leader. It is usually the responsibility of the second speaker to rebut those matters that have been put forward by the first speaker on the opposite side. In this instance, all we have had from the honourable member is platitude, rhetoric and irrelevant comment. He has not tackled the core issue. It was not the Liberal Party which profiled this project; it was the Labor Party. It was not the Liberal Party which set the benchmarks for achievement and for recording progress on this project; it was the Labor Party, the Government.

Since 1988, some five years ago, when this project was first put on the agenda for South Australia, we have seen Labor Governments set benchmarks for achievement for the multifunction polis. Time and again those benchmarks, set by the Labor Party, the Government, have come and gone. In other words, the Government has not met its own criteria as it has put them down.

The role of any Opposition is to ensure that there is questioning, probing, and prodding of the Government into action where there is inaction. The only comment of concern by the honourable member that I picked up during the course of his remarks was the fact that the Federal Government was getting cold feet and having second thoughts about this project. If that is the case, I think the Premier ought to indicate that to the Committee, either to confirm the member's view or to rebut the member's view as he has put it before the Committee.

The last Liberal Government got Roxby Downs and Olympic Dam up and running within three years. It had to negotiate with international consortia to have that project established in South Australia and it did it within three years. Here we are five years down the track (in this past 12 months ended 30 June 1993 some \$16.7 million has been spent), and what are the tangible results that the Government put forward to this Committee, to this Parliament and to the people of South Australia as visible achievements?

As the questioning has highlighted, those visible achievements, those tangible benefits, cannot be quantified before the Committee, the Parliament or the public of South Australia. That is why this motion has been moved by the Leader: to draw this to the attention of the public and the Parliament, but more importantly to try to prompt the Government into some sort of action in relation to the multifunction polis.

Members will note that the motion is in two parts, highlighting the difficulties and the lack of achievement by the Government, but also in a positive sense putting down the redirection the Government ought to take in terms of putting the multifunction polis back on track.

The honourable member referred to the needs of South Australians. I will tell you what the needs of South Australians are: they are to get South Australia up off its economic knees. You do not get South Australia up off its economic knees by talking about projects without achieving on projects. That is what we have with the MFP. What South Australians want is job security, job protection and job prospects. Tens of millions of dollars have been spent on this project with some \$40 million budgeted to be spent by 30 June 1996, but where are the job prospects and the job security for which South Australians are looking?

That is what they are looking for and what they require now. The South Australian economy needs to be picked up

off its knees. The people are sick of promises, false hopes and rhetoric provided by the political process. It is no wonder that politicians are held in such low esteem by the general community, given the promises that have been made year after year, highlighted I might add by the last Federal election campaign and the promises of Prime Minister Keating and what has been delivered in the budget. It is no wonder that the voting public have such a disregard for politicians when there is such blatant abuse of and disregard for the political process, for putting down benchmarks and not achieving them. That is what we have seen with the multifunction polis.

I referred during my questioning to a number of areas, one of which involved the survey of those 28 international companies. What we have seen from that is interest but nothing tangible put on the deck. It has been drawn to the Committee's attention that the National Environmental Protection Agency and the Commonwealth Environmental Protection Agency are two different bodies with two different functions. A Federal Minister has verbally announced that it is the intention to establish a facility in South Australia. Given the track record of Federal Ministers in the current Labor Government and their commitment to the people, I would not take any verbal assurance at this stage, I would want it in writing and I would certainly want it countersigned before I took any regard of any commitment from the Federal arena.

I am sure that the Premier would acknowledge that at least, given what the Government has done to our wine industry when it has gone back on three and four month-old commitments in relation to that industry. There is no real or tangible commitment for the establishment of those facilities in South Australia. Once again, that reinforces the point. We have had rhetoric and promises for some time. The direction of the multifunction polis stalled for two years because of the total inaction of the Cabinet and the then Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, the current Premier. The current Premier set the benchmark. He said that he would refocus the multifunction polis. Where is that refocus? What is happening with it? The current Premier said that 1993 would be the year of the multifunction polis. If this is the year of the multifunction polis, the year when we are going to make great strides forward after five years of its being on the agenda, I would hate to think what the Premier would achieve over the course of the next 10 years if he were given the opportunity to do so, which I am sure to his relief he will not.

The MFP clearly needs a refocus, one that is achievable and realistic. That is what this motion seeks to achieve. It seeks to highlight the inadequacies and problems of the past and the lack of decision-making of the Cabinet and the Ministers that has left officers of the multifunction polis, well meaning public servants who want to achieve, with a vacuum, because Ministers and the Government would not make the decisions to enable them to get on with the job and to achieve. Now, some five years after the MFP was put onto the track, we are at this Estimates Committee with no real tangible ticks to put against the benchmarks set by this Administration and by no-one else. The Government set the benchmarks, what it intended to achieve, and it has not.

Let me refer briefly to this media project. I think it demonstrates some confused priorities when we have plans to support a high-tech film and television media facility in Queensland rather than going ahead with the South Australian project despite the involvement of South Australian companies in its development. Two years ago, the Economic Development Authority, with the support of the MFP,

appointed a project steering committee to examine the feasibility of a similar joint public/private sector project, which was to be based in Adelaide. Since then, an enormous amount of time and energy has been put in by the members of that committee to make South Australia an international centre for media production and broadcasting, to meet entertainment education and training needs and to look at the Asia-Pacific region: a commendable objective that we would all want to support wholeheartedly, but I understand that the participants believe that that project has now moved away. It is not to be a joint public/private project. It now involves the Pacific Film and Television Commission of Queensland and the Commonwealth Department of Industry, Technology and Regional Development.

What has happened to the South Australian companies? Where have they been left in relation to this project? I note the reference to the committee that an attempt would be made for them to be accommodated and incorporated in some way in the project in the future. My argument is why were they not? I do not think the committee was given substantive arguments as to why those companies were bypassed in this instance to allow the establishment of the project with the Queensland based commission and the Commonwealth department, a fully public entity; not a joint public/private consortium but a fully public entity.

If that is the way in which South Australia is supposed to win out of MFP Australia, it reinforces the old adage that when the Labor Government of South Australia fights for South Australia we lose. There are numerous examples of that. With a project such as this one could say that it is important in the long term for South Australia. We do not deny that. The motion demonstrates that we want a project of this nature to be established in South Australia, but let us tackle it realistically, let us not create false hopes and let us get on with the job so that we can use the resources that are available now in South Australia to build on. When the Leader announced last year the refocussing of our policy direction in relation to the multifunction polis, it was not intended to dismiss it. It said, 'Let's use the resources that we have in place at the moment on which we can build and sell. We will build on those resources and get tangible results and benefits from them now, and in the longer term we will develop this project so that it achieves for South Australia those goals and objectives that the people have set down for it.'

That is what the Leader and the Liberal Party have put down as the policy thrust that we ought to have. It does not create false hopes, perceptions and dreams which this Government has attempted to do in the wake of election campaigns pending. We have been long enough without action, without decisions of Government, and not only on this project and this issue. This Government, its ministry and its Cabinet have been in a vacuum since the State Bank bail-out was announced. It is as though they have lost their focus and their policy direction altogether. The problem with that is that South Australia is losing while that focus and policy direction have not been put back on track.

With the establishment of these seven super ministries, rather than departments focusing and getting on with the job, we have seen the public servants within those super ministries trying to shake out their position in the structure rather than getting on with the job of policy direction for the future. That is all of the making of the Premier and Minister and the changes that he put in place, the changes that strangled the direction of South Australia and put it on hold, put it on stall,

further to the vacuum that was created by the State Bank bail-out in February 1991.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr OLSEN: You see, Premier, I get confused—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: The fact is that since February 1991 we have had no real focus or direction by Government. That has created frustration and annoyance for those public servants who want to achieve for South Australia. They cannot achieve because the Government, the Cabinet and the Ministers are not giving direction. We have seen that exemplified by this project, the subject of this motion. Unfortunately, South Australians are losing, and that is why the motion couched by the Leader highlights the criticisms and lack of action but also puts the positive, the focus of where we ought to be going and what we ought to be doing to get back on track.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I would like to deal first with some factual matters which seem to have alluded members opposite. One of the key reasons why South Australia was awarded the multifunction polis was the fact that, as part of that multifunction polis project, the Gillman site was offered as a degraded site. It was offered deliberately in terms of the fact that the technology could be sold at the end of the exercise to make that degraded site into something that could be used. In most countries in the world the development is on the sea front. This is a very important aspect and one of the reasons why the Gillman site was selected. Developing that site to the point where it can be used for urban development and to the point where it can be used to look at the environmental requirements for the fisheries and the mangroves is important, because in every country in the world that technology would be a saleable commodity. It is something that is a long-term project. I think that the Leader of the Opposition and the other speaker have not looked at that.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: I suggest that the Leader extend the same courtesy to me as was extended to him. The multifunction polis was specifically premised on the fact that that would be a major part of it, but it is not the main part of it, and that is what members opposite are losing sight of. The other part of it also involved the development of technology within the State and the development of the education services within it. Already there have been some sales of the education technology we have in South Australia. The very negative attitude we are hearing from members opposite certainly will not promote the interests of South Australia in a project such as this.

This is a joint Commonwealth/State project, and I would have to agree that there has been a very slow start to the project, and that was mainly because in the intervening period there was a Federal election plus the fact that the appointments to the board and of the CEO had to be made jointly, so a delay was involved in that. Now that all that has occurred, members will probably see that there will be some advancements in the whole area. But that is not to say that there has not been some work on the site: there has been. I think members opposite did not even consider that. The member for Kavel, for example, tried to compare the Roxby Downs project with this project. There is a saying that you should compare apples with apples. That is not comparing apples with apples, because that was a single individual project. The

multifunction polis encompasses a whole range of projects, and it extends across the whole area of the operation of the State. So, it is a very short-term view that the member for Kavel and also the Leader of the Opposition have.

One of the other comments made by the member for Kavel was the fact that the Leader had said we should be using the resources that we have within the State. That is one of the things that is actually happening: we are using the resources of the State at Technology and Science Parks. There have been some major achievements in the area of technology advancement, which can be a saleable commodity in the open market. So, it is a long-term project and one which should be viewed in that way.

Members opposite have to recognise that a key part of that was the Gillman site, and we cannot throw the baby out with the bath water, which is basically what members opposite are saying we should be doing. One of the problems we have consistently with members of the Opposition is their very negative attitude to any project that does not or has not emanated from them. If they get behind the project and have a bipartisan viewpoint about it, the project can and will succeed. In any project a multiplicity of functions should be carried out before we can actually see the bricks and mortar on the site, and nobody could be more aware of that than I, and I am anxiously looking for some of those bricks and mortar.

As was pointed out earlier in questioning, when it was said there should be some buildings on that site in terms of the housing development, it seemed to be very difficult to get across to members opposite that a competition was in train to try to get the best possible designs for that and that you cannot, immediately after the designs are selected, have something built there: you must have some lead time in that regard. That is one of the things that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in his motion, that is, the lead time that has occurred before there is something actually on the site. He is being very naive if he thinks that we can build something immediately after the competition closes. I would be very suspicious of his way of leadership if that is the way he thinks. I am speaking very solidly against the motion, and I point out to members opposite that, if they want the State to go ahead, they must show a bit of innovation and initiative and support a project such this, because if they do not, they are going to downgrade—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member has interjected more than enough.

Mrs HUTCHISON: —the State of South Australia as they have been doing consistently.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My remarks on the topic of the MFP have been pretty consistent ever since the concept was announced—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I know I should not respond to interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! They are out of order and they should be ignored.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My next remark was that, whilst I have been pretty ambivalent with regard to the Gillman site, mainly on advice given by Flinders University scholars, Health Commission reports by a number of submissions put to members on this side of the House and from a fairly extensive perusal of the MFP document itself—a document which I have been pleased to quote in debate during consider-

ation of the MFP legislation which came before the House—I am supportive of the concept. The Premier and Mr Kennan have very recently announced some redirection, and more of that shortly. In spite of that announcement, I find on the perhaps slightly premature release by the Premier today of the MFP reports to the Economic and Finance Committee that we can say from that report that even now, with a claimed redirection, the direction is still firmly towards Gillman, with some 45 per cent of the finances for this year (however much may be spent, the allocation is no evidence of the money being spent at the end of the year, let us face it, because last year we were \$30 million under spent) being spent in other directions and 55 per cent being firmly committed towards the Gillman development. I try to look at it from a less than parochial point of view. I am, after all, a rural representative, and I am firmly committed to my electorate in the South-East, Mount Gambier, which is, in its own right, a site suitable for MFP development.

I try to be pragmatic and to consider the lot of Adelaide residents. I cannot help but think, time after time as I drive from north to south of the city with some difficulty, that the vast conurbations to the north and south of Adelaide, where we have concentrations of Housing Trust development and minimal amounts of work provided, do militate against a happy lifestyle for those people. The end result is that the Government and the people of Adelaide have a problem. We have the north-south corridors, land for the extension of which was provided some years ago, but land which has subsequently been sold off for somewhat ephemeral profit. It has been spent: it has just gone down the tube. The problem with Adelaide dwellers is that they have to move from north to south across the city in search of work. The work is not where they would like it to be.

All States in Australia benefit from the better cities funds. As I said, the 1992-93 funds for South Australia were under spent by \$30 million when other States were only too happy to get their hands on their allocations and commit them to the good of the people. We must have at least 50 000 South Australians on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list—in the city, great concentrations and certainly in the country to a lesser degree. In addition to those South Australians waiting for homes, we have the homeless youth problem in South Australia which is—as it is anywhere in Australia—a major problem. Surely, the \$30 million could have gone towards mitigating the housing problems confronting South Australians. The South Australian Housing Trust would certainly have liked to get its hands on some of it. I maintain that the Better Cities program should benefit all South Australians, because surely in the long run, in one way or another, they will subsidise the MFP infrastructure, and they will do so for years. They will not have any option—they will do it by way of State taxation.

Rural South Australia has many handsome cities. Mount Gambier was the prize city for the whole of Australia last year in that it won the tidy towns competition, and it has a diversity of cultural, educational, industrial, developmental, sporting and recreational facilities which you would hardly find in any other rural city across Australia. Probably only one or two would parallel that city. I am not only talking for Mt Gambier. There are many others in South Australia, such as Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Renmark, and so on. The list is far from exhaustive.

I believe it would be a great compliment to the whole of South Australia if the Government widened its vision and, rather than list simply Whyalla and, to a much lesser degree,

more recently, Murray Bridge as centres where some incentives will be given to developers coming into this State, it would be better, and people would not see it as political opportunism with respect to Whyalla as the seat of a State Minister, if the Government were more pragmatic and said that it would look at the whole of South Australia for development. After all, the same incentives could be applied to any of the cities in South Australia, and I believe that they should be.

However cheap the land may be, we do not know how expensive and extensive the clearance task and associated costs will be at Gillman. Pollution removal will incur extra costs that are not applicable elsewhere in South Australia. The Leader has mentioned \$354 million, which is estimated from figures given by the Premier today, as the initial development cost for the Gillman site and associated works. The question remains: could we not carry out the same work elsewhere at a lesser cost? Have we even bothered to ask the many councils around South Australia whether they would be prepared to participate in the MFP? Have we asked them whether they would be prepared to offer cheap land and local government concessions? I think we would be surprised about the extent to which local government and rural South Australia would be ready to join in.

Progress undoubtedly has been very slow. The progress has been almost reluctant at best and inept at worst. I am not blaming Mr Kennan for that, because he is new to the job. When I read Mr Kennan's press release, which was the day before the MFP board was due to report to the Economic and Finance Committee—by statutory requirement and not voluntarily—I thought: is this an after-thought; is it what we have been accused of in putting forward this motion tonight, a gimmick, or is it genuine? I give Mr Kennan the benefit of the doubt, because he is new. He may be bringing a new vision to the concept.

His new redirected aims for the MFP were released before he appeared before the Economic and Finance Committee. While they may not have been in contempt of that committee, which was waiting for him to appear the following day, I still found them offensive, as I am sure did my colleagues. We may be too sensitive on that issue, but I detected no respect for that committee, to which the MFP board will have to report by statute year after year, and certainly no hint of commercial confidentiality, if that is the catchcry for almost everything we want to find out.

Gillman is still the main area for expenditure. It could be several years before the Wingfield dump is acquired. It is an eyesore. It is on the nose. It will be a long-term problem, as we witnessed with the dump down by the Adelaide airport and many other dumps across the world. It will cost a lot of money to redress that problem. The Health Commission has identified plumes of long-term health problems for people across LeFevre Peninsula related to industries which have been situated there for some time. Those health problems may or may not be significant once the MFP is established, but they have been reported on. I would hate to see them dismissed as simply ephemeral concerns. I think the people in the area deserve more than that.

I would like to see the Government and the MFP board have a wider vision and look at wider horizons across Australia, and give wider South Australia a chance. I also have to express my continuing concerns about the relatively lukewarm approach to MFP Australia. Are we using the name in order to ensure that we continue to get Federal funds? I say 'lukewarm approach' because the funds that have been

allocated are, after all, Better Cities moneys, which we should be receiving anyway, with or without an MFP. Just one Government project—the scrimber project in the South-East—lost twice as much as the Federal Government allocated to the MFP.

Those of us who have been to France to look at the 20 or more MFPs over there—substantial cities which all have the designation multifunction polis—realise that they are very strongly supported by the French National Government, which has the multifunction system as part of its major state development. It is progressing very well wherever you go, be it Bordeaux, Toulouse, Montpellier, Sofia Antipolis and Nice. As I say, there are 20 of them around France. They are all different, and they are all commendable in their own right. They are all strongly supported by a national communications, transport, electronic communications and financial system—an ideal way to carry on.

What do I see with the Australian Federal Government? Certainly no evidence of that. I suppose, if I were to be too critical of the Federal Government, it would say, 'Well, you had \$30 million last year in the Better Cities scheme; you have not spent that, so why are you coming knocking on the door for more money?' It thinks we are nuts—and so we are. We should be further advanced than we are currently.

I have to respond to another snide comment. Members on this side are often told that we do not support the submarine project and the Grand Prix. We support better management. If projects are for the betterment of South Australia, we support them. As a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, I always look at the bottom line. Responsible Government should do that. We have a wonderful example, in relation to the State Bank, of how we should have been looking at the bottom line for the past several years, but that is enough of that.

As a matter of fact, recently I was only looking at a letter I received two or three years ago from the former Premier, John Bannon, in response to a letter I sent to him on the announcement of the submarine project's being allocated to South Australia. His letter said, 'Thanks very much, Harold, for your letter of congratulations', and then went on to discuss the merits of the submarine project and the long-term benefits. The significant thing is that I was one of many people on this side of the House who took the time to write to the Premier and congratulate him and the State for winning the project. Enough of the nonsense on that side—it is just specious. Incidentally, I did not go along to the launch of the submarine. I have work to do in my electorate. I would have liked to go, but not for the free drinks, as implied in the snide comment of the member for Playford.

In conclusion, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition, as ever, is looking for the best results for South Australia in the shortest possible time. We are not asking the State Government to scrap the MFP project. Perhaps it is significant that the Government has now passed over responsibility to the board in the 1992-93 budget papers. We learned that it has passed over responsibility to the board but, within the MFP Act, the State Minister still has responsibility for the MFP.

So I hope that passing over responsibility to the board will not amount to passing over responsibility for the failures. We will do better than we did with the State Bank: we will keep our hands on at parliamentary level, which is really what this debate is all about. This is hands on politics, analysing, assessing, stating the best and the worst of what we believe in, in the hope that something positive and constructive will

emerge. We are not asking the Government to scrap the MFP but to widen its vision and move away from the very narrow focus on Gillman and what I regard as possibly a cynical extension of focus to Whyalla. I ask the Government to give the whole of South Australia and, probably more importantly in the long term, the whole of Adelaide a chance to participate.

Mr HOLLOWAY: What we have seen here tonight is the worst stunt since Eval Knievel tried to cross the Grand Canyon in a rocket-powered motorcycle. It really was a grubby exercise, totally media driven. What a coincidence it was that people from the *7.30 Report* happened to roll up as the Leader was about to move his motion. What a coincidence that it was at 5.30, just before we were about to finish the session. The fact is that—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY:—we had three hours of questioning of the MFP people this afternoon. This followed two hours of questioning before the Economic and Finance Committee several weeks ago, in accordance with the statute passed by this Parliament. The simple fact is that the Leader of the Opposition could not find any holes in it. How convenient it was that this motion was typed up, that it was all ready to roll just as we were coming towards the end of the session. The motion is totally contradictory.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY: Let us look at the motion and see what is so bad with what is happening with the MFP. The motion refers to the continuing concentration on urban development at the Gillman site. That is what is so dreadful about it: the concentration on urban development at Gillman. The motion then goes on to say that the expenditure has no tangible benefits. So, on the one hand, there is too much urban development while, on the other hand, paragraph 4 of the motion says, 'We want some bricks and mortar; we want something tangible for it.' The motion also talks about the long lead time before any commercial land will be available for sale. What do those opposite really want? Do they want a land sale? Are we supposed to turn it over to Myles Pearce and get rid of it? Do they see the MFP as some sort of latter day land sale like they had last century?

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY: It is just crazy. The motion then goes on to say:

As a consequence, this Committee calls on the Government to stop further development of the Gillman site and to refocus its efforts on the development of high technology industries...

Perhaps it has not occurred to members opposite that Technology Park and Science Park were absorbed into the MFP from 1 July this year, which is just on two months ago. Already officers from the MFP have made it quite clear to this Parliament, both here and on the earlier occasion before the Economic and Finance Committee, that a lot of progress has occurred in those areas with respect to developing industries on those sites in the two months that those parks have been absorbed into the MFP.

The Leader's motion is unreasonable and quite contradictory. The point of it is really in relation to the delays in expenditure. That is hardly a secret. Everybody knows that the MFP's allocation for last year was not fully spent, and we all know that occurred because of the delay in appointing the board and the Chief Executive Officer. The reasons for that

are well known. Obviously, the Federal Government had to be involved in such matters, but surely it is better to take a little bit longer, and get it right.

Members opposite referred to the State Bank. I would have thought that, if there is one lesson we have learnt, it is how important it is to get the right board, the right CEO (which we now have) and to get it right. Instead, members opposite are saying that we should rush into it; we should just spend the money for the sake of it.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: That is what they are arguing.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The other area of criticism is that the MFP is an evolutionary and dynamic project—it is not a static project—and so it ought to be. The fact is that since the appointment of the international board—and I have not heard any criticisms of the calibre of that board or of the Chief Executive Officer—there has been some fine-tuning and focussing of the objectives of the MFP, as there ought to be. The MFP began as an idea some years ago, but it has been only in the past 12 months that we have had the focus with the appointment of the board and the CEO, and of course now it is addressing itself to these objectives. It should be evolutionary—it should not be a static project that simply looks at the original objectives that were put out when this was just an idea some two or three years ago.

The Gillman site for the MFP is important. The Leader referred to it as a problem site, but what he did not say is that it is also a site of great potential. It is one of the few tracts of land of considerable size close to a major capital city, and it has a number of advantages. It is close to a port and it is close to major industrial development, yet it is close to all the infrastructure of the city.

The member for Mount Gambier made a very parochial speech. He wandered all over the place, talking about Scrimber, Housing Trust waiting lists and so on. He tried to attack the project by saying we should look at Murray Bridge and places like that. The fact is, whether we like it or not, the Gillman site does have a value and a benefit. However nice Murray Bridge might be, I do not really think we could seriously suggest that it is an alternative to an area that is within 20 kilometres of a major city.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind members that interjections are out of order and, as your Chair, I have the right to ensure that the Standing Orders are adhered to. I have chosen to ignore one or two of the louder conversational comments and assume that is par for the course, but when interjections are thrown across the Chamber I think I am reading the Standing Orders correctly by ensuring that members do not transgress.

Mr HOLLOWAY: The member for Mount Gambier also criticised the use of Better Cities moneys. What gall it is coming from members opposite who opposed the Better Cities fund. Dr Hewson, their national Leader, made some very scathing criticisms against Better Cities—what a waste of money it was; and how dreadful it was that we should spend money on things like making our cities better. Now, of course, they seem to have changed their tune and suddenly this Better Cities money is wonderful and should be going for other purposes.

The member for Mount Gambier also talked about Federal Government support. I would have thought that the most tangible evidence of Federal Government support is money. The fact is that the Federal Government has continued to support this project; it has done so after the recent election, and there can be no doubt about that.

The Leader earlier criticised former Senator Button for, I think, receiving some money—a very small amount, I would have thought, for someone of Senator Button's abilities and experience—for assisting this project. The former senator is widely respected throughout Australian industry. I have been to local companies in my electorate—I would not say they are friends of this side of politics—and they all have great respect for Mr Button's abilities and for what he has achieved, both in relation to industrial policy and his vision in areas such as the MFP. Rather than attacking the MFP over what is, after all, a very minor aspect of the activities, those opposite should congratulate the corporation for using the expertise that is available.

The member for Mount Gambier also referred to the Economic and Finance Committee report and appeared to anticipate what that report might be. I suspect that, apart from being a breach of Standing Orders, his interpretation of what that report might say is a lot different from mine. I think we should wait until that report comes out before we jump to conclusions, because, certainly, the honourable member's comments appear to be a little different from what we were hearing from members the other day. However, it really comes back to the fact that this is nothing more than a stunt. The whole exercise was totally media-driven; the Opposition ran out of useful things to contribute this afternoon. What did it do? It concocted this motion. It was extremely predictable. So, we have gone through this charade to take up a bit of time to cover the fact that the Opposition really does not have anything constructive to say. I think we should all reject this motion and get on with the business of dealing with the Estimates, which is, after all, the reason we are here.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Premier wish to address the Committee?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, Mr Chairman. This has been a stunt and it was tried last year. This year it has been done again and the Leader knows that come what may—regardless of the date of the election—there will be an election between now and the next Estimates Committees. So, he is determined to put on this stunt. I wonder what the effort will be like for the next two weeks—will we have these special events coming on the 5.30 p.m. entertainment song and dance act from the Leader? I also have the feeling that his motion will not get up this evening and I wonder whether we will see another little stunt—whether he will find himself obliged to walk out or something like that.

The facts are that this is a juvenile effort; the sort of effort that we would expect from a newly-elected member of Parliament. I say that because in 1980, as a newly-elected member of Parliament, I did it myself. I was here for one year and I was representing the Opposition at the Estimates Committee. We were getting very poor answers on that occasion—we did get poor answers from the Minister—and we did move a motion like this. However, one learns a lot over the years. I know the Leader has been out of this place; I know he lost his seat and had to get himself re-elected into this place as a result of someone retiring from a very safe seat. However, I would have thought he would have learnt a little over the years and would know that this kind of juvenile performance does not get him anywhere. It also does not help

the operations of this Estimates Committee process when the Leader treats it so cynically.

This matter was being canvassed on the Murray Nicoll show before it was raised in this place. This matter had already been to air; he had already said that this was what he was going to do. We have had talk about the typed-up motion—but one might call it a trumped-up motion—that the Leader has moved. However, the Opposition had determined it was going to do this before it had heard even the first answer to the first question on the MFP today. In its meetings this morning, I am sure the Opposition members said, 'We know what we are going to do. At 5.30 p.m., regardless of what they say, we will have a motion. We might make a few changes to the figures when the actual thing comes, but we will have it all there on the word processor ready to go.' I think that shows disrespect for this whole process.

I have tried to do my level best in answering questions as openly and honestly as possible. The Leader has asked many questions on various issues and I have said, without wanting to take up the time of the Committee, that I will take them on notice and provide the answers by 1 October. If that is the way this Committee is going to operate, and if that is the way the Leader is going to operate, then I will deal with each question *seriatim*, as they come, and if it takes all evening to get through these questions because the Leader is going to put them on the agenda, then that is the way we will do it.

This Committee operates on the basis of a reasonable degree of cooperation and good will. We are actually trying to provide information to members of this place. If members look at the *Hansard* record—of which I have a copy of the early pages—of my early performance on this Committee they will see that I have been willing and able to come up with as much information as possible without unnecessarily trying to consume the time of this Committee. The Leader made reference to a 20-minute afternoon tea, as we were apparently beavering away worrying over the figures. The *Hansard* record quite clearly shows that it was a 15-minute afternoon tea and one that ended when this Committee got together without the Leader, because he was outside doing his stunt. He was outside preparing for this stunt performance and he could not get himself back here on time. We were all here waiting; he was not ready himself. That is the calibre we see in this Leader.

There are a number of points that I have to make about the stunt and the various comments that have been made. First of all, the Leader has not waited for large swathes of answers on questions. He was given rounds of three questions at a time and we had long questions, such as:

My third question is: what is the cost last financial year of engaging executive search consultants? How many positions were filled through a contracted executive search company? How many persons does the MFP Development Corporation currently employ? How many positions remain to be filled? How many of the positions still to be filled have a general manager classification and what salary will be offered to each of these positions?

Later we had another one of these multi-barrelled questions. He asked:

How much of that money [that is, the \$40 million] was received by the Government and spent in the year ended 30 June 1993? How much is budgeted to be spent this financial year? Is it a requirement of the Federal Government that all Better Cities funding be allocated to the MFP site at Gillman or is there some flexibility as to where that money can be spent? Can the Better Cities money be spent elsewhere? Is the Better Cities money being spent on houses at Osborne and, if not, who is paying for the 70 houses at Osborne? Is the level of State funding of the project tied to the level of Commonwealth Government spending? What other Commonwealth

Government spending is likely to be available for the MFP? What other Commonwealth funding is likely to be available for the MFP? When was the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State Government signed for the payment of this \$40 million and, if it is not spent from last year or this year, is it simply sitting there and being carried forward in some form of deposit account?

To help the Committee, I said that we would take those questions on notice as far as possible and provide the information later. However, I would say that those questions represent information that I thought was being asked for in good faith by the Leader, and that he actually wanted to know the answers. In fact, he does not wait for the answers; he does not wait for that information to come; he does not demand that it come today and say, 'No, I won't have that; I won't have you wait until 1 October.' So, we presume that 1 October is a reasonable date on which to provide that information on those and other questions. In that case, the Leader could have got all that information together and he could do his little stunt in the full House and move a motion of no confidence in me over the handling of the MFP matter.

If the Leader were genuine, he would have done that in terms of wanting to consider all the information. He would have deferred any notice of a motion until he had all the information available. However, of course, that messed around his little ploy; that was not satisfactory to his purpose. He with his tactics team had determined that they were going to do this anyway and, come what may, he was going to do it today at 5.30 p.m. That was why we were waiting for the clock to strike 5.30 p.m. and he would do it. If he has not been replaced as Leader of the Opposition by the member for Kavel before next year's Estimates Committee, the Leader would do well, if he is going to do this stunt again, to do it in better media time than 5.30 p.m.

The Leader then chose to misrepresent the figures that he was given. For example, on the recovery of State Government revenues and on the costs of the scheme he said:

It is going to cost the taxpayers \$354 million.

However, he then acknowledges that there will be revenue received of \$222 million. Then, in one of his typical *sotto voce* asides, when he has to recognise in an embarrassed way that there is another point of view, he said that the net cost will be \$132 million for stages 1A, 1B and 2. Then, twice later in his speech he came back to say that the cost to the taxpayer would be \$354 million. That is not correct. It is not correct by what I have said and it is not even correct by what he in a *sotto voce* said himself this afternoon. If you are going to argue a case, you argue it on a real case and not what you wish to be the case. I will come back to some more points about that cost to the taxpayer, because it is important that that information be considered by this Committee. If the Leader is not going to ask the questions then I will give the answers to questions that should have been asked.

Let us come back to another point. It is true that some people have expressed concern about the length of time that the MFP has taken to go through various stages, and I am one of them. I am one of the people who has expressed those concerns, but I can identify that there was one person who expressed some concerns when he came to South Australia a couple of years ago on an investment mission from Japan. I refer to none other than the Chair of the MFP Australia Corporation Association of Japan, Mr Toshikuni Yahiro. The Leader may remember, if he was reading the daily paper at the time—it was before he got back into politics, so he may not have been deeply into reading the newspaper—that that was the occasion when Mr Yahiro gave a speech that was

regarded as being critical of the MFP and the way it was being handled. The speech was regarded as being an embarrassment to the Government at the time and there were various ways of interpreting what was said. However, undoubtedly, it could not have been regarded as a rave review by Mr Yahiro about the MFP. That point has to be acknowledged. This same Mr Yahiro had some different things to say this year. He is a plain-speaking man; he says it as he sees it; he says it as he has analysed the situation. At that time he was not prepared to be unequivocal in his support for the MFP.

Let us have a look at what he said this year, on 11 May 1993, after he had the information that has been available to members of this place, after he has had the information about what has been happening in recent times, after he has been told what has been going on in terms of the legislation and in terms of the board's being appointed, the corporation being established and the CEO being appointed. After all of that, and after advice from his own advisers and other Japanese business and governmental sources, this is the sort of thing he said at a function in Japan:

In particular, I [Mr Yahiro] was deeply impressed by the positive measures clearly outlined for the MFP.

What measures was he talking about? He was talking about the measures that I announced in the 'Meeting the Challenge' statement. He went on to say:

Looking back, as you know, in late 1991, as leader of an MFP Investment Environment Survey Mission, dispatched by the Japanese Government, I and many who are in this room tonight went to Adelaide and other parts of Australia.

In the report of the mission submitted on our return, we included a number of proposals for the realisation of the MFP. While the state of progress since then has been 'steadily moving forward' in some respects, it cannot be said to be progressing at the pace for which one might hope.

And that is the point with which we all agree. He continued:

This is because both Japan and Australia, their economies hit by the global recession, have been forced to bide their time. Nevertheless, throughout this time it is true that construction of MFP's project infrastructure is steadily under way and the organisation has been established with the establishment of the MFP Development Corporation, the appointment of its board, the revitalisation of the activities of the International Advisory Committee and the recent appointment of the Development Corporation's CEO. MFP-related activities in Japan have also graduated from the prior 'study group' with the establishment of the 'Cooperation Association of Japan'.

With these preparations in place, the announcement of such an enthusiastic new economic policy by Premier Arnold and the inclusion as an integral part of the policy of positive stimulus measures for MFP are clear indications of the inseparability of South Australia's economic revitalisation and MFP, and it seems that 'a soul has truly been breathed into' MFP.

In particular, the designation of the MFP as an 'Enterprise Zone' involves the provision of various taxation incentives and we, who have repeatedly stressed the need for such public incentives, it is highly gratifying to see our wishes granted.

Further, the plan to merge the existing Technology Development Corporation and the MFP Development Corporation is of extreme significance for the consolidation of the foundations of MFP. That this merger is the logical thing to do no-one could deny, but logic and actual execution are often two different things. In Japan, for example, I believe it would not be easy to realise such a merger, but I greatly admire the farsightedness and resolution of Premier Arnold in bringing about this merger, which will take effect on 1 July.

The approach run period of MFP has largely been under the leadership of Senator Button and Premier Bannon. Now that MFP has reached the realisation stage, it is most heartening to look to the excellent leadership abilities of Premier Arnold. Prime Minister Keating, who recently visited Japan, has long been a pro-MFP politician and I have no doubts that Australia's commitment to MFP will not change under Premier Arnold and Prime Minister Keating.

So, they were the terms spoken by the head of the Cooperation Association of Japan and that was the same person who

gave very equivocal comments two years earlier, comments that were easily interpreted by many as being negative about the MFP. Those who heard him speak were astounded by such forthright words on behalf of the MFP. Now that is the kind of thing that is being measured by those who watch the MFP with real interest rather than political cynicism.

We come to the matter of John Button and his work for the committee. Apparently this is supposed to be some unforgivable act. This is supposed to be some act of political cynicism. This is supposed to be some act of political payback. He is a person who has worked long and hard for industry in this country and who is well respected by industry and by people who, as the member for Mitchell said, do not vote for him but who acknowledge the considerable work he has done for industry development in this country. I want to put on the record that it was the board who wanted to use him to go around on the work he has been going around on. It was not something he sought and it was not something that he necessarily wanted to do. Certainly the matter of payment for his services was not something that he initiated: it was something that the board insisted upon. He did not want to have that happen but the board insisted upon that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The board insisted upon it because, aware of his capacity as an ambassador for the MFP, they wanted his full-time commitment. They did not want him in a voluntary capacity then finding that his time was lessened by the many other commitments that are calling away his time already. He is in such demand for his services, paid services by organisations. He was prepared to work voluntarily for the MFP but they said, no, we want your commitment full time. The point needs to be made that not only did they want him, they wanted Professor Claude Rameau, whom they are paying three times as much to do that self same sort of work.

The matter has been raised about the length of time that the project has taken to get up and running. That length of time has been of concern to us all, but when I was in Japan I had the chance to visit the high-tech city developments near the city of Kobe and I saw there a very MFP-like development that has taken place. I asked them to go back to when the first concept was identified and they told me that it was back in the 1970s. That was when this idea of a high-tech city near Kobe was first mooted. Then I asked them, 'When did you actually get the structure in place?' The structure was not in place until over five years later. When I say the structure, I mean just the committee, just the organisation. That was not in place until six or seven years later. Then I said, 'How long did it take from then to get the first bricks and mortar on the ground?' That did not come until about 1989-90. That was a period of 10 or 11 years after the concept first took place and here now in 1993 the project is expanding massively and is a great success.

The reality is that these projects of a generation do take time to get established in terms of bricks and mortar. I know that the Leader and those on this side are wanting a kind of Emerald City rising from the sands or mudflats of Gillman. That is not the way these things work, to have this kind of Emerald City approach where you are looking for a great beacon like that. How these things work and become a success, you do them the right way, and you do them solidly and properly. That is precisely what has happened here. Of course we would have liked it to have been speeded up but that has not been the case.

The member for Kavel offered to us, I do not know whether it was gratuitously or otherwise, that he gets confused, and in fact I think he has been very confused on this matter. I am conscious of the fact that I cannot read in all this information, but there are many interesting things that I have here that I was prepared to answer questions on, and but for the fact that the Chair is chiding me for the length of time I am taking I would read these in as answers to unasked questions about progress that has actually been achieved: about the Australia-Asia Business Centre, the International Software Services Company, the biomass project, the learning environment technology concept, the intelligent precinct program and the MFP Services Company—all of those are things about which I can give concrete evidence of progress that is being made, and I was ready to do so had the questions been asked. But of course it did not suit the purposes of the Opposition to actually ask questions on all those sorts of matters.

Then we had a very discursive discussion by the members opposite. They took us through the north-south corridor, we went to visit Murray Bridge and we went to various other places. Do not frown at me; it was the member for Mount Gambier who took us on this discursive trip around the State. Then we had all sorts of other issues about the Housing Trust and other concerns—concerns that are of course serious concerns of South Australians but hardly pertinent to the debate that was at hand. Then, the member for Mount Gambier I think it was said, 'All South Australians will subsidise MFP infrastructure'—and we just got a 'Yep' to that. I do not want to take much more time but I feel I must read out some evidence that was put before the Committee by the MFP because it is very pertinent and it concerns the development costs of the MFP site. It also concerns the contribution of the work at the MFP site to the State economy. I quote:

In the process of developing the MFP concept from its most formative stages there has been a range of economic implications. The MFP feasibility study estimated that gross State product could increase by \$2.1 billion by 2014 or an increase of 7.5 per cent over current levels and that an estimated 43 000 jobs could be created throughout South Australia as a consequence of a fully developed multifunction polis, all stages. These estimates reflect the broader range of benefits from the fully developed project.

That is 20 years from now. Of course, it is a project of a generation and it was always going to be the project of a generation. If you look at the—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I caution the Leader. When I call for order it is because he is breaching Standing Orders and ignoring my call is a further breach of Standing Orders.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will leave out some of the intervening pages—not because I am embarrassed by what they say; in fact, I am very pleased by what they say—because I am conscious of the time I am taking. However, they are there to be read. It goes on to say:

Therefore, meeting the updated target employment of 1 550 new jobs directly in MFP industries will result in additional gross State product of almost \$400 million across the next six years and an additional \$19 million in revenues to the State from general activity. From the turn of the century there would be an annual increase in gross State product of \$130 million with an employment of 3 100 people with general annual returns to the State Government of \$7.7 million with payroll tax exemptions in place—

including the effect of the enterprise zones—

rising to \$11 million when payroll tax exemptions are withdrawn. Development costs include the following area: environmental remediation costs necessary regardless of the urban development.

This point has not been considered by members of the Opposition. Even if the MFP had never been heard of, even if the MFP concept had never come up from the MITI mission, the site would have needed remediation and environmental rehabilitation. In addition to that, we have a population growth in this State that again, even if the MFP had never been heard of—unless we are going to see urban development spread into the Barossa Valley and the Southern Vales—needs the development of urban residential potential. This land has potential for urban residential development.

South Australia's population is going to grow. The MFP will make it grow faster but, nevertheless, it will grow. The area around Gillman will have to be cleaned up, even if there is no MFP. The tables contained here summarise the MFP business and urban development models in constant 1993 dollars. They indicate that at the conclusion of stage IA of the Gillman development there is a net South Australian site development cost after land sales of \$88.9 million. This includes \$49 million in area remediation works necessary regardless of urban development, resulting in a net stage IA development cost of \$39.9 million. Completion of stages 1A, 1B and 2 will result in a total net South Australian site development cost after land sales of \$132.4 million. This includes a total of \$55 million in necessary area remediation costs, leaving a net total development cost of \$77.4 million.

I suggest that, before the Leader goes on with senseless motions like this, he works out how much the alternative cost of infrastructure would be to accommodate residential and commercial activities for that population centre elsewhere in the urban area of South Australia. I am certain that the figures would come pretty close to those figures. In other words, there are net costs that would be a cost to South Australia anyway in respect of whatever location was chosen.

I apologise for the time I have taken on this matter, but I do think it is important to cover those facts. They are facts that could have been extracted by questioning. In fact, I was prepared to provide those facts, but I could not do that earlier because we wasted two hours on this senseless stunt by the Leader of the Opposition, who was not even prepared to wait for answers to his own questions. He asked many questions that he knew he would receive answers to, and which, out of courtesy, he still will get answers to. He was not prepared to wait for those answers. I hope that members of the Committee will forthrightly reject the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Leader wish to exercise the right of reply?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to go through what has been raised by the Premier, because frankly what was raised by members opposite, who have a chance to vote on this motion tonight, was not even worth rebutting. They did not stick to the arguments raised in the motion, and they did not stick to the arguments raised during the debate. I pick up what the Premier had to say, because he quoted at great length from the MFP management study in terms of what it will produce in 20 years as a benefit to South Australia. Let us look at where we can make a fair judgment in respect of some of the other reports that have been prepared on the MFP. We can pass judgment on the effectiveness of those reports.

The first report is the EIS approved by Cabinet earlier this year. The EIS states:

The first release of land on the Gillman site is staged to occur in 1995.

Yet this afternoon we heard that it has been put back by at least three years to 1998. Even on this present day judgment, three years have been slipped in less than 12 months. That is how accurate the Government's statements are. I refer to other statements in terms of what the Government proposes to achieve on this Gillman site. Again, the EIS states that the site would be cleaned up and greening projects completed by the end of 1992. The work has not even started and is not proposed to start this year. We find that it is intended to have the principal site works for stage I in 1993-94, yet no money has been allocated for that, and they are not likely to start until 1995-96. The environmental impact statement also says that in 1994-95—next financial year—work on the village will commence. We found out this afternoon that the village work will not even be able to start until 1998-99. They are the sort of reports that are put up that have absolutely no substance whatsoever in terms of credibility and in terms of the time frame put down. That is what we object to—the fact that we have spent \$17 million on this project and yet nothing tangible has been achieved for South Australia. Mr Chairman, no doubt you recall the very same sort of arguments coming from Hugh Hudson and Don Dunstan in 1979 over Monarto; that vision that they had out towards Murray Bridge where this State blew \$80 million of taxpayers' money and achieved nothing but a zoo. A zoo for \$80 million of taxpayers' money! I can recall Hugh Hudson standing in this House arguing day after day the same type of argument being used by the Premier and other members opposite here this evening; and it lacked credibility.

On all the assessments of anyone who has looked with any objectivity towards the MFP site at Gillman, they would argue equally that what has been put forward lacks credibility. At 3.15 this afternoon we asked the Premier the second question on the MFP. He has had weeks to prepare for the Estimates Committees, so he must have known that one of the first questions would be: what capital works program will be carried out in 1993-94? What money will be spent? It is the most logical question you can have in an Estimates Committee. I put it up as the second question, and he could not answer it. They ummed and ahed and fiddled and looked at reports and said that it would be \$1.56 million, and I wrote down that figure as the total capital expenditure for 1993-94. Then they came back after a 20-minute break and said, 'Look, we made some mistakes. We have had to revise those figures. It is now \$1.7 million, and on top of that there is another \$9 million for land acquisition and, sure, we are doing some environmental rehabilitation work; it will cost another \$6 million.'

Premier, it was you who sat here last year, exactly 12 months ago in this Estimates Committee, and gave us a figure of \$31 million to be spent on capital works on the MFP in 1992-93. I can recall him going through a schedule and detailing how that money would be spent. What was the result 12 months later? Three million dollars has been spent. This represents less than 10 per cent of the allocation put down by the Premier just 12 months ago. That is how little credibility he has with this Estimates Committee. It is no wonder that the Chairman of the Japanese committee of the MFP made the statements that he did. At that stage he had been told they were spending \$31 million on capital works alone. It is no wonder he came out and said that at last some money had been spent. He was fooled. He was deceived, just as South Australians were deceived in respect of the State Bank and so many other issues. The reality is that only \$3 million was spent on capital works.

I realise, Premier, that you are embarrassed, and so you should be. You talked about the benefits of the biomass project. The biomass project happened to be the Liberal Party's 1989 election promise in terms of using sewage effluent to create a hardwood forest north of Adelaide. It has now been grabbed at the last moment as an MFP project.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is also interesting to see the Premier boast about his so-called enterprise zones. The package that the Premier put down under his enterprise zones was the decentralisation package introduced by a Liberal Government in 1979 and abolished by a Labor Government in 1985. There was a commitment of about \$16 million a year in the last year of operation of those decentralisation grants where companies were given a complete rebate of payroll and land tax for establishing in a certain area.

Here we are in 1993 with the Government trying to recycle the policy that it abolished in 1985 and put it forward under the name of an enterprise zone. Premier, you again lack credibility—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Your economic statement—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Premier's economic statement was brought down only in April of this year. It was the Premier who said that the construction—not 'to begin construction' but 'the construction'—of up to 70 medium density lower cost houses on a site at Osborne was to be scheduled for the end of this year. We find that those houses have not even been commenced and will certainly not be completed by the end of this year.

This afternoon, the Premier has been unable to give any firm commitment of private investment on the Gillman site of the MFP—no commitment whatsoever. Yet, Mr Bruce Guerin, when he was head of the MFP, stated that unless a firm commitment from a private enterprise organisation could be achieved by the end of 1992 the project should not proceed. We still have no commitment for the Gillman site 12 months later.

The Liberal Party is not against the MFP concept: it has always been in favour of it. The honourable member opposite even highlighted the fact that at least I have been consistent because when I came back into politics in May last year one of the first things I said was that the MFP should be refocussed.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have been joined by a chorus of every other thinking person in South Australia who supports that point of view, because they realise that to pump \$354 million of scarce taxpayers' money into the Gillman site without even the possibility of a commercial job on site before the year 2000, because the land will not be released until 1998, is sheer stupidity. That is why the Liberal Party pleads with this Labor Government in its dying days to at least have the commonsense to reassess its position. The Premier himself last year, having been newly elected, came into this Chamber and during the Estimates Committees said that he would refocus the MFP. We sat back and sighed with relief. But what have we found? There has been no refocusing whatsoever. The Premier has charged into this on his white charger trying to pump literally hundreds of millions of dollars committed between now and 1998 into the MFP site at Gillman.

I come back to the motion. Let us highlight the points again. There has been a continuing commitment by this Labor Government to urban development of the Gillman site, but there has been no commitment by commercial interests to investment in that site. We see enormous lead times with no commercial development able to establish one single free enterprise job on that site before the year 2000. We have already seen the commitment to expend almost \$17 million by June of 1993 with no tangible benefits whatsoever except two holes sunk in the ground and plenty of reports, reports which would appear (from what we can judge of their substance) to lack real credibility.

So, there is a plea from this Committee: for goodness sake, as a Government, have the hindsight to look back and see the mistakes you made at Monarto and have the foresight to look forward and see what everyone else is saying, that the MFP needs to be refocussed and that the development should take place outside the Gillman site. We should no longer continue to waste taxpayers' money on that site. We need to refocus it and to quickly establish high technology jobs, industry and investment in centres of excellence away from the Gillman site. I urge all members to support the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (3)—Messrs Allison, Brown and Olsen.

Noes (3)—Mr Holloway, Mrs Hutchison and Mr Quirke.

The CHAIRMAN: There are three votes for the Ayes and three votes for the Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the 'Noes'.

Motion thus negated.

Mr OLSEN: Have all Government departments now agreed to cooperate under the revised information utility? Last year several departments and agencies were concerned about joining the utility, thereby reducing the potential savings to the Government.

Mr Shepherd: The new concept for the information utility is based upon a revised and upgraded form of State Systems and corporatised, and uses that organisation as a vehicle for securing strategic alliances with the private sector. As that concept has been developed and discussed through the public sector, we have had good cooperation from all agencies, and I am not aware of any problems involving lack of cooperation or acceptance of that proposal from any agency.

Mr OLSEN: I therefore take it that they will all participate in the new structured body. What is regarded now as the potential savings to Government of establishing the information utility, given that three or four estimates have varied since the information utility was first put on the agenda and those amounts have been downgraded significantly with each review?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: These matters can be further examined under the Minister of Business and Regional Development, and we will identify that to him as a question that needs to be answered on that occasion. It will need to be picked up by the new board, and the advice I have is that an interim board of management will be formed and an announcement relating to this will be made later this month. A Bill for the necessary legislation to cover the information utility will be introduced shortly in this session of Parliament, and Mr Brenton Wright has been appointed as Chief Executive, as was announced recently.

Mr Shepherd: In regard to savings, of course, the new concept of the information utility is one which requires a full development of the alliance concept, which is under way, and the development of a business plan of the new utility under

the new concept, and that will be undertaken under the direction of the new board.

Mr OLSEN: In the last annual report—and the response just given to the Committee in part answers some of these questions—of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet a number of activities were foreshadowed for the information utility, one of which is the appointment of a CEO, which the Premier has now indicated. I take it that the business plan will be developed by the new board when it is announced in September.

‘Negotiations with consortium and associated studies aimed at agreement and the form of the information utility entity, equity holdings and contribution to the parties and owners or shareholders agreement’ was a reference in the last annual report of the Department of the Premier and the Cabinet. Where are we at as it relates to the information utility in that area?

Mr Shepherd: The participation of the private sector organisations is on a completely different basis, on the basis not of equity but of partnership arrangements in which the various strategic alliance partners undertake areas of business in partnership with the new information utility. For example, under the memorandum of understanding entered into with Digital Equipment Corporation of Australia, the new information utility will use Digital Equipment Corporation’s special expertise in network management, and the Minister of Business and Regional Development last week opened the new network management centre of State Systems which uses the technology and that special expertise of Digital.

That will develop significant savings for the State and be a vehicle for business by Digital Equipment Corporation. As a result, Digital Equipment Corporation has already invested significantly with the provision of equipment, both in an economic development sense and in a sense of pursuit and development of the network management centre. That is typical of the kinds of relationships that have been developed with those strategic alliance partners.

Similar arrangements have been developed with Lane Telecommunications, which is a South Australian based firm with which a memorandum of understanding has been signed, with Telecom, which is close to signing one, and with Andersons, which is also close to signing one. That covers the four partners of the Information Utility.

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

Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, \$1 932 000

Departmental Advisers:

Mr P. Nocella, Chairman, S.A. Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

Mr S. Everard, Acting Executive Assistant, Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs.

Mr A. Gardini, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs.

Mr P. Della, Acting Manager, Support Services Branch.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer members to pages 28 to 30 in the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, and pages 31 to 38 in the Program Estimates.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is a new allocation of \$215 000 for multicultural grants. When will these grants be

allocated? Can the Premier provide an itemised list of the proposed recipients of these grants? Why are they not being administered by the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In some cases they are; in some cases they are not. The extra amounts that have been provided for include an amount of money for festivals in South Australia. I have been concerned for sometime that South Australia is not only the Festival State but it is really the State of festivals. The Festival of Arts is renowned throughout the world, and we also have a number of special festivals. Glendi is acknowledged as the best of its kind in Australia; the Italian festival in November is well respected in Australia; and we have the Dozynki Polish festival, regarded as the best Polish festival in Australia.

We have the Dimitria festival which is well regarded compared with other Dimitria festivals around Australia, and so on. Of course, we have the Multicultural Arts Carnival which is also highly regarded. But there are many such festivals and I have been concerned that we have not had any mechanism to provide support for these groups. So in this budget we are providing an amount of \$50 000 which will be administered by the commission upon application by various groups to determine whether they can be given some financial support for their festivals. The anticipation at this stage is that there will be a limit of \$10 000 per successful application. There will be a maximum. Some groups will not quite qualify for that much, but it provides the opportunity for these organising committees, who make such a wonderful effort, to receive some recognition and support. The funding will be limited to cultural and educational activities. It will not be available for the promoting of culinary diversity or traditional dancing activities. It will be focused on trying to reach out into new educational and cultural arenas, particularly those that reflect the impact of that particular culture on the multicultural Australian culture. So that will be administered by the commission.

A fund of \$25 000 has been announced for the commissioning of literary works that are authored in this country by people who write of their experience in this country or somehow write of the impact of this cultural context upon their own identity as an individual or as a group. An amount of \$25 000 is being allocated for that. Again that will be administered through the commission. Other amounts that are being allocated include \$25 000 that will be jointly available to the South Australian Institute of Languages and the Centre for Language Teaching and Research (CLTR), on the basis that if they receive outside sponsorship for language courses that are not in the mainstream then they can receive some help from us. The Institute of Languages has for some years tried to encourage the availability of languages that are not mainstream languages in our higher education arena to students in South Australia—for example, Russian, Korean and Arabic—and they have done that from within their resources but they are limited as to their capacity to do it in future.

We have said that if, for example, they could get support from embassies or from the private sector to give funds for sponsoring these courses we are prepared to match the sponsorship they can receive from that. I think the anticipation is that that will be administered through the Tertiary Multicultural Educational Coordinating Committee (TMECC), which comes under the Hon. Susan Lenahan. A further \$50 000 will be available for sister cities promotion—or sister regions, really, it should be referred to as. We have

a number of sister relationships in this State and I think it is time that we focused on those and had a special committee in the Premier's Department that will include representation from the commission. It will also include representation from the Protocol Section of the Premier's Department, the Tourism Commission, the Economic Development Board and from other agencies that all have some interest in the promoting of strong bilateral relations with other regions of the world.

We have a number of these already. In the formal senses we have the Gemellaggio with Campagna; we have the sister province-State relationship with Shandong; we have the relationship with Penang; we have the relationship with Okayama and the like. We also have a series of other relationships of a lesser order but which do need regular reporting on, and I am keen to see that each of these relationships should be the subject of some annual reporting to Parliament so that we are aware that once these agreements have been entered into we can know whether or not any progress was made on them during the year. This committee will be responsible for ensuring that happens. The \$50 000 is being allocated to that committee to help it work with the various groups that are doing activities to promote these sister relationships.

A further amount is to be given to the Centre for Intercultural Studies and Multicultural Education. The centre has made an application for an intercultural information network. It has already received international recognition for its role in promoting intercultural studies in South Australia, not only within the education sector but also within the wider community. Indeed, I notice that the next person to address one of its seminars in a couple of weeks is the Hon. Julian Stefani in another place. I have had the privilege of being invited to seminars on earlier occasions. However, the centre has put a considerable amount of effort into providing a conduit for not only the academic community in South Australia and the multicultural communities in South Australia but also the general community to have a better understanding of intercultural studies and multicultural education. So, we have accepted the centre's submission in part and are giving it \$40 000. TMECC will also have responsibility for oversighting the expenditure of that money.

The last amount that has been allocated is to the South Australian Institute of Languages again, this time for an oral history project. When I first established the Institute of Languages, at the occasion of its official launch some years ago, I indicated that we had something very special in South Australia. We have many special things in South Australia, but one thing that was special was a heritage of languages that is unique. Some of these languages are rare and actually dying out in other parts of the world, but older South Australians still speak them, either these minor languages or dialects. It is important that we catch through oral history means some of these languages that have now died out in some cases in their countries or regions of origin. We have the chance to do something here. So, a research project will be sponsored through the Institute of Languages to help gather together this linguistic tapestry that we have in this State. I think it is a very exciting project. That project will be done in conjunction with the commission, because the commission will be an important source of support and advice as to where various people in the community are that have these languages. So, some of these funds will be done through the commission, some will be done in consultation

with the commission, and others will be done with the TMECC, which comes under another Minister.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I wish to turn to the heading 'Provision of Language Services', which I appreciate the Premier has been talking about in general terms. The Program Estimates show that actual employment for this program was 20 full-time equivalents—six positions below the budgeted level. What is the reason for the fact that this is six full-time equivalent positions below the budgeted level? Also, in answering that, I highlight that, although the situation is far below the budget in terms of positions, in actual dollars spent it is only \$52 000 below the budget. Why did the much lower employment level not result in a significantly reduced expenditure? Also in terms of the provision of language services undertaken during the past financial year, who undertook the review that is referred to, what was the cost of the review and what was the outcome of that particular review?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In general terms, the full-time equivalents were: 56 proposed 1992-93, 48.7 actual and 46.7 proposed 1993-94. A number of vacant full-time interpreter/translator positions were left unfilled throughout 1992-93 and a further four positions subject to negotiated conditions were terminated in July 1993. It is expected that two retirement separation packages will be taken in 1993-94. One of the points I need to make is that the Language Services Centre is required to cover its costs. It is required to meet demand within Government, but also for its private sector customers on a cost-effective basis and on a competitive basis, and it is required to meet the demand with respect to the range of languages that are required to be interpreted or translated. The reality is that that changes.

The mix of interpreters and translators needed now is actually different from what it was years ago, and it has not reduced the effectiveness of the service to actually see a reduction of some full-time positions in some languages, because there is no longer the demand for those languages, whereas new languages are coming on and we now have to work out new ways of providing for those. So, there always will be some turnover and maybe some change from full-time to part-time or part-time to full-time positions with respect to certain languages, depending upon the tomography of South Australia.

Mr Everard: In accordance with the guidelines of the Government Management Board for periodic reviews of Government programs, the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs reviewed the program, as indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. The review considered the appropriateness of providing interpreting and translating services by Government and the efficiency and effectiveness of the services provided by the Interpreting and Translating Centre in meeting the interpreting and translating needs of both the South Australian Government and the community as a whole. Interviews were held with 24 representatives of the 11 main client organisations, and a survey of all 206 customer agencies was conducted, which resulted in feedback from 112 customers. Those agencies represented over 80 per cent of the total volume of business conducted by the centre. As far as the actual cost of the review was concerned, it was done internally in accordance with the instructions given by the Government that we avoid the use of external consultants. It was done in-house by our own officers. So, in that sense there was no payment to consultants.

The CHAIRMAN: In calling the Leader for his third question I point out the time and indicate that, if the Commit-

tee wishes to maximise the number of questions between now and 10 p.m., some brevity in both questions and answers is possibly indicated. The Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We would certainly support that. I understand that a number of departments, in particular the Health Commission, are setting up their own language service, as no doubt you are aware: is that in accordance with the sorts of arrangements that you would like to see or is that starting to cut across the provision of language services?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Some discussion has taken place between the Language Services Centre and the Health Commission about that issue. The South Australian Health Commission and its various entities have been an important part of the customer base of the Language Services Centre and we are concerned if that base is eroded because that cuts down the cost effectiveness of the service. From the point of view of the Health Commission, what they are after is the most cost competitive service themselves and we certainly respect that matter. The argument really comes down to the fact that we should be able to ensure that we are giving the most cost competitive service from the Language Services Centre. The centre has gone through this review to help make sure that we do it because it is not a good idea, in my view, to fracture the provision of these services. Treasury officers are assisting with those discussions between the Health Commission and the Language Services Centre.

Some concern was expressed earlier that there might be a reversion to the reliance, in some instances, on non-professional translators or interpreters for clients and we are opposed to that because, if somebody comes into a hospital, a family community services centre or a court, they should know that they are being interpreted professionally so that their health worries, their welfare worries and their legal worries are being properly communicated from them to the person they are dealing with and *vice versa*. I think there has been some evidence that in some entities of the Health Commission certain institutions from time to time have used a non-professional. We do not support that.

The CHAIRMAN: I will allow the third question, but I will be stingy with any supplementaries.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Program Estimates indicate that the number of interpreting and translating assignments last financial year was significantly lower than for the previous 12-month period. Can you explain the reason why? I realise you will need to get a prepared answer to this next part, but how many Government departments and agencies actually paid for translating and interpreting services last year? If you could perhaps provide an itemised list of payments made by the various departments to the commission?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can provide that quite easily by 1 October, not only for last year but even for the year before, maybe even the year before that so that you can get trend lines.

Mrs HUTCHISON: One of the objectives of the department over the past two years was to go to an accrual system of accounting. That was to be completed within a two-year period. Has that been completed as yet? If not, when is it anticipated that it will be completed?

Mr Everard: The systems and policies have actually been developed within the office and we are ready to go with accrual accounting. Indeed, we have actually done a mock trial balance for last year. However, being one of the smaller agencies, Treasury has asked us if we would be prepared to participate in a pilot program which I understand is likely to

take place in November this year and therefore they have asked us if we would mind holding off any further development to assist them with participating in that pilot program. As far as the office is concerned, we are ready to go now, but we are holding off in order to cooperate with Treasury.

Mrs HUTCHISON: The next two questions relate to page 38 of the Program Estimates. The first question is in regard to the specific target to continue to promote and assist in the implementation of projects and activities to overcome racial tensions. Could you provide us with a little more information on that project?

Mr Nocella: The objective there can be generally described as being aimed at anti-racial vilification and anti-racist activities. The objective is to assist in the development and implementation of anti-racist strategies. The current state of implementation is that the South Australian Education Department's anti-racial policy has been completed as part of continuing the program of implementation of multicultural management commitment plans, which is the major strategy that the commission and the office jointly apply in order to obtain those outcomes that are the institutional objectives as set out in the Act. The Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs has participated in the University of South Australia working group, which has developed the University of South Australia anti-racist policy in 1991.

The proceedings of the South Australians for racial equality forum—community relations in a multicultural society—have also been published, and discussions are taking place between officers of the policy branch of the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and officers of the universities' equal opportunity office. The universities, although outside the State ambit, have undertaken to develop multicultural management commitment plans as a gesture of goodwill and as a show of their intention in this area. In addition, as far as the vilification legislation is concerned, on the part of the State there was an intention of going down a path different from that proposed in the Commonwealth legislation.

National legislation would have been a preferable option rather than State by State legislation. The parts of the proposed law that make racial vilification unlawful allow for a person who believes that they have suffered racial vilification to make use of the complaint process provided under the Racial Discrimination Act 1975. The provisions in the proposed law are such that they would ensure that certain activities are not affected. These include: discussion on issues of public policy; the publication and performance of *bona fide* works of art; general academic discussions; news reporting on demonstrations against particular countries; and serious and fair reporting of events. As an example, the law will not prevent public discussion on issues such as immigration policy.

The current state of implementation is that State Government agencies have been approached for comment by the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department. Officers of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Equal Opportunity Commission, the Attorney-General's Department and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs met to advise on a coordinated response for the consideration of the State Attorney-General. The Government of this State has indicated that it will consider whether State legislation is needed once the Commonwealth legislates on this issue. Public hearings that have been held in all States, including South Australia, have, unfortunately, been the scene of rather appalling displays of intolerance and racism. If anyone

needed confirmation that this legislation is needed, it was provided on the night of the hearing.

Mrs HUTCHISON: A further line on that page provides for the assistance and encouragement of ethno-specific community groups to develop projects for the Centenary of Women's Suffrage and the International Year of the Family. I applaud that. What form would that assistance and encouragement take?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs are in the process of developing a corporate plan, as has been indicated. In recognition of the centenary celebrations, the office has proposed a series of projects to highlight the significance of this event for migrants and women of non-English speaking background. The following have been proposed: a research and advocacy project on non-English-speaking background women's needs; access to information in relation to the Australian electoral system and how they make decisions on how to vote; a multi-media project developed in conjunction with other agencies and the Women in Multiculturalism Network, which recognises the contribution of women and families to ethnic businesses and the economy; and a percentage of the multicultural grants scheme from the commission will be allocated to projects that benefit women.

In addition, a multicultural grants line will be dedicated to non-English-speaking background women's issues, and the office will also endeavour to assist and encourage ethno-specific community groups to develop appropriate projects for the centenary celebrations and to develop appropriate projects and strategies which recognise the contribution of women to the community generally. The office has established formal and ongoing links with the executive officer for the women's suffrage centenary celebrations. Ms Loine Sweeney and Ms Vaia Proios representing women of non-English-speaking background in the women's suffrage centenary steering committee are the officers with whom contact has been made.

Mr INGERSON: Is there a problem with the appointment of the CEO to the Ethnic Affairs Commission, as it seems to be taking almost as long as the appointment to the MFP, and is there any further difficulty with the appointment of the Deputy Chairman of the commission?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is no problem. On Thursday, the Governor in Executive Council will, we hope, accept the recommendation of Cabinet that Mr Paolo Nocella be appointed as the CEO as well as maintain his position as Chair of the commission. That is consistent with what has happened with some other boards, for example, the Economic Development Board, which has an executive chair.

In the meantime, I want to pay tribute to the significant work that Alex Gardini has done as acting CEO following the retirement of Mr Trevor Barr, who was an excellent CEO for the office, and that has been previously acknowledged. Mr Gardini has fulfilled that job with great skill in the intervening months. The commission has had a Deputy Chair since May last year, and I refer to Basil Taliangis, who is still Deputy Chair. He is currently in Greece. Ms Dagmar Egen was previously Deputy Chair for a time, and there was a vacancy between the two. So, that position has been filled.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that significant funds have been spent on media education as it relates to racial matters and other issues involving the multicultural and ethnic area. What general process has occurred, and what budget figure is involved?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The sum of \$90 000 was involved in these two projects—\$20 000 involved State funds and the balance was Commonwealth funds. The project was completed in December 1992, and the project report evaluation was presented to the Canberra Office of Multicultural Affairs. The project represented a three-tiered approach to contributing to a socially-cohesive South Australia by influencing the attitudes and behaviour of people working in the media industry and student journalists, bringing about changes in media organisations and the school of journalism of the University of South Australia, empowering Aboriginal people and people of non-English speaking backgrounds to work more successfully, confidently and skilfully with the media.

The report's recommendations will be examined and further initiatives will be developed, subject to resources being available. The recommendations of the media report will be followed through and, where appropriate, will be implemented by officers of the community relations branch in partnership with appropriate agencies. I had the chance to attend only one of the sessions organised under this project—the very first one—and I found that an excellent occasion. I have heard very good reports about the matter since. A community relations resource kit, which was an outcome of this, was launched in December 1992. That can be purchased from the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs for \$40, but I am quite sure we could arrange for a free copy for the Opposition if required. The kit will be updated where appropriate.

Mr INGERSON: Quite a number of chambers of commerce with a specific ethnic base have been developed. What role are the chairmen playing in the development of trade with specific countries? What was the general cost last year for overseas travel of any commissioned staff?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are now 17 country-specific or region-specific chambers or business councils in South Australia. Just as an aside, I am pleased to say that the amalgamation which is now in progress of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the South Australian Employers Federation will see closer links with these chambers, and we are keen to support the establishment of those closer links. The seven new chambers that have been formed in the past 12 months are: the African, Australian/Croatian, Czech, Polish, Russian/Australian, Spanish and Ukrainian/Australian Chambers of Commerce. There are currently moves to establish Hungarian, South African, British and Thai chambers. There is, of course, the grants scheme. Establishment grants of up to \$3 000 are available for such chambers, and specific project grants of up to \$5 000 are available.

A number of chambers have already received grants under that scheme. A chambers network has also been established. That consists of a number of people, including Mr John Valero, Project Manager, Export Access; Mr Lindsay Thompson from the Chamber of Commerce Export Centre, which is supported by the Government; Mr Malcolm Clements of Bonaire Pyrox; Mr Marty Williams, the Business Information Librarian of the State Library; Dr Leon Gianneschi of the Economic Development Authority; Mr Robert Bean of the National Language and Literacy Institute; Mr Jim Wilson of the Research Institute for Asia and the Pacific; Mr Victor Duranti of the Office of Multicultural Affairs; and Ms Sylva Footner of CEDA.

In terms of support from the commission, there is certainly officer support, and the Chair of the commission is a keen supporter and some of his energies would be devoted towards

helping to establish these new chambers. In terms of other activities, Mr Basil Taliangis, Deputy Chair of the commission, is presently in Greece supporting the Hellenic Australian Chamber of Commerce participation in Helexpo, the Thessalonica trade fair. Following my visit to Greece in January, South Australia was offered free space at that expo. That free space has been passed on to the Hellenic Australian Chamber of Commerce, and we have supported that by sending an officer of my office and Mr Basil Taliangis to support the chamber while it is over there. This has been seen as a very good initiative which has been well supported by business that want to promote trade with Greece. We have also provided support at various times to the Italian Chamber's participation in expo's overseas, and will, for example, be providing some support to the technology fair in Turin in November, which is a high technology fair. We have not yet determined the final nature of that support, but that has been asked for by the Italian Chamber, and we are happy to oblige.

Mr INGERSON: What was the cost of that to the department?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can have those details tabulated and submitted by 1 October.

Mr HOLLOWAY: One of the objectives of the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs is to promote South Australia as a migration destination. It is estimated that the unit will help 800 clients this year. Are they all in the business immigration category?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: They are in various categories. Skill migration is also of interest to us. We are also keen where possible to attract general migrants to South Australia. I do not have the latest figures as to what our share of migration is. We will supply those figures by 1 October and I will provide a more detailed report by 1 October on the work of this particular unit of the commission.

Mr HOLLOWAY: In relation to the performance indicators referred to earlier by the Leader of the Opposition about the interpreting assignments and translating assignments, could we be provided with statistics on the number of languages that are now dealt with so we could get some idea as to how things are changing?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are approximately 80 languages. We will provide a table of the changing pattern of language in demand over the years.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In view of the time and with the consent of the Premier, I will read these remaining matters into the *Hansard* and replies can be made available in due course. With respect to the provision of language services: what languages are covered by the full-time staff of the Language Services Centre, how many assignments did the centre provide interpreters for in 1992-93, and how many translations were produced?

There are a number of matters in terms of the Auditor-General's Report: Promotion of multiculturalism. At page 200 of the Auditor-General's Report, grants to ethnic organisations last financial year totalled almost \$218 000. Will the Premier provide an itemised list of those grants? This financial year, grants to ethnic organisations will be almost \$36 000 less than last year's actual allocation. Will the Premier explain the reason for the reduction?

The Financial Statement at p. 2.29 states that \$50 000 will be provided to support multicultural festivals this year. What financial support was given to the festivals last year? The papers provide some detail of the explanation for this year. The Financial Statement indicates that funds will be provided for the Centre of Intercultural Studies and Multicultural Education to support the establishment of an intercultural information network. What level of funding will be provided for this purpose?

The Financial Statement indicates that an additional allocation be made to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training to fund tertiary level education, language education and language as a commercial significance to South Australia. What will this allocation be? What is the Government's total spending this financial year on the teaching of languages of commercial significance? What languages are being given priority under this program?

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the effluxion of time, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.2 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 15 September at 11 a.m.