

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 September 1980

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B**Chairman:**

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

The Hon. Peter Duncan
 Mr. T. H. Hemmings
 Mr. G. R. Langley
 Mr. J. Mathwin
 Mr. J. K. G. Oswald
 Mr. R. J. Randall
 Mr. I. Schmidt
 Mr. J. W. Slater

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.***The CHAIRMAN:** I have received the following letter:

Mr. E. K. Russack, M.P.,
 Chairman,
 Estimates Committee B,
 House of Assembly.
 Dear Mr. Chairman,

I have been advised of the resignation of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran from Estimates Committee B, and pursuant to paragraph (10) of the sessional orders I nominate Mr. J. W. Slater, M.P., in substitution.

B. C. EASTICK, Speaker, House of Assembly
 I draw the Committee's attention to the draft time table for examination of proposed expenses, which each Committee member should have in front of him. I should like members to peruse that, and ask whether someone would move that the time table for examining the items of proposed expenditure be as circulated. It will be noted that the time table covers the full six days of sitting.

Mr. MATHWIN: I move:

That the time table as laid out for Estimates Committee B be accepted.

Mr. SLATER: I second the motion.

Motion carried:

Services and Supply, \$4 214 000

Witness:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Acting Premier, Deputy Premier, and Minister of Mines and Energy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. W. Voyzey, Director-General, Department of Services and Supply.

Mr. C. Crisp, Director of Chemistry, Chemistry Division.

Mr. D. Woolman, Director and Government Printer, Government Printing Division.

Mr. B. Lock, Acting Director, A.D.P. Centre Division.

Mr. J. Tanner, Acting Director of State Supply, State Supply Division.

Mr. R. Dundon, Director of Support Services, Support Services Division.

Mr. B. Guerin, Executive Assistant, Public Service Board.

The CHAIRMAN: We are all feeling our way in relation to procedure. However, I inform members that I will call on any Committee member who indicates that he wishes to

ask a question. That question will then be referred to the Minister (in this case the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, who is at present Acting Premier) and, if the Minister wishes one of his officers to give information on that question, the Minister will indicate that officer.

Questions will now be asked regarding the Services and Supply Department. I point out that the official documents will be the Estimates of Expenditure, Parliamentary Paper No. 9, and the Loan Estimates, Parliamentary Paper No. 11. All members have a copy of the Programme Description of Departmental and Selected Agencies' Financial and Manpower Allocations Proposed for the Financial Year 1980-81.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I should like to make a brief comment in order to clarify some of the information with which the Committee has been provided, and, in the process, I hope to facilitate its deliberations.

The Department of Services and Supply was formed on 1 July 1976 by the amalgamation of four separate organisations, namely, the former Government Printing, Chemistry and State Supply Departments and the A.D.P. Centre Division of the Public Service Board. A consequence of this amalgamation was some lack of uniformity in accounting systems and operations across the department which, incidentally, has almost been rectified.

Although this department has been among the first to introduce corporate planning and programme budgeting into its operations, a further 12 months will be required to develop its accounting and management reporting systems so that they will provide complete information in its most useful form for programme budgeting.

Of further importance is the fact that the State Supply, Government Printing and A.D.P. Centre Divisions charge their clients for the services they provide (the Chemistry Division charges only non-Government clients), therefore operating on a commercial basis and being largely self-funding.

For this initial attempt at programme performance budgeting, the department has allocated to each of its programmes the total of costs incurred (fixed, variable, direct and indirect) in carrying out that programme. These costs include such things as interest, depreciation of plant and buildings, P.B.D. charges, rentals, etc., which do not appear under the Department of Services and Supply in the Estimates. The programme budgeting figures are also prepared on a commercial basis involving accrual accounting, unlike those in the Estimates which, in the normal Treasury pattern, are on a cash basis.

The figures appearing in the programme budgeting papers, therefore, are not the same as those appearing in the Estimates. The two sets of figures can be reconciled, although this is a time-consuming business. More appropriately, the programme budgeting figures can be reconciled with those appearing in the operating statements for the department included in the Auditor-General's Report, since these represent the actual costs of the department's operations.

Present with me today are the following departmental officers: Mr. W. Voyzey, Director-General; Mr. C. Crisp, Director of Chemistry; Mr. D. Woolman, Director and Government Printer; Mr. B. Lock, Acting Director, A.D.P. Centre; Mr. J. Tanner, Acting Director of State Supply; and Mr. R. Dundon, Director of Support Services.

I also point out that, although he is not an officer of the department, Mr. Bruce Guerin is present with these officers. He has been appointed Chairman of the Data Processing Board, which was recently set up by the Government, to take charge of computing investigations

for the Government and the implementation of computing recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask each member to refer to the line to which he is speaking, as I want to ensure that members are confined to the appropriate line. My method of calling a member will be that if it is obvious that a member is pursuing one line of questioning, I will give him the opportunity to follow that line, provided questions are not repetitious. Are there any questions?

Mr. RANDALL: I understand that members who are not assigned to the Committee may sit in the Chamber and observe proceedings and, at some later stage, ask questions.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Members of the House of Assembly who wish to do so can sit on the benches as Mr. Bannon and Dr. Hoppood are now doing and, at the conclusion of questioning by Committee members, may ask questions, provided those questions have not been previously covered by the Committee. As there seem to be no further questions, I declare the expenditures open for examination.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to "Office of Minister, Administrative and Clerical Staff" and the increase in actual payments in 1979-80 from \$117 927 to the proposed expenditure for 1980-81 of \$126 670. Can the Minister explain this increase?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The increase is due to a reclassification of one Ministerial officer from grade 5 to grade 2. The same number of people are in the Minister's office, but one Ministerial officer was appointed to a higher grade than had previously been the case. The increase in the proposed expenditure is simply due to the full year's payment of the officer and an award increase. Initially the expenditure over Budget last year resulted from one officer being appointed at a higher level than the previous officer, who was a grade 5 officer. This increase is simply the normal incremental salary increase in relation to the officer in the Deputy Premier's establishment.

Mr. LANGLEY: I refer to "Office of the Director-General, Management Services Officers, Administrative and Clerical Staff". Last year the vote was \$134 699, actual payments were \$117 699 and the sum proposed is \$293 762, which is more than double last year's actual payments.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There was a delay in filling two clerical vacancies pending investigations into the requirements of consolidating various administrative and accounting functions into the office of the Director-General, and what is apparently a very large increase in this year's vote is the function of award increases. This increase is due to the transfer of non-clerical officers from other divisions into the office of Director-General. This is not increasing the head count but is simply a transfer of officers into the Director-General's office. Also, I refer to the appointment late in 1979-80 of the Director of Support Services and a senior accountant, as well as the proposed appointment of a finance officer during 1980-81. That accounts for the proposed increase.

Mr. LANGLEY: The increase in the number of officers was because they had been transferred from other parts of the Public Service?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Earlier I referred to the transfer from other divisions within the Department of Services and Supply. It is a reallocation of officers from other divisions into the office of Director-General. In all, there were nine transfers. In other words, there is a consolidation of some activity into the office of Director-General. Those nine salaries now appear on this line, but that was not the case last year when they were dissipated through other divisions of the department. This transfer

has been within the department. There may have been a transfer from the Printing Division, the Supply Division or the Chemistry Division, but it was an in-house restructuring. One of the results is an extra nine salaries in this line.

Mr. SLATER: I refer to "Office of Minister". How many administrative and clerical staff are involved in the amount allocated, and what is the capacity and level of those officers?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In total there are eight officers in the Minister's office, which was the case last year. I would have to get the actual salaries of those people for the honourable member. There is the Secretary of the Minister's office, four females, one other male clerk, and two Ministerial officers. I do not have the actual salaries, but I can get that information.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Following the question asked by the member for Napier, and in relation to administrative and clerical staff, I ask who is the officer who had a significant upgrading from grade 5 to grade 2, and what was the reason for that upgrading.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The one officer who was formerly employed in the Deputy Premier's office as a grade 5 officer was a female whose name I do not know. She was appointed by the former Deputy Premier and left the chain of Government as did the then press secretary. I appointed two Ministerial officers in their stead. In the case of the officer replacing her (I think Mr. James Kimpton), his qualifications and duties merited a higher classification.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Was that reclassification recommended by the Public Service Board?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, this was a Ministerial appointment.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Deputy Premier stated in answer to a query regarding "Management Services, Officers, Administration and Clerical Staff", which shows an increase of \$293 762, that that relates to movements within the Department of Services and Supply. I think the Minister mentioned nine persons being involved, but in the Estimates of Resource Allocation I cannot pick up any real movement of manpower between the divisions. Will the Minister explain where those transfers are coming from, whether they have already taken place or, if not, when they are expected to take place?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is shown in a manpower table on page 67. It represents actual figures as at 30 June. The figure of 660 represents an average figure taken over the 12 months. That figure, in fact, takes account of the fact that over that period there were a number of vacancies in the department that were not filled. There would appear to be an increase in the manpower within the department but, in fact, at one stage during the year there were more than 50 vacancies that had not been filled. I understand that there is a decrease in the manpower allocation for the department. Those figures are taken at a specific date. It would be incorrect to say that during any specific period that was the number actually in that job.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister quoted staff movements which accounted for the increase here from about \$117 000 to about \$293 000 but, on looking at page 67, I cannot pick up any movement as regards the actual and proposed figures. Will the Minister give some indication where the nine people in question came from and where they are going?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Mr. Dundon is the Director of Support Services and is intimately involved in these transfers. He may be able to identify the actual movement for the honourable member.

Mr. Dundon: The figures shown on page 67, as the

Minister said, were actual figures recorded as at 30 June 1980. Against "Support Services" is shown a figure of 19. In fact, on 30 June this year, on moving into new accommodation, nine staff members were shifted from various divisions into the Support Services Division as at 30 June. Therefore, for the whole of the previous financial year there have been only 10 people in the Support Services Division. Those transfers occurred on the last day of the financial year. The salaries for those transfers are allocated into next year's Budget, but they do not show up in the previous year. Those transfers are also offset in the actual figures for the other programme areas.

Mr. HEMMINGS: We have established that the transfers were, in effect, all into the Support Services Division and that there were originally 10 people there and now there are 19. Where did the other nine people come from?

Mr. Dundon: Seven of those people came from Supply and Disposal of Materials and Requisites, one from Analytical Chemistry and one from A.D.P. Services.

The CHAIRMAN: Reference has been made by the member for Napier to the document headed, in part, "Estimates of Resource Allocation", which I think, to make it easier, we will refer to as the programme papers.

Mr. LANGLEY: It appears that in every case staff clerical and administrative salaries have increased. The Minister mentioned that there has been an increase but that it has not made any difference to the department. Will he explain this matter?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: As I said before, figures for last year in these programme papers are averaged throughout the year. I point out that there were continuing periods where positions were vacant. I think there were more than 50 positions where at some stage applications were called and positions not filled. These figures represent the actual number of people in employment. It is anticipated that some of those positions, if not all, will be filled progressively. This is an estimate of what the numbers will be during the coming 12 months although, as I have indicated, there has been no increase in the staff ceiling for the department, but a large number of vacancies at various times were unfilled.

This is an average. Let us say, for argument's sake, that one office was filled for six months; that would appear as half an officer when one comes to the average. That accounts for the fact that, although there appears to be an increase in the actual number of people employed, there is no increase in the staff ceiling for the department. It is simply that some offices will be filled this year that were vacant at the end of the financial year.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does this figure of 670 include temporary offices under the Public Service Act?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes.

Mr. HEMMINGS: When I queried where the nine people came from I got a satisfactory answer. The Director stated the areas those people came from. On having a quick look through at the salaries for clerical staff, despite projected increases in salaries over the next financial year, one would expect, if there had been cases of people moving from one division to another, that that would reflect in those salaries, but in every case there is a significant increase in the amount. Can the Minister explain why there is no significant decrease in those amounts?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There is a decrease apparent in some of the lines. For instance, under the State Supply Division, the salaries bill last year was \$1 026 380 and this year is anticipated at \$959 779. That also includes the escalation in salaries so the difference in that one line is more marked than appears there. There

are examples that I think we can find where there is a decrease in the budgeted amount. On the same page, for magazine keepers, there is a decrease from \$53 045 to \$42 504, and so on.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Where is this?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In the Chemistry Division. A lot of these are masked by the fact that on every line there is the inevitable increase due to salary increases. There may appear to be an increase, but this is more than offset by the increase in salaries across the board.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I accept the Minister's answer to a certain extent, and perhaps the only area where we can look at a significant decrease is under State Supply Division, where the salaries decreased by about \$40 000. When we are talking about an increase from \$117 699 to \$293 762, this is a considerable increase. The answer given to us was that nine people had been transferred from different divisions.

Even allowing for the increase in salaries due to wage increases, one would expect that an increase of about \$180 000 would be reflected in other areas. It is not, and the answer was that, under the Chemistry Division, the provision for magazine keepers has decreased from \$53 045 to \$42 504. We were talking about clerical officers, not "Magazine Keepers, labour as required". I think we can dispense with that. We are talking about an increase of about \$180 000, and one would expect a comparable decrease in other divisions if nine people were transferred to the office of the Director-General.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that \$180 000 spread over the whole of these lines would be pretty thin, but I repeat what I said in relation to the filling of some positions which, until this time, had not been filled. There was the appointment late in the financial year of the Director, Support Services, and of a Senior Accountant, so that had minimal effect on last year's Budget, but the full impact will be felt this financial year. I also indicated that it was proposed to appoint a Finance Officer. That position was vacant. We intended to fill that during 1980-81. I think one can say that the \$180 000 is spread over several areas, and two senior officers were appointed late last financial year. That will have full impact this year and had minimal impact last year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: For the A.D.P. Centre, under the item "Director, Programmers, Computing, Administrative and Clerical Staff", there is an increase of about \$311 000 for 1980-81. Can the Minister explain what that increase is for? It does seem larger than the normal inflationary rise one would expect.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Again, that increase was due to the fact that some vacancies will be filled. There will be the full impact of the effect of wage increases that have occurred during the past 12 months, and also of award increases expected in the current year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I accept what the Minister said previously about the programme for 1979-80 being at 30 June. The Minister does not expect the staff in A.D.P. Services to be increased, according to the programme papers, yet in the reply to my question he spoke about an increase.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I said that there may be some vacancies in the A.D.P. establishment. I do not think that one can take too much notice of the figures on page 67 of the supplementary document. The figure of 105 is simply an average for the 12 months and I do not think that what is shown in the proposed budgeting can be taken as firm.

Mr. HEMMINGS: We have now to accept that any manpower figures in the programme papers are to be

taken with a grain of salt. If we are talking about two vacancies yet to be filled, is the Minister saying that the 105 at 30 June included those two unfilled vacancies, or were they people working within the department?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I agree that you have to take the figures on page 67 as indicative, not as precise, because the 105 for 1979-80 is a figure at a certain date, and, in a department employing that number of people, the number is subject to fluctuations. The figure for 1980-81 in the programme is only indicative and can vary up and down. I said that we anticipated filling some vacancies that were not filled last year. I think that the figures have to be taken with a grain of salt.

The CHAIRMAN: This is stated on page 1 of the programme papers:

What has been attempted here should be taken as a draft and as only the first steps in a longer term process to provide Parliament with a programme and a performance budget.

These documents do not provide a complete analysis of all the resources—financial, manpower and physical—required to carry out the designated programmes.

In most instances, departments and authorities were able to provide only approximate levels of these resources. Current accounting systems within departments and authorities are designed to provide accurate information for the existing line budget system but not yet for programmes.

Thus, the information here should be regarded as indicative rather than accurate to the last dollar and manpower number.

I should like the member to take note of that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Probably, Mr. Dundon can give more detail in explaining the increase in the allocation to the A.D.P. from \$1 459 872 to \$1 770 475. I indicated in round terms the factors that led to that. Mr. Dundon may be able to be more precise on the effect of wage increases and on wage increases expected during the year. I do not know whether he is able to comment on the impact of the vacancies. That represents a 20 per cent increase if we do the sums on that allocation. I think that perhaps 10 per cent would be taken up with award increases.

Mr. Dundon: The figure for 1979-80 is artificially low because during the year a number of positions were vacant for various periods and no expenses were incurred for salaries.

The increase, as the Minister has said, is about 20 per cent. Because the A.D.P. Centre charges clients for its services and operates in a self-funding manner, it builds into its budget from the word go the expected award increases for next year. It does not draw on the round sum allowance that is included for other divisions that are funded straight from the Revenue Budget. We are anticipating about a 10 per cent increase in award payments during the next year. Also, there was some carry-over of approximately seven per cent of the full effect of award increases awarded last year which will take into account the full year ahead.

That is higher than the average increase, but the Public Service received increases late in the financial year and early this financial year which bumped up the average award increase. We are talking about 17 per cent and 20 per cent roughly arising out of award increases and the fact that last year there was an artificially low salary figure due to vacancies which remained unfilled for a period of time.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I wish to pursue that line about unfilled vacancies. The Minister said when I questioned the increase that there were two unfilled vacancies which would be filled this financial year. I accept what the Director has said about award increases. Perhaps we could forget the figure of 105 for the moment, as the Minister

has agreed that we should take it with a grain of salt. Would the Minister advise when those two vacancies will be filled and in what area of the A.D.P. Centre they are?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We could get the Acting Director of the A.D.P. to highlight where those positions will be filled.

Mr. Lock: There is going to be a reallocation of staff within the division. There will be an increase in the Software Services Branch of two officers, with a corresponding decrease in the commercial applications area. Overall the additional positions will be in the Software Services Branch, where we have a need for more staff to keep pace with increasing work in that area.

Mr. LANGLEY: If that is the case, will there be no redundancies in that department at all?

Mr. Lock: No.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to the A.D.P. Centre, first, as I understand it the centre provides both in-house computer facilities for other departments as well as what might be described as a consultancy service. Is that correct?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes, that is correct.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: And its services are self-financing by billing other departments and Government agencies. What impact do Public Service manpower ceilings have on the ability of the A.D.P. Centre to provide these services? Given that the Government generally is pursuing a policy of computerisation in a number of areas, there does not seem to have been a dramatic increase. Does that mean that the efficiency of the department to provide services to client departments will be impaired because of Public Service ceilings?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think that there has been any dramatic movement toward additional computer services. Certainly, there is a move toward provision of computing services in departments, but I do not think that one can say that there has been any dramatic growth. It cannot be claimed that there has been any diminution in services.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What additional services have been provided to client departments in the past 12 months? Which departments have undertaken additional computer work loads during the past 12 months and which have been provided by your department?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think it is true to say that computers are available to provide more information because of the advances in technology than in the past. It is erroneous to conclude that, simply because there could be an increase in workload without an increase in manpower, the service cannot be provided. In fact, the other component in this is the computer and its ability to perform functions. It is in one area where there are significant advances so that, if machines are replaced, the new machines can do more than the previous machines, given the same level of manpower. In relation to the variation in the demands of departments, we will have to provide the honourable member with information. I am not aware of any spectacular changes in relation to the demands of the departments for computing services. Off the cuff, I suggest that spectacular changes have not occurred during the year, but it will be better if we get some more precise information for the honourable member and let him know.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is the Minister saying that all departmental computing requirements are being met at the present time?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am not really saying that. I do not suppose one will ever reach perfection in any Government department but I have not been aware of any

complaints. I think it is meeting the demands made on it at the moment.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was not seeking to question the quality of the services being provided. I was seeking information as to whether there are demands by departments for computer services which, at the present time, are not being met.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Not with respect to the A.D.P. Centre, I am advised.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What changes in policy in relation to the A.D.P. Centre have taken place within the last 12 months as to the use of the facilities as against private contracting of the computer needs of various departments.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No thought has been given to using private contractors to perform computing services for the Government. As I publicly announced in relation to the provision of computing activities, there has been no discussion with me about farming out work to the private sector. We have set up the Data Processing Board under the chairmanship of Mr. Guerin, and there is a great deal of investigative work being undertaken. Currently the Director of the A.D.P. Centre is overseas. He is due back in a couple of weeks. Mr. Guerin has been travelling interstate making extensive inquiries and will be going further. One of the roles of the Data Processing Board will be to provide advice to Government departments. Developments in relation to computers are so rapid that what may have been concluded in such a short period as two years ago may no longer be considered valid. When one is dealing with replacement machines, facilities and accommodation, it would be foolhardy to assume that all decisions made in the past were the right decisions, or, indeed, that a strategy which may then have appeared to be correct is still valid.

We are currently making an up-to-date assessment of present and future Government needs and the best way in which they can be met. There is no change in relation to the services provided by other companies.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Under which line do the staffing costs of the new Guerin Committee come?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is currently in the Department of Services and Supply vote. The sum of \$20 000 was allocated but it has not yet been earmarked. Of course, the Data Processing Board was established only recently. It is intended largely to staff that board by transferring personnel from the current establishment in the Public Service Board who have responsibilities in relation to data processing. It is envisaged that some of those staff members will be transferred to service the Data Processing Board and that there will be an allocation of funds. There was an allocation, which was not earmarked, of \$20 000 to the Department of Services and Supply. It probably appears under the provision of administration expenses under the office of the Director-General. I anticipate that that could be allocated, partly servicing the Data Processing Board.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: For convenience, can we deal with the Data Processing Board under this line? What are the board's terms of reference?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They have been announced, and I will read them to the committee. The board's terms of reference are as follows:

Co-ordinate, in co-operation with the responsible decision-making authorities, the development of data processing arrangements within the South Australian Government. In particular, the board will be required to:

advise on overall data processing needs within the Government;

formulate policies and establish strategies for the development of data processing arrangements to meet identified needs;

advise on priorities for allocation of resources for data processing developments;

in accordance with general policies and strategies, identify situations where integrated approaches may be most economic or desirable and co-ordinate developments designed to meet common needs or overall Government requirements;

ensure adequate arrangements to meet the needs of departments and instrumentalities unable or not wishing to undertake their own data processing operations;

appraise all proposals valued at more than \$50 000 for the development and acquisition of computer systems and related resources;

ensure the observance of appropriate and ethical procedures in the acquisition and development of computer systems;

advise the Treasury, Public Service Board and the Supply and Tender Board on the implementation of Government policies;

provide Government with expert advice on any general or specific data processing matter, in particular bringing to Government attention any matter associated with computing developments considered to be of significance;

provide Government with expert advice on any general or specific data processing matter, in particular bringing to Government attention any matter associated with computing developments considered to be of significance;

encourage co-operation in the development of data processing applications between departments and authorities;

assist in the establishment of sound planning and management processes in the Government generally;

monitor developments in data processing technology, applications and management and provide an information and advisory service for departments and authorities;

evaluate systematically the performance of data processing systems and facilities within the Government.

I think that I outlined those terms of reference broadly in the Ministerial statement that I made to Parliament. Although perhaps I did not go into quite that detail, I certainly outlined the details publicly when the board was established about four or five weeks ago.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is it now proposed to transfer from the Public Service Board officers who have previously dealt with data processing matters in a consultancy fashion to the board?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that the job specifications will be rewritten; it is proposed that this will happen. However, applications for at least some of the jobs will be called. It is not proposed that the group will be transferred holus-bolus.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Given the breadth of the terms of reference, there would seem to be some overlapping in the services provided by the Public Service Board and this board.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes. I envisage that the Public Service Board facility will be run down and that it will be taken over by the group that is servicing the Data Processing Board. However, it is not expected that we will take over the whole group; other expertise will be needed in certain areas. Current discussion proposals are being formulated in relation to the level of staffing, and I envisage that some of the people from the Public Service Board group will be employed in the support group for the

Data Processing Board. However, I would not envisage that necessarily all of them would be employed. In other words, there may be some new personnel in this new group. Certainly, some of them will be transferred directly.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: How many persons is it contemplated will be employed in this group?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Those matters are not finalised. I am having discussions on the matter, and I do not think it is proper for me to comment on matters that have not yet been decided. The board was created only four weeks ago, and the honourable member has had enough experience in government to know that one does not make instant decisions or have staffing levels and salaries approved within that space of time. However, these matters are currently being considered. The proposals have come to me recently and are being evaluated.

Mr. SLATER: I understand that the A.D.P. Centre's principal clients are Government departments and that the service is available also to clients outside the Government service. To what extent is that service available to instrumentalities outside the Government service, and what are those instrumentalities?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am advised that services are provided to ETSA and the Adelaide Children's Hospital; they have been provided to the Lotteries Commission but have not been for some time, and they have also been provided for the State Government Insurance Commission, but it is not being serviced presently.

Mr. SLATER: Are they the only ones?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Essentially, Government departments—Engineering and Water Supply, Education, Lands, Highways, Treasury, Health Commission, Public Buildings Department, transport services, the Services and Supply and Community Welfare Departments, the Public Service Board, and others.

Mr. SLATER: Is that charged against those instrumentalities and organisations? Is there a differential charge for the services provided to different organisations?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The same criteria are used for charging Government departments, statutory authorities and, in this case, the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

Mr. LANGLEY: I wrote to the Minister concerning outside work undertaken by the Government Printing Division, and the Minister's answer was similar to the answer he has just given to this Committee. Is work undertaken by the Government Printing Division for people outside the Government service?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think we do work for outside companies.

Mr. RANDALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I question the right of the member for Unley to ask a question about the Government Printing Division while the Committee is considering the A.D.P. Centre. In fairness to everyone, we should complete our questions on the A.D.P. Centre and then move on to printing services.

The CHAIRMAN: I previously suggested that we would follow one line of questioning and that as long as questions were on that line they would be in order.

Mr. RANDALL: I was concerned that confusion could result regarding whether the member was referring to A.D.P. services or printing services.

Mr. LANGLEY: I merely pointed out that I wrote to the Minister concerning the Government Printing Division. In referring to his reply, I was simply asking whether the same situation applied in respect to the A.D.P. Centre.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We do use private consultants for certain investigations, but we do not do

work for the private sector as such. However, the Government engages private sector consultants in some cases to work with Government officials to investigate areas on which the Government seeks further information. In that sense the Government has some contact with private firms.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member satisfied in regard to his point of order?

Mr. RANDALL: I was merely concerned that confusion may ensue.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask honourable members when they are speaking to refer to the line in question.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I note that the sum of \$517 000 is owed under "Sundry debtors" to the division as at 30 June 1980. Which departments are responsible for that figure, which comes from the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That sum is comprised of outstanding payments that Government departments have not made for services provided. The payments were outstanding at the end of the financial year. All accounts are not necessarily paid by 30 June, but they are payments from departments.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Which departments are they?

Mr. Lock: I will provide that information, but I will have to obtain it.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is merely a question of what is owing at 30 June. I will ask the Acting Director to comment.

Mr. Lock: The amount outstanding at 30 June was \$517 000, but that sum was \$300 000 higher than it should have been because a payment from the central processing of accounts system was not paid in on 30 June. About \$300 000 was paid in but was not reflected in the financial statement to which the honourable member is referring.

Mr. SLATER: Regarding the A.D.P. Centre, is a sum allocated for this financial year in regard to security control and the control of physical access to the area where the centre is located? To what extent is expenditure likely to occur this year?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think there has been any allocation this year regarding that matter.

Mr. SLATER: The Auditor-General reports:

In 1979 it was reported that the A.D.P. Centre had commenced implementation of some recommendations of the working party in regard to computer file integrity and control of physical access to restricted areas. However, structural limitations of the current accommodation prevent full compliance with physical security.

Has any action been taken to implement that recommendation and has any allocation been made in the Budget for this year to comply with that recommendation?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask the Acting Director to comment.

Mr. Lock: Action has already been taken to safeguard terminal equipment in the centre by keeping it in locked areas out of normal hours. We are restricted in what we can do to secure the centre itself because of the structural nature of the building. A considerable amount was spent some time ago in providing card-key access and security measures that presently exist. We have no plans to upgrade that in the future.

Mr. SLATER: Are there plans to relocate the centre?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I indicated earlier that that question and a number of other questions are being assessed and investigated. The Director of the centre is overseas and will be back shortly.

One of the tasks Mr. Guerin has undertaken for the Government is as Chairman of the Data Processing Board. That position entails gathering information and providing us with advice on equipment. Of course, allied with that is

the question of accommodation. We are actively pursuing those questions at the moment.

Mr. SLATER: When you say "we", to whom are you referring, the board or the Minister?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A group of people. Of course, it is Government responsibility, eventually, to authorise any purchase of equipment or accommodation, but that Government decision will be based on what I believe will be well researched evidence and will be put to the Government by Mr. Guerin, who is heavily involved. Support staff, the Director of the A.D.P. Centre, and the Public Buildings Department will be involved, and there will be a whole range of input into the final decisions.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I refer to the Data Processing Board, under the A.D.P. Centre line. I am interested in the terms of reference that the Minister was kind enough to read out to us. I note that those terms are wide ranging and detailed. I am particularly interested to know whether the administrative decision to set up a Data Processing Board was the subject of a family impact statement. As members will know the Liberal Government, before the last election, stated in relation to community welfare and, in particular, family impact statements:

The Liberal Party acknowledges the impact on the family of administrative and legislative decisions taken in a wide range of areas. We believe that Government and the community should constantly be aware of the importance of protecting the family from any undesirable effects which may flow from these decisions. Therefore, we will institute a system of family impact statements under which relevant State Legislation and major administrative decisions will be examined with a view to ensuring that such legislation and decisions have no adverse consequences for the family.

Was such a statement undertaken in this matter because, quite clearly, this is a matter of major administrative importance? It is a decision which is quite obviously going to have widespread implications for the Government at large. I would imagine that this is a good example of an area where the Government would be anxious to try out its new policy to ensure that this decision has no adverse consequences on the family.

The CHAIRMAN: I might say, before the Minister answers, that it is competent for the Committee to ask questions on matters of policy associated with the portfolio under discussion.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What the honourable member has said is perfectly true. This is a major administrative decision, so his preamble was perfectly correct. I do not have before me the detailed terms of reference for the scope of family impact statements but, of course, their purpose is to assess what effect legislative or administrative action taken by the Government will have on families in South Australia. A lot of material which comes before Governments obviously has minimal or no significant impact on families in South Australia. It may have some impact on families of members of the board, but that will probably be minimal, because they are anticipating sitting during the day. The establishment of this Data Processing Board will have minimal impact on families in the general community. That was a consideration, and it is a consideration in all proposals. If it is considered that a family impact statement is not relevant in certain circumstances, a statement is made to that effect.

I think the honourable member knows that, when one is proposing a range of social legislation that obviously has a family impact, a detailed family impact statement is relevant. In this case it was deemed not relevant.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I can well understand the

Minister's position and his reluctance to undertake family impact statements, in light of the fact that I believe it was a pie-in-the-sky concept originally and will cause the Government nothing but problems in future.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the member for Elizabeth is now commenting on policy. I did say that it was pertinent to ask questions on policy, but it is not in order to make comments.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would like to take a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman. Surely in this Committee I am entitled to make a speech on the matter if I wish. It is not the normal situation we are confronted with in daily Question Time: this is surely the normal procedure for investigating something in Government that has gone on over many years, and in the Committee stage members are quite competent to make speeches of up to, say, 10 or 15 minutes. In those circumstances, I believe that your ruling was not correct.

The CHAIRMAN: The fact of the matter is that we are endeavouring to keep to a time schedule, and there has to be some ambit in which we work. That is the reason I have called that to the honourable member's attention.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We can argue here for the rest of this session on whether or not family impact statements are appropriate. The fact is that in this case there are guidelines for the provision of family impact statements. If the honourable member disagrees with the Government's view in relation to them, he is perfectly entitled to do so. The answer is still valid; in a number of cases, administratively and otherwise, when it is assessed that a family impact statement is not necessary that is stated, and that is the position in relation to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Elizabeth that I was not ruling him out of order a moment ago: I was endeavouring to contain the discussion within the time limits.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am sure the Opposition is anxious to co-operate with you, Sir. I was somewhat surprised at the Minister's suggestion that the major administrative decision to create this board was not seen as having any impact on families in South Australia. Given the sort of matters that this board will be dealing with, the introduction of computer technology and the co-ordination of that introduction throughout the State, I would have thought that the impact on employment throughout South Australia, and therefore on the families of those employed, would be very great indeed over the next few years, and that, therefore, it was a matter that could well fall within the family impact statement policy.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In establishing the Data Processing Board, to postulate developments that could occur in future would be getting into the realms of the unknown. The establishment of the board as such was assessed not to have any great family effect. What will flow from that will be decisions that may well have an impact on the family, and each of those proposals will be assessed accordingly.

The decision to set up the board does not affect decisions made along the line or to be made in future. That would make a nonsense of it. Everything that the honourable member says is true but not relevant. A committee is in the process of being established by the Government in relation to technological change and the Government is not unaware of the matters raised by the member, but in my view they are irrelevant to the setting up of the board. It may be that other matters that flow from decisions of the board will be subject to a family impact assessment and statement, if relevant.

Mr. HEMMINGS: In reply to the member for Unley, the Minister said that the A.D.P. Centre had used private

consultants. I should like to ask the Minister how many private consultants were used last year, how much it cost to use them, and what were the names of the private consultants.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I did not say that. I said that the Government from time to time uses private consultants. I did not refer to any use of the A.D.P. Centre during the past 12 months. I made the general statement that, in relation to certain services, the Government does use private consultants. No private consultants were used last year by the A.D.P. Centre but the Government does use them from time to time and could well use them in relation to computing services.

Mr. LANGLEY: I refer to terminal leave entitlements, provided for on pages 24 and 25 of the Estimates. When these people have left, has someone taken that person's place or has the department said that it will not employ anyone else?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There are two points here. The variation in terminal leave payments in relation to what had been budgeted and what was paid is due to the fact that in some cases officers deferred retirement. In others, they took early retirement. The Estimates can show considerable variation, because some officers delay retirement and others retire early. That occurs from one financial year to the next.

The second point raised was in relation to the filling of vacancies. Some vacancies are filled fairly swiftly and some take a considerable time to fill. I think that, when I was talking earlier about manpower figures, I said that there was a stage when I thought upwards of 40 to 50 vacancies were to be filled at one time. At any given time, there is a range of vacancies to be filled. It cannot be claimed that the position is not filled. It is not filled immediately in some cases. There were two elements to the question. The first is whether there are variations in the budgeted figures in relation to payments. That is explained by the fact that some retirements are delayed and some are taken ahead of time. Secondly, there is no time scale by which a vacancy will be filled.

Mr. LANGLEY: If someone left and no-one replaced that person, the work load must fall on someone. A person remaining at work would have to carry the work load of the person who ceased employment.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is true.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister said that the A.D.P. Centre did not use private consultants last financial year but that from time to time the Government does use them. Can the Minister tell me whether the Government keeps a list of private consultants who are available for advice? I am speaking of his particular portfolio. Alternatively, is the matter let out for tender by private consultants for any particular function for which the Government wants to use them?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Government usually puts these proposals out to tender. I think it true to say that there is a fair amount of interest and competition in consultancy. Any consultancy firm that has expertise in a field would normally tender.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What policy has the Government in relation to the use of private contractors in the computing area, either software or hardware, to ensure that a rational approach is taken to the availability of computer services throughout the Government? If the Highways Department, for example, decides to have computer work done and it is put to private tender, has the A.D.P. Centre any say in that or will the Data Processing Board have any say? Is there any rationalisation throughout the Government? I suspect that there is not.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It depends on whether it is

a Government decision in relation to consultancy and, if it is a decision that falls within the responsibility of the department, it is the department's decision, a Ministerial decision. As indicated in the guidelines, one function of the Data Processing Board will be to provide expert advice to the Government and provide a service to departments. I would anticipate that departments would use the facilities. If they are currently available within the Government, they would be used within the Government. The policy is that Government computing facilities are provided to service the Government.

[Sitting suspended from 12.33 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the Minister?

Mr. HEMMINGS: On page 152 of the Auditor-General's Report is a line "Recoup for services of officers" and an amount of \$417 746. Will the Minister give some information as to what that is for?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is for the hire of programming staff by client departments.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister give more explicit information?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: People from A.D.P. work for Government departments from time to time and those departments are charged for their services. That is a recoup of money from departments in payment for those services.

Mr. LANGLEY: On page 25 of the Estimates is a line "Produce Office, Light Square—Administrative, Accounting and Clerical Staff". Will the Minister inform me as to what happened to the people concerned with that department?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A decision was taken to scale down the Light Square operations of the Government Produce Department, and that has been largely accomplished. The people still remaining there are Borthwicks. We agreed to allow them to stay there till the end of 1980 pending negotiations for further occupancy by them. They are having negotiations with the Public Buildings Department at the moment. We have arranged terms with Borthwicks so that there is no net cost to the Government. There has been a massive scaling down of the operations, which ran at a loss. The decision has been taken to close down operations, but we have negotiated with Borthwicks to allow them to stay until alternative premises become available. The clerical staff have been redeployed.

Mr. LANGLEY: I take it that some of these positions are in a reasonably high wage bracket. Have these people been re-employed?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In fact, they have. I do not know that they are in the higher wage bracket; one cannot assert that. The people who were employed at Light Square have been employed elsewhere. One of the conditions was that alternative employment would be offered to them, and that has happened.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister has advised me to some extent that they have been re-employed. As I am worried about the employment position, I would like the Minister to state where these people have gone, although I do not expect him to do that today.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: One of the undertakings was that nobody would be retrenched and that alternative employment would be found for the people employed at Light Square. That undertaking has been honoured. We do not have the details but we can certainly get the information for the honourable member. We will be pleased to detail the arrangements made for the people

that were employed at Light Square and state where they have gone.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Over a long period this department has had a lamentable record in the employment of women. A cursory glance at the Public Service list, when last printed in 1978, will show that there was only one female in the CO range in the department, much less the AO or the EO range. The Minister is under some obligation to tell the Committee what steps he intends to take to ensure that more women are employed at the higher echelons of this department. Looking at the Public Service list, one could be excused for thinking that the only roles open to women in this department are those of office assistants or folders. I presume that that is something to do with binding in the Government Printing Division. The fact that so few females are employed at a high level is an unsatisfactory position. What steps is the Minister taking to ensure that females are given greater opportunity in this department than has occurred in the past?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There is no bar whatever to women applying for senior jobs within the department or in any divisions of the department. If, on scrutiny of the current list of people employed in the department, one finds that there seems to be a dearth of women in senior positions, it is a reflection of steps that the previous Administration took or sought to undertake in that regard. There is no bar at all to women applying for positions within the department. We advertised recently for a Director of Supply. I do not think any women saw fit to apply for the position. So, if women are not interested in applying for the positions vacant, I do not know what the honourable member thinks we should do further. In the Government Printing Division the vast majority of employees are male. There is not much interest being shown by females in printing apprenticeships. When I was going around all of the divisions I noticed quite a few women doing laboratory work. In the Department of Chemistry there were males and females doing the same sort of work. That work is more attractive to women.

Likewise, in the Supply Division there were a large number of females. If women are not motivated to apply for printing apprenticeships, I do not know what the honourable member suggests we should do about it. Certainly, there is no bar to women applying for apprenticeships or for any of the senior jobs in which the honourable member says there is a dearth of women. Recently, we advertised for a Director of Supply, and no women applied.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am directing my comments at the higher ranges in the department. A survey of Public Service departments would show that some departments have been more successful than others in attracting women to higher positions, and I suggest that this department has had a poor track record in that respect. I do not deny that the former Labor Government bears a fair amount of responsibility for this. I merely want to know what the Minister intends to do about reassessing the position in order to ensure that more women have opportunities at the higher levels within this department.

To underscore my point, I need do little more than refer to the bevy of males that the Minister has brought with him today. A look at the Public Service list clearly indicates that, within this department, few women have availed themselves (to put the most generous interpretation on it) of the opportunity to take on senior positions or have been successful in applying for such positions.

I put this matter to the Minister so that he can indicate his concern regarding it and perhaps assure the Committee that he will ensure that women are given more

opportunities in the higher levels in this department.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is fairly obvious that, before women are likely to apply for senior jobs in the area about which we are speaking, it is essential that they have experience in the lower levels. It would be ridiculous to suggest that we could pluck a woman from a certain area of expertise and put her in charge of, say, the A.D.P. Centre or the Government Printing Division. One must have relevant experience. The fact is that in the past few women have been attracted into the printing trade to enable them to gain the breadth of experience necessary to apply for the position of Director of the Government Printing Division. I think that the honourable member is talking in circles in pursuing this line. If women with relevant experience in the lower levels apply for a more senior job, they will be considered.

I think that the honourable member is talking in circles in pursuing this line. If women with relevant experience in the lower levels apply for a more senior job, they will be considered.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did not want particularly to get to this level but, as the Minister has suggested that without the relevant experience at the lower levels a female cannot hope to be appointed to a higher position in the Data Processing Board, can he say what specific experience in the computer area Mr. Guerin had that made him suitable for appointment as head of the new Data Processing Board? That seems to explode the Minister's argument entirely.

I am not reflecting in any way on Mr. Guerin's ability to undertake that job. Indeed, I could not think of a person who would be more suitable for the job. Nevertheless, the Minister's argument is fallacious when he suggests that people need to have specific training in the area of data processing, or whatever, in order to undertake a higher position in the Data Processing Board, or, alternatively, in the processing centre.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Mr. Guerin is not a member of the department.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the allocation for "Magazine Keepers, labour as required", in the Chemistry Division. The allocation for 1980-81 is about \$10 000 less than the actual payments made in 1979-80. Will the Minister explain that reduction?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The decrease has occurred as a result of the reduction in one staff position which has been brought about as a result of improvements and efficiency. There has also been a slight drop in the number of explosives coming in. In the past, this was handled by a weekly-paid officer, who has left, and it was not necessary, because of the work load involved, to replace that officer.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can I take it then that, because of the increased efficiency, the person was retrenched or sacked?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, he retired.

Mr. SLATER: I refer to the allocation for the Government Printing Division. I understand that a three-year study was undertaken, beginning in 1972, in relation to the general operations of the Government Printing Division. This study related to a number of factors and was designed to improve the general standard of the division. Has that study been completed and, if it has, to what extent has it been implemented? Also, is it significant that the division's operating deficit is now \$99 284 compared to \$9 000 in 1978-79?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Price Committee has completed its investigations. That report was submitted to me some time ago as a result of some further discussions that occurred. Also, there was some amendment (although not major) to the report. Some improvements in

relation to the efficiency of printing facilities in Government departments has been effected during the ongoing course of the committee's investigations.

Before the committee had reported, a number of small printing facilities in Government departments had been disbanded, and, in order to achieve greater efficiency and economy, those activities were undertaken by the Government Printer. In fact, the final report went to Cabinet this week and has been accepted by it.

Regarding the deficit, one of the aims was to make the Government Printer delineate his functions and to ensure that the Government Printing Division was economically viable.

Mr. Woolman: The deficit of \$99 000 experienced during the past financial year was basically brought about by Parliament's rising last September for the election. This took out about six weeks of the Parliamentary session, for which we could not fill in work.

At the end of December we were looking at a deficit of about \$300 000 at the end of the financial year, because of the cutback in Government spending in many Government departments. We find that, where there is a cutback in Government spending, printing is one of the first things hit. Towards the last quarter of the last financial year Government spending in printing did increase and our sales to Government departments reclaimed some of the loss that we had encountered previously.

In connection with the deficit of \$99 000 at the end of the last financial year, if taken into consideration with the previous three years of the Government Printing Study Steering Committee, over that period we have a break-even situation, because the first two or three years of that study involved a slight surplus and, with the \$99 000 deficit in the last financial year, over that four to five-year period we have basically a break-even situation.

Mr. SLATER: At page 155 of his report the Auditor-General stated that the operations of the Government Mail Service resulted in savings of \$292 000 to the Government. What do the operations of that service entail?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It consists of bulk mailing. It attracts bulk postage rates. Instead of individual letters being sent out which would attract single postage rates, when many letters are sent out by Government departments, they are bulk mailed. This service is provided and results in a saving in the rates charged for postage which are reflected in this figure.

Mr. SLATER: Is this a recent innovation, or has it been under way for some time?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It has existed for about 15 years.

Mr. LANGLEY: Is it possible for a member of Parliament to use this service?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I would not think so. It is a service to Government departments, and no consideration has been given to that sort of extension.

Mr. SLATER: I am not clear about the Minister's explanation. If the scheme has been operating for many years, why is there a saving of \$292 000? Was a similar saving shown last year? Where is the saving?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The saving is over and above what it would have cost to post those letters under the normal rate.

Mr. SLATER: That would apply in previous years as well.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There would be savings, but they would depend from year to year on the amount of postage.

Mr. SLATER: Is this not a once only saving?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No. Former Auditors-General would have indicated such a saving.

Mr. SLATER: The amount varies?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It varies depending on the amount of postage and the rate of postage. Postage rates have increased dramatically recently and, therefore, the savings have increased dramatically.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the "Automatic Data Processing Centre Division, Expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance". I refer to the significant drop in the actual payment compared with the sum allocated in 1979-80 and the substantial increase in the amount proposed for 1980-81. Can the Minister say why there was a drop last year and why there is such a substantial increase this year?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The decrease resulted from a reduction in the leasing costs due to the late delivery of replacement equipment. Some charges were lower than was expected for modifications and upgrading of the building. The increase this year is due to additional interest and depreciation payments on the existing building and the site of the proposed A.D.P. Centre, and a full year's effective increase in equipment leasing charges; there was some late delivery which accounted for a reduction last year, but the full impact of the cost of leasing that equipment will be felt in the ensuing 12 months. Another factor was the refurbishment of some existing equipment.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have listened intently to the Minister's comments about terminal leave. The Minister said the Government has not any positions vacant and that positions may come up at any time. The Government has made a decision about its employees, claiming that they will not be retrenched in any way. However, I am worried that positions are still vacant, and the Minister has said that they may be vacant for some time, yet the unemployment situation in South Australia is not good. Can the Minister indicate how long those positions will be unfilled, because many people would like to fill them?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I did not say that there was a deliberate delay, but it is a fact of life that at any one time there is a varying number of vacant positions. It is also a fact of life that some of them cannot be filled at short notice. For example, I indicated earlier that we advertised for a Director of the Supply Department. By the time one goes through the processes of calling for applications, interviewing applicants, a decision from the selection panel being approved and the like, much time has elapsed. Each position is different, depending on the nature of the position and the applicants for it. There has been no deliberate hold-up, nor will there be, but it is a fact of life that there is a varying number of positions falling vacant at any one time and it takes time to fill them.

Mr. SLATER: Is it anticipated that there will be expenditure on additional plant and machinery for the Government Printing Division?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Government Printing Division is referred to in the programme papers. I think it has become fairly obvious that the information we have before us (and the Minister agreed with me earlier about this) one takes with a grain of salt. In reply to every question we have asked about the programme papers, we have been told that the figures are estimates or "guesstimates" and that, in effect, we cannot place any credence on them at all, and I am sure that this situation is going to unfold as we conduct the Estimates Committees over the next couple of weeks. I would like, therefore, to ask the Minister what was the cost of printing this programme. Also, does he feel that, as a result of printing it, there will be any benefit to

members of this Estimates Committee and other Estimates Committees sitting on subsequent days?

The CHAIRMAN: Before the question is answered, I ask the honourable member what line he is referring to.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Government Printing Division.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will have to find out the cost; I do not have it readily to hand. In relation to the value of the document, that judgment will have to be made by the honourable member himself. If he thinks that it is a waste of time, he will get plenty of opportunity to say so. There are, no doubt, other members who, if they read the document carefully, might find it is a source of information, even granted that some of the figures quoted are averages and others may be estimates. Nonetheless, there is a great deal of information in the document, and no doubt some members will find it very useful. If the honourable member does not find it useful, it is for him to say so at the appropriate time. As was pointed out previously, this exercise is in the nature of an experiment, but it does give more detail of expenditure in departments and does set out programmes for departments so that honourable members have some knowledge of what departments are about. That sort of value judgment, I think, is ultimately for the honourable member to make.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: All that might be so, but I am rather shocked to hear the Minister say that he cannot here and now give the information that was sought in relation to the cost of this document. The very idea of these Committees, we were told by this Government, was that the experts would be alongside the Ministers and would be able to prop them up in times of need. This seems to be a time of need, but the Minister has made no attempt to seek information from the Government Printer, or to ask him what was the cost of this document. It seems that the Minister is treating the Committee with a degree of contempt in the light of the way that the Government attempted to sell—

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Elizabeth that it is the Chair that will determine the attitude of the Minister.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Very good, Sir. In my view, and that of my colleagues, the Minister showed a degree of contempt in the way that he dismissed that question by saying that he would get the information for us, without even attempting to obtain that information from his officer sitting nearby. I think that that is not really good enough. Surely the Minister's attitude has not changed so much over lunch that he cannot continue to be a little co-operative with the Committee. I thought this morning that his attitude was, for him, relatively pleasant. He attempted to co-operate with the Committee. Surely the fact that he has had some indication that we are going to conclude these lines relatively soon allows his patience to remain in tact a little longer so that the Committee can continue to have a degree of co-operation in such matters.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I always enjoy the patronising remarks of the member for Elizabeth, and I always listen to his advice, but whether I take any notice of it is my business. Despite his assertions, the Government Printer tells me that he does not know the cost of this publication. It would have been charged out to the Premier's Department, I believe, which would have requested its printing. I would have thought that even the honourable member would think it impossible for the Government Printer to retain in his head details of the cost of literally hundreds of jobs that go through the Government Printing Office. I repeat, however, that I am perfectly happy to find out the cost of the document and make it available.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am fascinated by the

Minister's answer. All I sought was to have him ask the Government Printer, sitting almost alongside him, for this information.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I have asked. If the honourable member did not see me ask—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If that is the case, just as the Chief Secretary is looking for a press secretary who would obviously need to be a ventriloquist, then apparently the Minister claims that he is getting some sort of telepathic communication from his officers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The position is as I outlined at the outset: a member of the Committee asks the question through the Chair. That question is directed to the Minister, who has officers with him, and the Minister himself may answer the question; if he requests information from his officers, that is his business. As a matter of fact, the Minister does not have to answer the question, but in this case he has said that he will get the information. I consider that that is a reasonable answer and that the information will be forthcoming.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Let me clear up this point. If the member for Elizabeth did not see me ask the Government Printer a question, that is bad luck. In fact, I turned to the Government Printer and said, "Do you know?", and he said, "I have no idea." I asked the Government Printer that question—it does not have to be part of the formal approach.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that has clarified the situation. The honourable member for Napier.

Mr. HEMMINGS: It is good to see that the last line of questioning has attracted members on the Government side to participate in this debate. I congratulate them for at last taking an interest.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Napier to ask his question.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister widen the answer he intends to give me about the cost of printing the programme papers and find out what was the cost of this document as a whole to the Government? It contains 636 pages which are, it seems, full of useless information. It has obviously taken a lot of Public Service time, and Ministerial officers' time, to compile it, so will the Minister obtain for me the estimated cost to the Government of producing this report?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I did not say that it was not worth much. The honourable member is attributing to me words that I did not use but, ignoring that for the moment, I will be quite happy to try and get for him an estimate of what it cost to produce this document. As I have said, there will be every opportunity in due course for him to reflect on whether he believes that this exercise is worth while.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I will digress from the petty political point-scoring that we have heard from the Opposition members. I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, page 157, where the Auditor-General states that the stock turnover of \$9 537 000 in 1979-80 was \$1 140 000 less than in the previous year. One reason was that the general stores decreased by \$407 000, mainly as a result of a lower demand by Government departments, schools and approved clients. Is this an indication that the State Supply Division handles a lot of different outdated stock that is not relevant to the needs of Government departments or schools, and does it reflect a drop in the competitiveness of the department or delay in processing orders by clients?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That reflects a reduced allocation to some of the supply functions.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Does the State Supply Division buy at

the most competitive price and, if prices are similar, does it give preference to South Australian companies as against interstate companies?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There is a general policy of 10 per cent preference to State authorities. I think it is 15 per cent against overseas suppliers, so there is an attempt to get supplies at the cheapest possible price, with the State preference built into it.

Mr. SLATER: I refer to "Contingencies—Office of Minister—Overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved) and officers". The allocation is \$25 000. What is the purpose of the proposed visit overseas, and when is it likely to be undertaken?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member may have seen an announcement on Friday that I was to undertake an overseas visit. In South Australia, we are on the eve of development of the liquids and l.p.g. in the Cooper Basin, and there are other investigations in relation to maximising the effort in relation to gas discoveries. All these have been undertaken, and there are developments currently in Canada in these areas.

I am leaving on Sunday. There are other developments in Canada of value in the deliberations of the Government particularly in relation to uranium mining in Saskatchewan. Uranium mining is being undertaken at the moment, and I will see that. I will be having discussions in Canada in relation to the general energy question. In the U.K., I will be having discussions with the Atomic Energy Commission, British Nuclear Fuels, and Urenco-Centec in relation to the general question of enrichment.

I will be having discussions in Britain, France and Sweden to see the waste disposal techniques developed, and in Israel I will look at the latest developments in relation to harnessing solar energy. There are developments involving the development of solar energy from solar ponds. Finally, in Japan I will have discussions in relation to energy requirements and the nuclear energy industry.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister say who will be accompanying him on this trip, for which the allocation is \$25 000? The Minister has given a fairly modest description of what he is to do. I hope he shows a little more restraint when speaking to Ministers and officers in other countries than he shows to members of this Committee.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I have never had any complaint from my officers about the lack of restraint in speaking to them. I will be accompanied by the Deputy Director-General, Department of Mines and Energy, one of my Ministerial officers, Mr. Richard Yeeles, and my wife.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I ask the Minister whether he intends to follow my precedent and travel economy class, or whether he is going first class.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think we are travelling first class.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I ask the Minister why he is going first class and what justification he has for that. If the Minister has ever been overseas before on his own account, did he go economy or first class?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Regarding the first point, it has been normal practice to travel first class. Regarding the second point, I am undertaking a fairly exhausting tour. I understand it was the common practice of our predecessors to travel first class. I have been overseas on a couple of occasions previously, but I had not undertaken tours as exhausting.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: When the Minister has travelled at his own expense, he has gone business class, which we know is economy class, and now he is going first

class at the Government's expense.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am undertaking an overseas working tour on behalf of the Government and am following the normal practice, which is to travel first class.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The item states "where approved". Has the trip now been approved by Cabinet and did Cabinet approve that the trip for the Minister and officers be first class? If so, I wish the Minister all the best, because I think that, on \$25 000, he will be lucky to get back.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The answer is "Yes". Mr. Johns's expenses will be found by the Department of Mines and Energy.

The CHAIRMAN: Opportunity to ask questions will now be given to members who are seated in the back benches. Has any member a question?

Dr. Billard: Could you give some explanation of what the micrographic surveys are? The allocation has increased substantially.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I ask the Government Printer to explain. New equipment in micrographics has been ordered.

Mr. Woolman: In the Micrographics Bureau there is a new initiative that was set up by the Public Service Board in July last year. We had difficulty in starting the bureau and finally got it off the ground on 1 September last year, so the figure for last year included only nine months trading. Of that, the first six months was a starting-up period, when we were waiting on capital equipment to be built and commissioned. The bureau has been set up in three stages. We have completed stage 1 and are currently in the position of completing stage 2. Stage 3 is to commence in approximately January next year.

We have had some minor problems in establishing the bureau because of various departments having their own micrographic section. Transferring the work being done within the department to the bureau was a slow process. Figures for this current financial year, hopefully, will be as listed in the papers.

Dr. Billard: The administration costs of the A.D.P. Centre have increased considerably. Is there a large increase in manpower?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That answer will be in the record.

Mr. Keneally: I listened to a reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Duncan as to his own visit overseas, which I do not criticise. Under the Government Printing lines is an amount for overseas visits of \$8 300. I have often spoken in the House of officers, Ministers and members of Parliament going overseas, and I do not believe that it is an extravagance. Will the Minister tell me whether it is intended that his officers will be travelling overseas first class and what is the intention regarding the Government Printer regarding these lines?

Will officers of his department, that is, the Government Printer and officers of the A.D.P. Centre who have been listed for overseas visits—be travelling first class, which seems to be the standard that the Deputy Premier believes he is entitled to? If these officers are working equally as hard, if not harder than the Deputy Premier, will he extend to them the same benefit that he extends to himself?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There is some reference to the officers accompanying me who will be working hard: those officers will be travelling first class. On occasions some officers travel first class, and on other occasions they travel economy class. The Government Printer has just returned from an overseas visit, and I understand that he travelled economy class. I do know of some officers who

go overseas and, depending on the nature of the trip, some have gone first class, some business class and many economy class.

Mr. Keneally: I appreciate the historical answer that the Minister gave. However, I ask him what would be the class of travel of officers travelling overseas under these lines. He has already pointed out that he himself will be travelling first class. Will officers accompanying him travel first class? What class will officers travel who do not have the benefit of accompanying the Minister? I refer to the two lines involving the Government Printer and the A.D.P. Centre: will these officers travel economy or first class? The rationale that the Minister used to justify his own travel first class was that he would be extremely busy and that it would be an exhausting trip. I am sure that that is right and I do not cavil at it.

The Minister may justify travelling first class under that criterion, but he is obviously evading the question that I am putting. When he travels overseas on an extensive trip he believes that he ought to go first class but when officers of the Public Service travel overseas on an exhaustive tour, doing work for the Government, the State and the people of South Australia, he believes that they ought to travel economy class. The Minister wishes to have it both ways. However, it is reasonable for the Parliament to be clearly advised as to how this Government treats its public servants when they are required to work for the State.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member complains that I am not entirely specific. On occasions some officers travel first class, some business class and some economy class. Money has been put aside, but these trips have not yet been authorised. The overseas travel will be, as it is in 99.9 per cent of cases, as recommended by the Overseas Travel Committee. I do not think any of these figures put on the Estimates for possible overseas trips by officers have as yet been authorised. As the honourable member should know, these matters are considered by the Overseas Travel Committee, and in most cases the recommendations of that committee, including the class of travel, are accepted.

Mr. Keneally: The Deputy Premier is trying to tell this Committee that the Government itself has no say in how public servants travel overseas and that the Government does not have a policy. I am asking the Deputy Premier to tell the Committee whether officers for whom he is responsible will enjoy the same mode of travel when they go overseas as that which the Minister himself would enjoy. Is the Minister trying to tell the Committee that he, as Deputy Premier, will not have any say in the mode of travel of his officers? That is patently ridiculous. He ought to be able to tell the Committee one way or the other quite clearly whether or not he will personally authorise his officers to travel first class. If he will not authorise them to travel first class he should state the reasons.

I know that members on the Government bench are interested in this, and I hope they will be supporting me, as people will want to know the Minister's policy on overseas trips involving Government officers. The Hon. Mr. Duncan said that on his trip he travelled economy class. It is therefore reasonable for him to ask his officers to travel economy class. If the Minister is travelling first class, how can he ask his officers to travel anything but first class?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I suppose one could say that it was for the same reason that members of the previous Administration rationalised their trips. The fact is that the officers travelling with me are travelling first class. Other officers who may be undertaking overseas travel will have their trip examined in the first instance by the Overseas Travel Committee, which investigates the

purpose of the trip and provides a report which Cabinet then views. A decision is made in relation to the mode of travel as a result of representations of the Overseas Travel Committee and a recommendation by Cabinet.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What changes in Government policy have taken place as a result of the effect of the Administration of which the Minister is a member in relation to overseas travel of officers? Under the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations, the Overseas Travel Committee never considered such matters as the class of travel. The officials travelled economy class as a matter of Government policy, unless they were travelling with the Minister, in which case they travelled the same class that the Minister travelled.

As the member for Stuart said, it was always my policy when I became a Minister in 1975 that I travelled economy class, whether internally or internationally, and all officers of the Law Department, and subsequently the Health Commission, did likewise. First, has there been a change of policy, as the Minister's suggestion that the class of travel is now determined by the Overseas Travel Committee seems to indicate, and, secondly, what justification is there for the Minister to travel first class when he has already admitted that previously, when he went at his own expense, he went economy class? If it is good enough for the Minister to go economy class when paying for himself, surely it is good enough for him to do likewise when the taxpayers are paying for him to go overseas.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It seems to me that there has been no change of policy from what the former Minister has stated. I should have thought that, if it was good enough for Labor Ministers to travel overseas first class, it would be good enough for Ministers of the present Government to do likewise. The Overseas Travel Committee makes a recommendation regarding the cost of a trip and the class of travel involved. Invariably, the class of travel is mentioned.

Mr. Keneally: One of the planks on which the Government went to the people at the election was its policy of financial responsibility: it was going to cut costs. However, that intention does not seem to relate to Ministerial travel. It is the responsibility of Ministers to take overseas trips. Indeed, it would be irresponsible of me to suggest that Ministers could not benefit from seeing what is happening overseas. However, in this area the Government could take the lead of the member for Elizabeth and cut costs. When Government members talked about cutting costs, they did not imagine that such cuts would apply to their own welfare.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What is the Public Service level of the Director of the Automatic Data Processing Centre? For some reason, unlike the other sections, this figure has not been printed in a separate line but has been absorbed into the allocation for the Director, programmers, computing, administrative, and clerical staff.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that he is an EO2.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What salary is attached to that level?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that it is about \$32 700 a year.

Mr. SLATER: I refer to the allocation of \$8 300 for overseas visits of officers in the Government Printing Division in 1980-81. Where will the officer concerned be going, and for what purpose will he be going there? Also, what class of travel will he undertake?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Government Printer returned only last week from his overseas study. If the honourable member wants a full explanation of where the Government Printer went and what he saw, the

Government Printer may be prepared to give him that information directly.

Mr. SLATER: No, that is not necessary. I did not realise that the trip had already been undertaken. The money was allocated for expenditure in 1980-81. Obviously, the Government Printer got in fairly early.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes, he has just returned from that trip.

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

Department of Services and Supply, \$1 700 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Dr. B. Billard
The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr. T. H. Hemmings
Mr. G. R. A. Langley
Mr. J. Mathwin
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald
Mr. I. Schmidt
Mr. J. W. Slater

Witness:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Acting Premier, Deputy Premier, and Minister of Mines and Energy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. W. Voyzey, Director-General, Department of Services and Supply.

Mr. C. Crisp, Director of Chemistry, Chemistry Division.

Mr. D. Woolman, Director and Government Printer, Government Printing Division.

Mr. B. Lock, Acting Director, A.D.P. Centre Division.

Mr. J. Tanner, Acting Director of State Supply, State Supply Division.

Mr. R. Dundon, Director of Support Services, Support Services Division.

Mr. B. Guerin, Executive Assistant, Public Service Board.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the allocation for the purchase of printing machinery, etc. Last year, there was an astronomical reduction from the \$1 508 000 estimated to be spent in 1979-80 to \$610 801 actually spent in that year. One sees, from looking at page 155 of the Auditor-General's Report, that the \$610 801 purchased only five machines. Considerable concern has been expressed by Opposition members and others outside this place that there is a general delay in the printing of reports. One can put this down to the fact that the Government, for reasons known only to itself, decided to purchase very little new machinery for the Government Printing Division last financial year.

Indeed, I can refer to a specific example, namely, the report commissioned by the Minister of Health dealing with the provision of dental services in this State. When a member of the Australasian Society of Dental Technicians contacted the Minister's office only two or three weeks ago to inquire when the report would be available, he was told that the report was, in effect, ready. However, there was a

real problem in the Government Printing Division in relation to printing that document.

The reason was given by the Minister's office (it was from the Minister of Health's office and not from the Government Printer) and perhaps the Government Printer can correct the situation. It was claimed that there was insufficient staff working in the Government Printing Division and that machinery was so obsolete that it was unable to cope with that and other reports in the pipeline—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Minister did a bit of buck shoving.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That may be the reason, that the Minister's officers were trying to explain why the report was not available and used the Government Printer as a scapegoat. Almost \$1 000 000 of the sum allocated last year was not spent. The Auditor-General indicated that only five new machines were purchased in the last financial year. Can the Minister explain why only five new machines were purchased in the last financial year, and why the Government did not take advantage of the \$1 508 000 to upgrade the printing machinery in the division?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I would like to lay to rest a couple of the assertions made by the member, including the hearsay assertion of an officer of another department. In fact, there has been no delay by the Government in relation to equipment for the division. No decision has been taken not to buy equipment for the division, and the alleged statements by an officer in the Health Commission are incorrect.

The decrease in expenditure resulted from, first, deferment of the purchase of equipment pending an investigation of more recent developments in printing technology, and the overseas visit of the Director has assisted in answering some of those queries. Secondly, equipment was ordered but was not delivered within the financial year. In fact, \$525 000 was carried over to 1980-81. The 1980-81 figure includes \$525 000 for equipment that could not be paid for from the preceding year, because it had not been delivered, and the balance is approximately equally shared between the replacement of now obsolete equipment and the introduction of new technology. The Government Printer could give more detail in relation to the number of machines purchased during the past financial year.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the detail in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. Woolman: The items listed in that report are major pieces of capital equipment purchased by the division. I have a full list; about 61 items of equipment were purchased, excluding motor vehicles and minor works. Many of those items involve amounts between \$1 000 and \$2 000, but 61 items were purchased. The main reason why the budgeted figure for this year is far in excess of last year is, as the Minister has said, that there has been money transferred to pay for equipment which had a delivery lead time of about 18 months. The equipment was purchased or ordered early in the last financial year and will become available early this financial year.

We have had much difficulty in photo-typesetting within the division. The equipment purchased has become obsolete and is no longer made, and we allowed for a larger amount of money last year to purchase that equipment. It was decided that, with the tremendous breakthrough of technology in this area, we would delay that spending and would investigate the total overseas market to see what was available. That equipment should be available this year; that is why the money has been transferred.

The other item of equipment which was ordered in the

last financial year and which was delivered in this financial year involved about \$60 000. It will be available within about the next month. It was a lead time situation.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister said that I acted on hearsay information. Perhaps that is true, but it was given as a definite reason. Will the Minister categorically deny that only \$610 801 was spent in 1979-80 and that it was related to the delay in printing of any reports? The Minister did not deny that. Will he deny that that was a factor in the delay?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member claims there has been a delay because the Government decided not to purchase equipment for the division. I categorically deny that that is true.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Are there any excessive delays in reports being printed by the division?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I would be surprised if there were not delays from time to time. I will ask the Government Printer to comment on the question of delays.

Mr. Woolman: I have only been back for one week, and things would have had to go downhill quickly if in the nine weeks that I have been away our delivery times have suffered by that amount. We are presently delivering on time about 78 per cent of our work; another 15 per cent is delivered within 10 days of the delivery date. Many holdups that we get blamed for originate in departments because of the production of a report, the typing of copy, is late in coming down. We then have difficulty in meeting a deadline on that work.

Whenever a report is put into the division, it is treated with the utmost urgency and, if a particular delivery date is required, we will move schedules around, or send current work that is in the division to the private sector to cater for any work that is required in a hurry by particular Government departments. If it is a security job, that work is contained within the division. If it is work that could be let to the private sector and is wanted by a certain time that we cannot meet, it is let to the private sector, which charges our division. We then charge the department. I would like to investigate the allegations, but I would be surprised if they are correct.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What sort of additional charge does the division place on work let out to the private sector? Is an additional charge made to departments, or do they simply charge departments at the cost charged by the private sector?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The only on costs are those incurred by activities of the Government Printer or his staff. If it is a State job where the specifications are clear and it is handed straight to the private sector, then there is no on cost. If there are specifications to draw up, then the private sector cost has added to it the printer's cost. There is no automatic on cost.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Where the cost of sending work out to private printers exceeds the cost of printing the work in the Government Printing Division, are those costs passed on to the department in cases where the Government Printer is simply unable to do the work within the time set down by the department?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the answer to that question would be "Yes", if the Government Printer knows he cannot handle a job within a given time. Perhaps the Government Printer can add to that answer.

Mr. Woolman: If work is let to the private sector, we are required under audit regulations to call for three tenders. We get those tenders in and evaluate the answers to the specifications, the delivery time and the price. If it is an urgent job and perhaps the dearest printer can do it in the time, he would normally get the work. The invoiced cost

to our division is then charged against the department. We also monitor the costs of the private sector closely, because we are in competition, in certain areas, with the private sector, and the prices quoted are relevant to what we are looking at all the time. We get some idea of an excessive price or otherwise. We talk to the printers about the prices they are submitting if they are excessively high, but it is done on a tender system.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to the additional working capital for the State Supply Division, I know that last year there was additional working capital for the Government Printing Division and that this year there is \$100 000 additional working capital for State Supply Division. Some little time ago we were talking about the problems of the Data Processing Section in having its accounts paid promptly by other departments and, I think in passing, the Minister mentioned that problem with the Education Department. You may recall, Sir, that in the Parliament last week, I think it was, I asked the Minister a question specifically about the tardiness of the Education Department in paying its accounts, and about the problems it may be having with its computer in doing that. Is the need for additional working capital for the Supply Division, and the increase which occurred last year in the Government Printing Division's working capital, related to the tardiness of other Government departments in paying their accounts, thereby causing a cash flow problem for the particular divisions concerned?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I did not mention the Education Department today. In fact, the additional working capital is to provide for the stocking of primary school text books in State Supply Division. I will let Mr. Dundon comment on the accounting in the Government Printing Division.

Mr. Dundon: Last year, at the commencement of the financial year, the Government Printing Division changed from being funded out of consolidated revenue to operating on a working account. In order to set that system going, an injection of working capital was required to meet the initial expenses within the debt collection period. That is the reason for the \$700 000.

Dr. BILLARD: It was intimated earlier that printing machinery was not purchased last year because there was a change in technology and, apparently, the machinery that was to be purchased was suddenly obsolete. If there has been a change in technology, what sort of impact will it have? Will it allow better quality work to be produced or will it allow the same quality and quantity at a cheaper cost? What is going to be the impact of this new technology?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the Government Printer is best qualified to answer that question.

Mr. Woolman: I might have been misunderstood. I made the statement that the technology which we were using over the past 4½ to five years had become obsolete. The equipment we proposed to purchase was the latest technology available. Our decision on what we will purchase this year has not been changed so far as technology is concerned. The delay in making that final decision was brought about by big developments overseas, especially in America and Europe, where other manufacturers have come on to the market with newer equipment. From what I have seen overseas, and what we intend to purchase, basically it is of the same family and technology that we looked at last year.

Turning to the benefits we are going to get from this equipment; as members are possibly all aware, *Hansard* is typeset on a computerised phototypesetting machine that

we have. That has provided excellent service over the 5½ years we have used it. Unfortunately, the typesetters are obsolete. We had a breakdown in December which put us off the production scene for six weeks. If that had happened during a Parliamentary session it could have been embarrassing. The equipment we are looking at is far quicker, will give far better quality work and will also be able to accept peripheral software, which the current equipment cannot take. It is going to be able to accept word processing systems which are held within Government departments and which cannot be accepted now, so it is going to open up a wide range of other products which cannot be accepted now. A working party has been established by the Government to look into Government reporting. The systems we are currently looking at can be adapted to accept that as well. The technology which is available, basically, has not been changed from what we looked at last year; it has been consolidated and there are more people in the market with what we are looking at.

Mr. LANGLEY: What will happen to the equipment that is no longer used?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If possible, it is traded in or sold.

Mr. HEMMINGS: We have been told by the Minister that the reason for not spending \$1 000 000 last year on purchasing new printing machinery was related to new technology and other associated matters. I have to accept that. Why is it that, in connection with the purchase of data processing equipment, the Government failed to spend \$123 000 that was allocated in 1979-80?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The decrease in expenditure resulted from the deferment of purchase of some equipment, pending the outcome of investigations into the future role of computing within the Government and the investigation in relation to the best equipment to undertake that role. Some equipment was ordered but not delivered in the financial year and a decision was made to lease certain equipment rather than purchase it.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister give me details of those items of equipment that were deferred, those that have been ordered and not yet delivered, and those that were leased rather than purchased?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask the Acting Director whether he can give more detail.

Mr. Lock: I have some information that may be of assistance. If it does not satisfy the honourable member, I can get further particulars. We leased additional disc drives in October 1979 to satisfy the requirements for additional capacity required by a number of departments. We also leased a high-speed printer to replace a printer purchased in 1964. That was replaced by a leased printer, and we also decided to upgrade a Cyber 173 by an additional central processing unit. That was installed in May 1980. Those items were delayed in terms of delivery over what we anticipated and, therefore, there was not much leasing charged last year, because the items came late.

Mr. HEMMINGS: On the surface, that satisfies me, but, if the Minister and the Acting Director, after reading the *Hansard* proof tomorrow, can provide further information, I will be grateful.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Certainly.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Are there any questions from any other members? There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Deputy Premier, Miscellaneous, \$582 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Dr. B. Billard
The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr. G. J. Crafter
Mr. T. H. Hemmings
Mr. G. R. Langley
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald
Mr. I. Schmidt

Witness:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Acting Premier, Deputy Premier, and Minister of Mines and Energy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. W. Voyzey, Director-General, Department of Services and Supply.

Mr. C. Crisp, Director of Chemistry, Chemistry Division.

Mr. D. Woolman, Director and Government Printer, Government Printing Division.

Mr. B. Lock, Acting Director, A.D.P. Centre Division.

Mr. J. Tanner, Acting Director of State Supply, State Supply Division.

Mr. R. Dundon, Director of Support Services, Support Services Division.

Mr. B. Guerin, Executive Assistant, Public Service Board.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister inform the Committee when the report of the committee of inquiry into the public sector supply function will be made available?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will consider that request. I cannot see any real reason why it cannot be made available shortly.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister may recall that last year, in the Committee debate in the other place, quite a few questions were asked dealing with official publication exchanges with other countries and what these official publications were. I recall asking a question and being told by the Minister that I would receive the information. I am still waiting, and the member for Elizabeth tells me he is still waiting for the information. I will repeat the questions, as follows: what are the official publications which are sent to other countries and which last year cost \$1 646, and does the Minister feel that, in line with the Government's intention to make this State great and let other people know that we exist, he feels that the increase to \$2 000 is sufficient?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the figure was considered adequate. Otherwise, it would not have been budgeted.

Mr. HEMMINGS: So that I will not be asking the same question in 1981, will the Minister furnish me, and possibly my colleague who asked a question last year, with the details of the official publications that we exchange with other countries, the cost for which amounts to \$2 000?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I can do that.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I should like to take up the Deputy Premier's comment in his rather extraordinary statement that an amount must be adequate, otherwise it would not be budgeted. I have had enough experience to know that the Budget is never an indication of adequacy. It is always an indication of the Treasurer's iron fist with

the rest of the Public Service, and I would be amazed if the grins on the faces of his officers are not a fair indication that this allocation and so many others are not adequate.

I ask what this figure is for. I imagine that the publications exchanged are, by and large, publications by the Government, and an additional copy or two would be neither here nor there and would be a hidden cost. I ask what this money is spent on and whether my comment on his remark about adequacy was not well thought out.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The cost is the cost of packaging and mailing, not the cost of publication, and the increase in the amount budgeted reflects the increased cost of packaging and mailing.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: You have no comment on adequacy?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Unless the cost of packaging and mailing increases, the amount will be adequate.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions from non-Committee members? There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Mines and Energy, \$9 560 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr. J. C. Bannon

Dr. B. Billard

The Hon. Peter Duncan

Mr. G. F. Keneally

Mr. J. Mathwin

Mr. J. K. G. Oswald

The Hon. R. G. Payne

Mr. I. Schmidt

Witness:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Acting Premier, Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. B. Webb, Director-General, Department of Mines and Energy.

Mr. K. Johns, Deputy Director-General.

Mr. R. Hancock, Director, Engineering Services Division.

Dr. C. Branch, Director, Resources Division.

Mr. M. Whinnen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. L. Owens, Manager, Energy Development Branch.

Mr. J. Noble, Manager, Energy Policy Branch.

Mr. J. Hochwald, Accountant.

Mr. K. Bockmann, Director of Audits, (Auditor-General's Department), formerly Chief Administrative Officer until 31 August 1980.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): I declare the proposed expenditures open for examination.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Before we proceed to discussion under the lines, I would like your permission, Mr. Acting Chairman, and expect that it would be acceptable to other members, to take up one or two matters in regard to what the Chairman referred to as the programme papers that we have all been given. I refer to page 2 of that document, paragraph 2, under "Structure of Documents", as follows:

For each Government department and some selected authorities, information is provided (consistent with Government policies) on:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In my book it states:

... information is provided on:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is very germane, because it seemed that it may well have been an after-thought and that has just been confirmed by the Minister. In order to make use of the document described by an earlier member of the Committee and agreed to by the Minister as having to be taken with a grain of salt and as being only a guide, as the information in it consists of averages and all sorts of watered-down statements, the Committee would benefit from some amplification of what is meant by that phrase "consistent with Government policies". Does that mean that information will not be in this book if the Government does not wish it? Does it mean that, if the Government has a policy on a matter, the position outlined in the document may not be correct? Does it mean that some information is not in there at all? I seek an explanation from the Minister.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not know whether information is deliberately withheld, but that is my understanding. That qualification does not appear in the original document that I received; it must have been added in a redraft. I can imagine that in a discussion of the lines that we are about to consider there will be matters which have to remain confidential to Government, for instance, in relation to dealings involving the Government and Urenco-Centec, where we entered into a confidential agreement concerning the exchange of information with the Uranium Enrichment Committee. I will not carry it any further than saying that in some instances the Government has undertaken not to make information available. That is one instance that I can think of in relation to what we are about to embark on concerning mines and energy.

However, I do not think that anything more can be read into that qualification. In some matters, as the honourable member would realise, some information is confidential to the Government. However, that does not normally arise in discussions on Budgets.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suppose that that could be described as a valiant effort, although I do not know whether I am satisfied with it. If the statement qualifying the first sentence had said "except necessary or confidential matters", the explanation would have been acceptable. Certainly, however, every member of this Committee would understand what could be construed from the statement "consistent with Government policies". I believe that we are entitled to somewhat more of an explanation than we have been given thus far.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will have to undertake to see whether there are any other implications. I do not know why that qualification was written in. I think that the Treasury had a fair bit to do with the compilation of this document, and this could well have been written in by Treasury officers. However, I will make inquiries as to the full extent of that qualification, and I undertake to let the honourable member know.

Certainly, there has been no attempt to conceal information. The only information that could not be made available in Treasury documents would be that in relation to which confidentiality was warranted. Although the honourable member could read into that all sorts of things, I can only give my interpretation as I know it. I will inquire why that qualification was included.

The whole idea of programme budgeting is to make available more detail than is currently available through the traditional Budget papers, and one must agree that

that has been done. The qualification may refer to the fact that programme budgeting is being applied to any great degree to only a couple of departments, of which the Department of Mines and Energy happens to be one. I cannot do better than undertake to make inquiries and to ask the reasons for the qualification. I do not see anything sinister in it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I must make the point that I did not use the word "sinister".

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I did not suggest that the honourable member did that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I simply pointed out that it would be fair for any Committee member to place any one of half a dozen meanings on that phrase. How do we know what weight to put on the information that is provided when the Minister is not able to say what this means?

It is incredible for the Minister to say that it may have been put there by a Treasury official. I thought that the area of Government policy and administration was clearly defined a long time ago in relation to Parliamentary matters and the role of the Public Service generally, and that there was no cross-over in that area. However, in view of the explanation that has been given, I can only assume that we must look forward to further amplification from the Minister.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I have just had a note handed to me. One suggestion is that it came from the Treasury. I think that it is probably more apt to say that it came from the Treasurer. I am informed that "consistent with Government policies" means that the statement of objectives set out in the papers is in accordance with those policies. This information has been passed to me by one of the officers who had a hand in compiling these documents. However, I will get further information for the honourable member.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take up the same matter. We have here a Minister who is currently the Acting Premier and Treasurer of South Australia. He is the acting head of the South Australian Government, yet he comes before the Committee with a document that is not identical to that which has been provided to Committee members. The Minister has been asked a question which is of considerable importance and which reflects on the accuracy of the whole document, yet he knows absolutely nothing about it. The Minister is then passed a note from a member of his staff, and is not sure that he has conflicting evidence from that person. The evidence that the Minister has given cannot be consistent with the phrase that is under discussion.

For the Acting Premier and Treasurer of this State to come before this Committee and to be inadequately briefed, and in addition for him to have a document that is not identical to the one that Committee members have been given, is to be deplored. The Minister's obvious ignorance regarding the meaning of the phrase that is being questioned gives me great suspicion as to his ability to answer the questions that will inevitably flow from the discussions that occur in this Committee. Whatever answers the Minister is able to come up with, it does not detract from the fact that at this moment at least the Minister does not know what he is talking about.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Is that a speech or a question?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is clear that we will not get anywhere else on that matter. The Minister will understand that Opposition members on the Committee will not forget the lame explanations that we have been given so far. Accordingly, we will be looking even more closely at any information that follows throughout the

documents and on any of the lines that we will be considering.

At page 84 of the same document the objectives of the Department of Mines and Energy are set out. What is the rationale behind the first objective, which concludes:

... and energy resources to enable their proper and orderly development in the State interest.

I ask the Minister, who is in charge of the department, to define "State interest", because that will obviously have a great bearing on the expenditure which is proposed in relation to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The mineral and energy resources reside in the Crown, and it is the Government's responsibility to see that they are developed in the best interests of the State. Under South Australian law the Crown owns the energy and mineral resources, and it is the Government's responsibility to see that they are developed in an economic and orderly manner in the interests of all South Australians. "State interest" refers to the interest of South Australian citizens.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have the same thoughts as the Minister has expressed. Perhaps the Minister would consider rewording the document. The first time I read it I came up with perhaps an objective which strangely bore some resemblance to the explanation that we got from the Minister. I would have thought the objective would be in these terms:

To ensure that the State's energy and mineral resources are developed and utilised in an efficient manner, to realise the maximum benefit for the people of the State, consistent with protection of the environment and the health of its citizens.

That may have been a far better first objective for the Department of Mines and Energy. At least the Minister partly agrees with me because, having read the first objective, he certainly did not give the same words that appear in the matter we are considering. Will the Minister indicate whether these objectives are to be taken with the same grain of salt which was referred to earlier?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The third objective stated on page 84 provides:

To encourage private sector exploration for mineral and energy resources in the State.

Has the Minister considered what that statement says, as an objective, for his department in South Australia? It seems there is no technical qualification to it whatever. It simply says that the department is to encourage private sector exploration for mineral and energy resources in the State, come what may. I am surprised that the Minister was willing to put before the Committee a document containing such a statement, irrespective of the other point. On examining all of the objectives one finds that they appear to be a hotch-potch of ideas thrown together hastily and without real thought. Surely the Committee is entitled to consider expenditure under these objectives, because that is what it comes down to—to have some confidence in the principles that are going to be followed in the development and orderly organisation of the State's mineral resources. Can the Minister indicate that perhaps another look will be taken at these objectives, so that in future they will properly state the objectives of the department for the development of these resources for the benefit of South Australia?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is not particularly useful to take one sentence in isolation. This sentence is to be read in conjunction with the other sentences outlined on this page. It is a fact of life that everywhere in the world exploration for mineral and energy resources is done with private capital. That is fact. Governments can either encourage or discourage it. One of the objectives of this

Government and this department is to encourage it.

Mr. BANNON: That is not accurate as far as South Australia is concerned: there is major Government involvement.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not know of any place in the world where Government is the sole explorer. I am not denying that there are arms of Government that do a fair bit of investigative work. In fact, the Mines Department does much work on base line data on the geology of South Australia. It is equally true that it is perceived as an objective of the Government and the department to encourage private sector exploration for mineral and energy resources.

I can think of no circumstances in any Australian State or under any form of Government where all exploration work would be undertaken at Government expense. If I announced large expenditures on off-shore exploration, I do not think that the public of South Australia would welcome the Government committing, say, \$100 000 000 to high-risk exploration such as that. It is a statement of this Government's wish to encourage private sector exploration of this State's mineral resources.

Mr. BANNON: Our concern is tackling it from the other direction. If the Government's rhetoric is about encouraging the private sector and private sector activity, we are not arguing that private sector exploration should be banned or discouraged; to the contrary, but the point being made by my colleague is the inconsistency in this statement of objectives which suggests that in some way the orderly development in the State interest should be subjugated to private sector exploration and development. In fact, this is an indication of the Government's policy to, in a sense, vacate the field and, by so doing, abdicate its responsibility. Our concern is justifiable, not only on the basis of that statement of objectives, but on the general policies that the Government proclaims and pushes. I think we should be reassured on that point. The Minister has raised our doubts even further.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think that what has been suggested can be read into that statement. There is no suggestion that the Government should not be involved in exploration activities. What we are stating is that we believe we should encourage capital into South Australia to undertake exploration which the Government could not contemplate.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In the remarks I addressed to the Committee earlier, I asked the Minister whether he would consider having another look at the objectives stated on page 84 to ascertain whether they might not stand modification. The Minister tried to evade what I said to him by saying that it is not always profitable to take one point alone. The Minister might also have given me credit for the fact that I did not criticise every point listed under "Objectives". I criticised those I thought were badly phrased, and in the case of the first one it is, to say the very least, diffuse and virtually meaningless. From the point of view of "State interest"—what does that mean? I take it that the Minister might, in future, have another look at it and try to redefine it. I am not suggesting that my suggestion was absolutely correct, but it seems to me to put more bones into the bare skin that exists in the draft we have before us. I have no quarrel with No. 6, and I am numbering from top to bottom, which states:

To ensure that the Government's policies on environmental protection measures are adopted by those industries engaged in exploration and development of the State's mineral resources.

I have a minor quibble: I think it might have been much better stated "to ensure that, in co-operation with the Department of Environment". It almost sounds as though

we have two departments in the same field. I do not know that that would be productive or useful to the people of this State. I tried to take out those points I thought were glaringly wrong. I believe, in the case of the first point on page 84, that it is the first time the Minister had read it, despite his subsequent attempts to gloss over that. I hope, as was demonstrated this morning in Committee when I was sitting at the rear, that in his co-operative spirit, which appeared on occasions this morning, he might undertake to the Committee to have another look at them.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I have read them. I am quite prepared to look at anything the honourable member requests me to look at in relation to these objectives, but I find no great fault with them. If the honourable member does request I look again at them, I am happy to do so.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: When the Minister has time to read them properly.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member has been a Minister and he knows that reading time is limited, but I can assure him I have read through the document.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Obviously the Minister's study of the programme tabled was not all that productive from the point of view of the Committee, except to show that the Minister has been forced to fall back on the time-honoured statement, "I am sorry, I did read it but I have to do so much reading I cannot remember it". It is only the main, basic objectives of the departments of which he is Minister. When I was a Minister, and I have been Minister of Community Welfare, Housing, Planning, Water Resources, and relieved as Minister of Lands, Irrigation, you name it, I always made sure that I at least knew what the objectives of a department were. If the department was in any error or doubt about its objectives, I made sure I let it know what it ought to be doing on behalf of the Government of which I was a member.

It seems that we now have a different scheme of things, that the Minister said to this Committee, "I did read them, they did not register with me, you will have to excuse me." I am prepared to excuse him and move on to the lines we are directly considering. I refer to the line on page 28 "Salaries, wages and related payments", titled "Terminal leave payments". I note that in 1979-80 an amount of \$58 000 was voted and an amount of \$85 317 was paid. Is the Minister able to give me information as to why the large additional payment occurred? I say to the Minister before he answers me that I heard an explanation given earlier in relation to this line in another area; that officers defer requirements and shuffle their dates around, and so on. It is my understanding that it was a policy of the previous Government that these matters were being brought under more scrutiny and that the interests of the people of South Australia have also to be given consideration alongside those that could be termed, in some cases, the specific interests of a person who is seeking to leave a department by way of retirement, or in some other way. Is the Minister able to give the Committee any information about that line?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There were more resignations than anticipated during that period.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister would know that there is not a great deal of profit in attempting to answer members of the Committee in that fashion. It might well be, if we had been given the courtesy of a little more information, that there would not be any need for me to be on my feet seeking further information. What were the reasons for those unexpected resignations?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: These people took other jobs, I guess, or retired because they had reached retiring

age. If the honourable member wants details of the officers who retired during that period, I will be happy to provide them for him. I do not retain that sort of information in my head.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I cannot let that go, either. There is a complete battery of people here with the Minister. One of the purposes of this Committee system we are now operating, and a stated objective of the Government, was to allow for closer examination of the proposed expenditure of this State. Here we are on a simple item like a matter of substantial over-payment when an estimate has been made. We know these things can happen, and I am not suggesting that people have to adhere to their resignation dates, or to the estimates being made. It is a sufficiently simple matter, if these Committees are going to function in the way the Government said they would, and promised the people of the State and the Opposition in discussions we had about these matters that they would, yet information is not available. That is exactly the same sort of answer we got last year and would have been given during the time we had available for last year's Budget. There is no improvement whatever, and I cannot understand why the Minister, when he knows these sorts of things get asked, has come here without that information. What is the purpose of this Committee, anyhow?

The CHAIRMAN: What is the honourable member's question?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister ensure that in any future sessions of this Committee the promises of the Government about this Committee are adhered to? One would hope that I would not have to remind the Minister what the promises were—he ought to know what they were. The promises were that a much greater range of information would be available, that the overall deliberations of the Committee would be such that all members would benefit from the greater range of information. We have 600 pages of "take it with a grain of salt information" here, and a simple question such as I have raised as to why an over-payment occurred (and a few details about it would be satisfactory) cannot be answered to my satisfaction. How are we going to get on when we want to ask more complex questions?

The CHAIRMAN: I feel that there can be latitude in the explanation, and a liberal amount of time will be given for that, but it would be desirable that, after the explanation, there be some form of question, not a comment. I would appreciate members of the Committee co-operating in that way.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There was an increased number of resignations from the department because there is an increase in the activity of mining companies in this country.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is good enough. Why could we not be given that?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It may be that the member has difficulty in making the point clear, in the plethora of words. There is an upsurge of activity in the mining industry in this country. There are far more employment opportunities open to geologists, and this upsurge has taken place in quite recent times. As the member would know, positions are being advertised daily and weekly for qualified people in the mining field, such as geologists, and there was a number of resignations that were not anticipated at the beginning of last financial year.

Some of the people who resigned from the department were Messrs. King, Northcott, Youngs, Robson, and Williams. This is indicative of the upsurge in activity in the mining industry, and I am informed that it is not an unusual trend that, in times when the mining activity is

slack, there is no great problem for a Government to attract to the Government Mines Department highly qualified officers but that, when activity in the private sector and mining company activity is intense, there tends to be a movement out of the Government Mines Department to the private sector. That has happened in the past and is happening now.

Positions are being offered at salaries that are more attractive than are offered in the Government department. That is a fact of life, so we would expect to lose officers in the present climate. That is what has happened and that is what this item tends to indicate. It indicates that the officers I have named resigned (they did not retire) during this preceding year because of the upsurge in interest and activity in the private sector. I think it would be unrealistic for the member to expect me to retain the names of all the officers. I think he would concede in his more generous moments that he could not retain the names of all who joined or left his department when he was a Minister.

I thought the point had been explained adequately. The Mines Department, particularly, is vulnerable. If the member goes back through the history of his Government over 10 years and of preceding Governments in South Australia and if he examines the movement in the Mines Department, it will be clear that in times of active mineral exploration there has tended to be a move out of the Mines Department, irrespective of his attractiveness as Minister. There is pressure on the individual to take another job if the financial rewards are greater. I do not think the position would be greatly different, even if the member was Minister in charge of the Mines Department, despite his self-praise.

I think I have answered his query sufficiently. I was castigated for being too brief previously. I have indicated, in full terms, the reason for the increased terminal leave payments. It is because of a demand for qualified people in the mining industry as a result of activity increasing in intensity during the 12 months. I anticipate that that will continue, and it is the objective of this Government and of this department, to which the member takes objection, to encourage private sector investment in this State.

One geologist has left to take a position with a company that is looking for offshore oil. He was a valued officer but the amount offered by this large company could not be matched. I do not think the member would have been able to match it. I expect this pressure on officers of the Mines Department to continue during this financial year. The financial inducements are there. I have endeavoured to elaborate, after being castigated for brevity. I have named the officers, and there may be others. It does not take many to resign for there to be a severe impact on terminal leave payments.

In looking at the increase from \$58 000 to \$85 317, that would soon be eaten up in terms of a couple of unexpected resignations. I think the member knows enough about the range of salaries for professional people to know that the payment to an officer for a couple of months of a year, when that officer has been receiving \$35 000 a year, is nearly \$6 000. We have had other resignations towards the end of the financial year. I do not think that the amount is as significant as the member seeks to indicate that it is.

I will be perfectly happy to get more detail than I have recalled. I have named five or six officers who have resigned, and there may be some others. It will be my wish to provide that information for the member. My officers will be examining the records carefully, as they always do when I request information. They are very competent officers and will thoroughly examine the records.

If the list I have given is not exhaustive, I apologise humbly if the member wants me to do that. I think it

would be unreasonable, even for a member with the undoubted abilities of the member for Mitchell, to recall every item in the terminal leave payments indicated. Despite his unkind words in his attempt to indicate my incompetence as Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, I plead ignorance of the fine detail, which even the member would not be capable of recalling.

We managed to retrieve five names, and it is abundantly clear that, even if those five had resigned towards the latter part of the year, that would account for the discrepancy in the budgeted terminal leave payment as against the actual terminal leave payment. Quite frankly, I am surprised that the discrepancy is not greater, because the \$58 000 budgeted as terminal leave payment indicates a fairly minimal turnover of highly paid staff. The prime ingredient of that figure would be retirements, which can be predicted. The sum of \$58 000 would indicate a level of retirements within the department which are quite predictable. The honourable member must realize that resignations are unpredictable. If we consider just those five people, I would have thought that with that level of resignations we could expect a greater discrepancy.

If the honourable member would like me to get the details and ascertain the reason for the \$58 000, which would have been postulated on the basis of retirements, I shall be perfectly happy to get those details. But to accuse the departments and me as Minister of being incompetent because there is a gross discrepancy between the two figures cannot be sustained. Another element comes into the calculation, because the Government has initiated an early retirement scheme in regard to a couple of departments. Even retirements cannot be entirely predictable: there are circumstances where they are delayed or taken early.

In some departments that tends to take place more frequently than in others. Here, I must apologise to the former Minister for what he might term my crass ignorance but what I might term an excusable lack of detailed knowledge. I am not aware of the pressures which came to bear on early retirements. I do not think the pressures for early retirements within the Department of Mines and Energy are very high. I visited the Department of Mines and Energy early in my career as Minister and took the opportunity of going through all the departments that are my responsibility. There were quite some supportive comments in relation to that activity. It was even said to me that no Minister had previously shown as much interest as I had shown in getting around his departments and meeting everybody.

The conclusion I gained from visiting the Department of Mines and Energy is that the officers were a happy bunch. In relation to this line, the pressure for early retirement would be quite minimal, and not many officers of the department would be contemplating that action. Honourable members will perhaps agree with me by observing the officers present. I want this answer to be full enough to satisfy the honourable member, as I have been castigated for being too abrupt and brief in my answers, and I want to fill him in on the full ramifications of this line, regarding which I would think there were probably no particularly early retirements. There may be, but I hope that in the report which I will be getting for the honourable member this position will show up. I suspect, although I cannot be sure, that the information that we can provide in relation to the \$58 000 will be fairly accurate in terms of the anticipated retirements.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I was castigated for being too abrupt and brief and I intend to give the honourable member—

Mr. BANNON: I rise on a point of order. I understand that the Standing Orders governing this Committee were aimed at avoiding repetitive remarks. The Minister has repeated himself every two or three minutes. I am suggesting that if you, Mr. Chairman, are not prepared to intervene then we will not be so polite as to sit and watch the Committee's processes abused. I would ask that the Minister conclude his remarks so that we can get on with it.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. There have been repetitious comments in the asking of questions. Any repetition relates in the main to questions being asked a number of times. The Minister has made his point and I would ask that he bring his remarks to a close.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I want to give enough information to satisfy the honourable member so that he will not say that I am too abrupt and not giving enough information. If he is satisfied, I will wind up at that point.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the Minister for that full enough explanation.

Mr. BANNON: Let me not be so courteous as my colleague. I suggest to the Committee that, if we are going to have time wasted for some 20 minutes with that sort of rambling discourse, we may as well close our papers and go home. It is quite ridiculous. The Minister was asked why this terminal leave payment had increased. Obviously we are not looking for a detailed description of who got what payments; we are simply asking why it was so much over Budget. The Minister's reply was simply that more people had left. That was not an adequate answer, and my colleague then proceeded to question him closely as to the reasons.

The basic point that we were seeking to establish is one that the Minister mentioned some 20 minutes ago, namely, that one of the reasons is that outside commercial pressure is luring away skilled Mines Department operatives into the private sector. Surely the Minister's responsibility in that situation, if he is to provide a full answer, is not to ramble on in that repetitive fashion but to indicate to the Committee whether he is concerned about that situation, whether he believes that anything can be done about it, whether it means that those presently in the department are not as qualified as the department might expect or be used to, and whether there is difficulty in replacing the people concerned with qualified personnel.

Those are the serious questions raised by my colleague, I thought quite clearly, which had not been answered by the Minister. I am not inviting him to go into another prolix ramble of the sort we have just heard, but to answer those specific questions that arise under the line—not by detailing who are getting terminal leave payments and how much they amount to, but by commenting on a situation involving persons resigning from the department and the implications for that department.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: With respect, the honourable member's colleague did not ask those specific questions, but I am happy to comment on them. It is very difficult to strike a happy medium that will satisfy the members opposite.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I said that I was satisfied that the reply was full enough.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: With respect, the Leader's colleague did not ask those specific questions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has been asked several questions. I call on the Minister to reply, and ask members to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member asked for specific details regarding the people who had resigned from the department. An examination of the extract will indicate that. He did not ask whether I was

concerned about the matter, although his Leader did. Of course, we are concerned to see that we retain a highly qualified group of professional people within the department. It is very difficult to maintain high levels of competence if some of our top people and our professionals leave under the pressures that exist at present.

The Leader must realise that it would be impossible for the Government to compete with the private sector in this climate in relation to salaries, because some very big salaries are being offered. It would be impossible for any Public Service Board or Government to offer salaries that could counter those being offered in the private sector. There has been an upgrading of some of the salaries of professional people in an attempt to counter the pressures being exerted elsewhere. However, this must be balanced off against all Government departments; it must be done with equity in relation to other departments.

In reply to the questions that I have been asked, I state, first, that I am concerned and, secondly, that the problem cannot be solved entirely. Indeed, that has not happened in the past. Nonetheless, we tend to lose some of our more experienced geologists and others in this climate and, when the occasion arises, we try to replace them with the best people that we can attract.

Mr. BANNON: Is there a problem in relation to attracting and recruiting people to fill those vacancies?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: One must concede that difficulty is experienced in replacing some of the people who have left with persons who have the same experience and expertise.

Dr. BILLARD: I refer to page 96 of the programme papers. In relation to engineering services, there may have been a change in accounting practice. Last year, \$145 000 was provided in the Revenue column, whereas nothing has been provided this year. As the notes on page 94 indicate that the work being done by this section is not decreasing, what is the significance of this change?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The nil expenditure on Revenue Account for the 1980-81 financial year is the result of a change in the method of accounting in relation to certain engineering salaries.

Mr. Hochwald: This represents a change in the accounting method. Drilling jobs done for the private sector were initially funded out of revenue. Then, an entry was made, transferring the funds into deposit account, with a contra entry in revenue receipts. In the 1979-80 Estimates, there was a revenue receipt of \$138 000, and in 1980-81 the same entry has been reduced to nil. In effect, there has been a reduced appropriation for this department to the extent of about \$140 000, and an equivalent reduction in revenue receipts of about \$138 000.

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister agree that the demand within the private sector for officers who work with the Department of Mines and Energy reflects great credit on that department and the work that it has done over the years, as well as on the training and experience that these officers have received in the department? Also, does the Minister agree that this demand for the services of these officers runs counter to the often voiced criticism that people who work in Government departments are non-productive? Finally, does he also agree that, because of the demands being made on his department, Government departments can be productive, that public servants are efficient, and that perhaps his Government might give greater consideration to the admission that I am sure the Minister is about to make?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes. However, that is not to say that I have ever subscribed to the view that officers

in the Government service were not first class. I agree that Department of Mines and Energy officers get jobs outside the department because they are the best applicants for those jobs.

Mr. KENEALLY: Does that mean that the Deputy Premier will reconsider his Government's policy to put out to the private sector work that could well be done within the Public Service?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The two matters are not really related. The fact is that the Department of Mines and Energy has certain responsibilities which it discharges for the Government and for which a certain number of officers are required. To suggest that by doubling the size of the department we will discharge those functions more efficiently and responsibly is not correct. This type of budgeting is designed to show that. There is a task to be done, and one does that with a group of people. Of course, the number of people required depends on the job being done. So, I do not really think that the honourable member's comment regarding handing jobs out to the private sector is correct. The private sector has its work to do, and it is a matter of finding a correct balance between the two.

In some areas, the Party to which the honourable member belongs considers that the Government should be undertaking certain responsibilities. The Government of which I am a member considers that the emphasis should be more on the private sector undertaking those responsibilities. I do not think that there has ever been any great argument between the political Parties in this State in relation to the Department of Mines and Energy.

Without wanting to prolong the answer, I point out that the expansion in mines and energy is in energy. The expansion was presaged and considered necessary by my predecessor. There has been further expansion under this Government, because it is such a vital area for this State.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I refer to the "Resource Division, Geological Survey of South Australia", which shows a moderate spending outside the provision in 1979-80 and a moderate provision for 1980-81, with a total allocation of \$2 337 857. Is this an on-going survey funded from year to year, or does it indicate some new activity by the department?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is an on-going activity. The survey involves work in various parts of the State and is part of a continuing programme. It seeks to extend the geological knowledge of the State. This provision relates to salaries and reflects a normal interest.

Mr. BANNON: That allocation should be considered in conjunction with the allocation outlined on page 29 providing operating expenses for this survey. An inflationary increase is proposed for operating expenses. In the case of salaries there is a reduction both in actual money spent and in real terms, taking inflation into account. Can the Minister indicate what stage the survey has reached and whether it is being scaled down progressively or simply because of financial exigencies in this year's Budget? My calculation is in real terms and not actual terms.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A static work force is involved in survey activities, and a couple of vacancies occurred during the financial year. It is an on-going programme. If that figure does not reflect a normal increase in salary payment, it is because there have been a couple of vacancies for a period. That may have run into this financial year, but I will ask Mr. Whinnen to explain the situation in more detail.

Mr. Whinnen: As the Leader of the Opposition suggests, the increase was because geologists, who left the department and about whom we were talking regarding

terminal leave payments, predominantly came from this division. The savings which occurred in the salaries by the positions being vacant for a couple of months resulted in savings which make the net increase less than what one would expect it to be. The geological survey activities of the department are on-going, but the Minister and the Director-General know more about those activities than I do. The apparent savings in the salary line are not because of a down-grading of the division.

Mr. BANNON: What stage has the survey reached in terms of comprehensive coverage?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask the Director-General to outline the on-going programme.

Mr. Webb: The survey work is on-going at this time. There is absolutely no indication that the basic fundamental work of the survey is anywhere near completion. The map displayed in this Chamber shows a number of areas outlined in red where mapping is planned to go on during the current year. Much of the State has been mapped, but much work still remains to be done. Considerable back-up work is needed to support people interested in exploration in the State. All of this is continuing and is an on-going function of the survey, which is the group providing the building blocks on which the rest of the departments work depends.

Mr. BANNON: What happens to the survey findings? To whom are they provided? If they are made generally available to the whole of industry, do private industry or private mining or exploration companies make any contribution to the costs of the survey?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask the Deputy Director-General to comment.

Mr. Johns: It should be understood that the geological survey does not relate only to mapping activities, which was what the Leader of the Opposition was referring to. It is an important part of our activity. The mapping presently in progress is outlined in red rectangles on the displayed map, but in addition to that mapping activity we have seven divisions of the survey concerned with other aspects of geological study. These include a fossil fuels branch, which is concerned with petroleum, natural gas and a coal study, and biostratigraphy, relating to fossils and paleontological studies of sediments and rocks. There is an engineering branch which includes assessment of ground water, a mineral resources branch and a technical information branch, which is concerned with the documenting and publication of results. These appear in a series of geological maps and a range of published bulletins that come out on a regular basis documenting the activities of the department. There are then occasional publications which are made available for sale to the public and companies, as required.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Information from the core library is made available to companies in relation to core samples (this includes maps and geological information), and charges are made for that information. Perhaps the Deputy Director-General can further elaborate on the charges levied to the public.

Mr. Johns: The charges made for maps are in line with charges made by other States of the Commonwealth. This State co-ordinates its activities and geological legends, and there is a standardisation of presentation, as far as possible, in the presentation of those maps. The result of all that is that the maps are charged at a cost consistent with what other State Government departments set on mapping. So, we do not really set prices on maps: we conform to what is considered to be a recoup of charges, because these vary greatly from area to area, on all sorts of things—time taken to map and publish, and so on. So far as the other publications are concerned, we set a charge

which recoups the cost of preparation of the publication.

Mr. BANNON: I assume, then, that the survey is providing basic data which those interested in prospecting, exploring, or whatever can take advantage of and use to follow up any projects that they wish to. It has been suggested that, with the considerable activity of the past few years, and the fact that much of this information is now becoming more rapidly available, large areas of the State are being pegged on the basis of general mining leases and that this is preventing individuals who are aware of or able to develop deposits of specific materials (and pyrites, for instance, is one I have heard of) from having access to those deposits and ability to work them. My question leads on from this. If the department is providing the basic data it is providing, it is effectively at public expense. That is, then, in turn, being used by private companies to stake claims for a variety of minerals over large tracts of territory which may, in fact, be preventing smaller prospectors, or people interested in small extractive industries, from gaining access to those deposits. Is that a problem and, if so, what is the department doing about it?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the Leader's question impinges on exploration licences and mining leases and the way in which the department makes its judgments in relation to discovery and development of the resources of this State. What the Leader is suggesting is legitimate because there is a balancing of interests to be undertaken in this matter. I think what the department has to decide is which company or individual has the resources, first, to undertake exploration which will give the greatest return of information and possible development to the State and, secondly, when a mining lease is granted who is capable of developing it in the best interests of this State.

In some instances, applications are received from a whole range of people and interests for exploration licences in the first instance, so the department and the Minister have to make an assessment of such things as finance and capability of performing. For instance, a whole range of conditions are attached to licences, some environmental and some performance, so an assessment has to be made; for instance, if an area of the State is being considered for an exploration licence, whether the applicant can perform and then do something worthwhile in the sense of exploration and whether he has the financial capacity to do it. That may tend to militate against the individual who does not have the technical, financial or professional expertise to do the job as well as a company which has already considerably more resources, so there is a possible complex difficulty. The department has to make its judgment without being completely exclusive of the smaller operator that the Leader mentioned.

Certainly, I believe that department tries to give these people a go. It stands to reason, if we are interested, for argument's sake, in exploring for petroleum, that considerable resources are required and that the isolated individual with a divining rod, or whatever, is not in a position to find it. Obviously, he is excluded in favour of a company with considerable resources. When we get down to the sorts of material the Leader is talking about, we let quite a lot of individuals in. One will always get complaints because there are a lot of applications for the same part of the State. I do now know whether the Deputy Director-General wants to add to what I have said. The point is well taken. I, as Minister, get complaints from time to time because small operators have been unsuccessful in gaining, against pretty stiff competition, exploration licences. We try to be fair to everybody. We certainly do not exclude

them. All we try to do is give them a go.

Mr. BANNON: It is part of the policy on minerals and energy that the Government propounded before the last election that it would:

Provide grants to approved explorers for specified mineral search. The repayment of such grants will be subject to negotiation should a viable mineral industry be established; Has that policy been given effect this year? Is it intended to, and if so on what terms and conditions would explorers be approved and what would be the nature of those grants?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That has not been implemented. That policy was postulated in the first instance as an incentive policy. The fact is that, in my view, there is no need to implement that policy at the moment because of the intense interest which is currently being shown and the competition for exploration licences in this State at the moment. When that policy was framed it probably was not apparent, and the Leader may want to comment on this, that there was such an intense level of interest in exploration. I have become far more aware of it as Minister. There is intense competition and I think, quite frankly, that I cannot envisage that that policy need be implemented in the short term, or in the foreseeable future, as I know that at the moment there is no need to provide that sort of incentive in this present-day climate in relation to exploration.

Dr. BILLARD: Turning to the geological survey, it was pointed out that the areas marked with red lines were where the survey is concentrating at the moment. What use has been made of the land satellite data available? I know that the Department for the Environment is developing a facility to analyse that information at the moment. I understand that overseas it is largely the large international mining companies and oil companies that are the main users of that sort of data, and it could be very valuable. I am interested to know whether they are using that information now or intend to use it in the future.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that Mr. Johns, the Deputy Director-General, should comment on that question.

Mr. Johns: The Department of Mines and Energy was one of the first researchers to work on Landsat imagery when it became available five or six years ago. We have a complete cover of the State and have had periodic coverages. This is a repetitive thing, dependent on the traversing of the satellite, so we have imagery related to different seasons. We have dabbled a bit with false colour and enhancement.

We have found great use for the imagery but, for the practical purposes of mapping, it really does not substitute for conventional aerial photography, in that we require great detail, and, in magnifying, one loses detail. For purposes of geological mapping, and most of our work, we rely on conventional aerial photography but we have used the other and will continue to use it.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is clearly stated that the Mines Department is a service department. I suppose that, because of that, it is difficult to determine how efficient the department is. That is not meant to be a reflection on the department but I believe that the Minister and his officers would wish to have an objective test as to the efficiency of the department. I understand that at present any such test would be subjective.

Is there any way in which the department can assess the efficiency of its operations? Do we know whether the returns to the department or through consolidated revenue by licence fees, and so on, would pay for the operations of the Mines Department? If that is so, I would be pleased to have information. If it is not so, I wonder

why the information is not available.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the revenue component of the Budget last year was between \$9 000 000 and \$10 000 000. I also think the royalties were \$5 283 000. One of the real benefits of the development in mining of hydrocarbons, to my mind anyway, is that you can generate significant revenue for the State. The level of royalties, although the activity of the department may not vary a lot from year to year, depends much on the levels of production in the State.

In a sense, one cannot claim that the royalty payments are directly related to the activities of the department. The department charges for some services. For instance, the drilling division charges for drilling wells, and so on, and the cost of the exercise is estimated. The charge struck is sought to be realistic.

In relation to the general question of efficiency, Mr. Bockmann, from the Auditor-General's Department, spent quite a bit of time in the Mines Department during the last financial year and I think his activities highlighted one or two areas where improvements could be made. They have been acted upon. I think that was an exercise in financial efficiency. Operational efficiency is in the hands of the Director-General. I invite Mr. Bockmann to comment on a financial view and Mr. Webb to comment on an operational view.

Mr. Webb: It is certainly something we would like a measure of and an indication of how good we are in relation to the other States. I think one way to measure quality is the quality of the work we publish. I think one could say without question that the quality of our mapping reports is recognised nationally and overseas as extremely high. If we can continue to hold the reputation of producing maps as good as are produced anywhere, that is a measure of quality.

A further measure of efficiency is the way the companies that come to the State and work here react to the kind of service they get from the department. We have had strong evidence that companies that come to the State are impressed by the efficiency of the service they get in terms of the operation of the Act and the regulations under the Act in the help they need to assist them to make their corporate decisions as to how to proceed and what to do.

Many companies have told me that unquestionably they would prefer to work in this State rather than anywhere else in the Commonwealth, particularly because of the efficiency with which this Department operates. On the question of a measure of the degree to which this is paying off for the people and the State, I suppose one can turn to royalties. Royalties have been increasing over recent years. They increased from \$4 000 000 in 1979 to \$5 200 000 in 1980. We assume that that increase will continue as a result of the capital that has been put into major projects in the State that will flow on in royalties to South Australia.

Mr. Bockmann: My comments will relate basically to the financial area of the department, as indicated by the Minister. From an efficiency point of view, as far as financial control of operations goes, from 1 July this financial year we have adopted a common accounting report system encompassing budgeting, control and reporting. It is a kind of budgeting system designed by the Public Service Board for use in medium-size departments. A number of departments have adopted this system.

As far as financial control is concerned, it is the provision of amounts on planned budgets for projected works that you intend to undertake. Period reports can be measured against these to indicate the achievement in projects or programmes. In addition, we have achieved a

considerable amount of upgrading of the accounting information and the reporting information in relation to our drilling operations, which are a major activity of the department, and quite a large percentage of those operations service the private sector. We have introduced profit and loss reporting there, and have introduced other techniques for tendering for particular jobs.

Broadly, the system of common accounting and reporting is still in the development stage but by the end of this year it will be fully implemented in our department, and that is the basis of measurement in control of programmes that the operations side of the department carries out.

Mr. KENEALLY: My experience is that engineering departments run by engineers do not show a great deal of concern for dollars and cents, and, because of that, there is a need to have people in the department sufficiently senior, with accountancy ability, to remind engineers that dollars and cents mean something.

Will the C.A.R.S. system now being implemented in the Minister's department apply to forward planning and financial information in the engineering section? Will they be encouraged to work within budgetary restraints, and will they be given the forward information that enables them to make decisions?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that people in any department, be they engineers, clerks or any officers, are made aware of the necessity to see that they earn their salary and do their job. I do not think that engineers can be singled out.

Mr. KENEALLY: Technical people.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What the honourable member is saying is that every department, not the least of which is the Mines Department, needs financial help in its administration. Mr. Bockmann is a senior officer, and he has spent considerable time in the Mines Department and has identified some areas where we could make some changes and where perhaps there could be greater efficiency. That has happened within the last year. I think that it is true to say that the department has officers in its accounting branch with expertise which is valuable to the department. I believe that that is true of other departments and that the same constraints apply.

Mr. Webb: This is a subject close to my heart because, coming from the private sector and having to learn the value of a dollar, one of my objectives when I took up the position of heading the survey here was to introduce some of this thinking to the officers on this survey. It is a further challenge for them to have to reckon with and to plan their work not only in terms of the technical aspects but also in terms of what it costs the taxpayers of this State. As a consequence, I was keen to introduce something as early as possible to bring these messages home. It was with Mr. Bockmann's help that we were able to introduce these various costing methods so that we can accumulate data to help officers to see what it costs to do the kind of work that they do. It is something which this organisation has been very ready to pick up and work with since programme budgeting was first mentioned. It was something which we had already moved towards as a department. I can say without question that I have had total support from the officers in this matter, and they now find it useful in talking to people from the private sector. Not only can they talk about the technical aspects of their work but also they can talk about the cost of doing that work.

Dr. BILLARD: I congratulate the department on implementing those techniques. Regarding the question of efficiency, Mr. Webb covered some of the aspects of efficiency by comparison with other States, which is always a good first base for assessing operations. He said that the

quality of the work was good in comparison. Regarding the area that we have covered so far in geological survey, what proportion of the State have we covered, and how does it compare with other States? Are we ahead or behind?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask Mr. Johns to answer the honourable member's query for the Committee. I reinforce the comments of the Director-General. Since I have been Minister I have made the opportunity to go interstate to talk to mining companies and inform myself of some of the developments elsewhere. I went to the Northern Territory to see uranium mining, and I went to Mount Isa and Roxby Downs. I was trying to look at the scale of the operations there. All honourable members will acknowledge the value of that. I have also had to go interstate to talk to other companies who are interested in exploring in South Australia. The Mines Department in this State is described universally as the best in Australia.

That is a matter what ought to be of some pride to all members on both sides. I do not ascribe that to anything I have done. It was the best department when the Hon. Hugh Hudson was Minister. That is universally recognised around the country. My understanding is that we are well advanced in relation to geological mapping. It depends on the dimensions of the State, the proportions covered and so on. In a small State geographically where the terrain is not difficult physically, one would expect a greater coverage. Perhaps Mr. Johns, the Deputy Director-General, who is involved more intimately, may care to comment on the state of mapping in relation to other States.

Mr. Johns: I do not believe that there is any part of Australia which is not somehow covered by some form of geological mapping. In terms of area covered and maps published and considering South Australia's area compared with that of the other States, we are not behind them. We can make available geological mapping of one sort or another for all of the State. Geological mapping is something that never really ceases. Having mapped an area to one scale there is always a call and a demand for refinements related to better knowledge, new interpretations of data and the resources that one has in the time at one's command to put into a map. Perhaps what I should say in this regard is that we have recently published three geological maps of this State. A scale of one to one million is used. Two are geophysical maps of which we are very proud, and the third is a geological map published in the last month or so. They are up-to-date presentations of the geology of the State at that scale and are the most recently available of all the States. If that puts us in front, then we are in front.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I ask the Deputy Premier a question in relation to the financial control of the department. He mentioned to us before that the Department of Services and Supply is in the process of appointing a finance director. The chart before us shows the positions within the Mines Department, and there does not appear to be a finance person at a high level. Can the Minister tell the Committee who the finance person is within the department at the highest level and what that level is?

I ask this question because often, although departments believe that they are receiving financial back-up and information, that is not the case, simply because the financial officer is not at a sufficiently high level to be able to give input where the decisions are being made. Of course, that is important in terms of financial control. It seems that the Department of Services and Supply has readily realised the need for a finance director. I know from the time that I was in Government and from my

subsequent time on the Public Accounts Committee that a number of departments have recognised this and are appointing finance directors at a relatively high level.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Perhaps the nomenclature could be clarified. I refer to the right arm of the chart which we gave out and which shows the staff deployment in the Department of Mines and Energy. The Chief Administrative Officer is a finance man.

Mr. KENEALLY: Fortuitously or deliberately?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Deliberately. Mr. Bockmann was seconded for 15 months from the Auditor-General's Department, and his level of classification was EO1. Mr. Whinnen is a Chief Executive Officer, and his classification is AO4. The officer underneath, who is referred to under the heading "Finance", is Mr. Hochwald, who is an AO1. The level of officer in the department (be it finance officer or whatever he is called) is determined by the Public Service Board, and the size of the department is one of the major criteria.

So, the office is advertised according to the level determined by the Public Service Board. I refer to the current level of officers who have most recently been associated with the department in the finance area. Mr. Bockmann, who is occupying the position of Chief Administrative Officer, was on the EO1 salary level. The current incumbent is Mr. Whinnen, who is on the AO4 level.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In the Department of Services and Supply, the position will be Director, Finance. Presumably that will be at one of the director levels in the department, and certainly in the EO range. My point is borne out by the fact that the Minister has brought Mr. Bockmann with him to give financial advice. I simply make the point that, unless the person giving the financial advice is at a senior level (and I guess that in the pecking order of the Public Service that needs to be in the EO range), the financial advice will not be considered in the decision-making process in the upper echelons of the department.

The Minister's comment that the Public Service Board makes the decisions about levels is, of course, correct. However, his point that the decision is made in accordance with the size of the department is not really borne out, given that the Department of Services and Supply is a smaller department, in terms of expenditure, than the Department of Mines and Energy. Therefore, it would seem that, if they are appointing a Director, Finance, in that department, a similar appointment should be considered in this department.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think it can be assumed, first (although the title may indicate that a high level of remuneration may be involved), that the Director of Finance will necessarily be at the top of the executive officer level. I do not think one can presume what the precise level will be. However, it is a fact, as the honourable member will know, that the size of the department is one of the factors that determines the level of classification of senior officers in every department. We are seeking to reclassify the position and to term the position "Director of Administration and Finance" at the EO1 level. Mr. Bockmann was in the department for 15 months, and he is at the EO1 level.

It was not an easy task to have reclassified some of the officers in the Department of Mines and Energy who have been reclassified recently. I do not know whether the honourable member was here when the Leader asked me a question regarding the movement of officers out of the department when activity is high in the exploration area. However, there have been reclassifications of some of the department's officers, and that was not easy to

accomplish. I should appreciate any help that the honourable member can give me to accomplish this reclassification, because I agree with him: in this area of financial control and management special expertise is needed, and we are very conscious of that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A few minutes ago, Mr. Webb referred to the moderate increase in royalties that occurred the year before last; I think that even last year was referred to. I therefore raise the matter of estimated receipts on Revenue Account. I notice that the estimate of receipts for 1979-80 for "lease registrations and geological fees, treatment charges, proceeds of sale of ores and minerals, recoup for services and sundries" was \$246 000, that \$277 414 was actually received, and that the estimated receipts for 1980-81 are \$160 000, which is considerably less. I should have thought that, in parallel with the kind of increase in royalties of which we have been told, one would see a relative increase in this respect.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think again that the explanation lies in the method of accounting.

Mr. Whinnen: Regarding this line, I draw the attention of members to the discussion that we had recently on the accounting change that resulted in a reduction of one of the vote lines for salaries. This is the other side of the change, where the \$277 000 revenue included \$138 000, which used to be paid until the end of last year, when that money was recouped from recharged jobs.

Because of the accounting change the \$138 000, or thereabouts, that was expected this year will no longer be paid into the line and the word "sundries" is the catch-all in that heading. It is our department's sundries line, and it is where we paid the \$138 000. In fact, the expected increase attributable to lease registration fees, etc., is increased by \$21 000. The net variation in the line from \$277 000 to \$160 000 is reflected by \$138 000 salary recouped, which will no longer be paid in, and a \$21 000 fee increase.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I refer to page 28—"Engineering Services Division, drilling"—in which there has been a small reduction in the amount proposed for 1980-81. Taking into consideration "Engineering Services Division" on page 29 under "Contingencies", there is a large increase from \$782 000 actually paid last year to \$1 067 000 proposed for 1980-81. Does that increase indicate a smaller involvement in departmental drilling in some outside private contractor drilling? Is that why the item under "Contingencies" is considerably increased while the allocation for "Salaries" is reduced?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It does not reflect a diminution of effort, but it does reflect a change of some accounting procedures from one line to another. I think it is tied up with the line on the next page where items were charged to other accounts. I will ask Mr. Whinnen to comment.

Mr. Whinnen: I refer to "Engineering Services Division", which comprises two salary lines, "Drilling" and "Mechanical Services". Last year \$1 605 000 was spent. From that line the contra entry on the following page (page 29) is "Less—Charged to other accounts", which last year had actual payments of \$991 000, and the adjustment is made because of an attempt in the presentation of the Estimates in this form to advise Parliament of the cost of the Engineering Services Division.

However, the division is a service division to the department and, as such, operates through working accounts. The funds for the workmen who work on departmental projects are provided to the department under "Contingencies". On that same page, the payment of \$781 930 was the cost of the drilling programme carried

out by the division. The department is provided with funds in two places: once under "Salaries" and once under "Contingencies"; hence the adjustment which reduces the salary area. Therefore, in looking at the net figure of the division, the actual expenditure last year was \$614 000, which is \$1 605 000 less \$991 000. That is compared to the net figure this year of \$301 000. The net figure this year is calculated. I apologise for this complicated explanation, but it is the only way to explain the situation. The net figure actually spent last year was \$614 000 by the division on salaries, and that is the cost attributable to the indirectly employed people in the division.

Mr. BANNON: How are they indirectly employed?

Mr. Whinnen: They are not directly employed in the drilling programme: they are management, overseers and the like.

Mr. BANNON: They are other supportive services?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is support service provided by people who are not in the drilling team but whose services are required and have to be costed.

The CHAIRMAN: Please allow Mr. Whinnen to complete his statement and then, if there are any supplementary questions, the opportunity will be provided to ask them.

Mr. Whinnen: The \$614 000 which was provided last year must be compared to \$301 000 provided this year. It is calculated by deducting from \$1 545 000 provided under "Engineering Services Division" the amount in the Estimates under "Less—Charged to other accounts" which is \$1 306 000. That does not mathematically work out, because \$62 000 is included in that deduction in respect of pay-roll tax on the wages of those workers. Pay-roll tax is included under "Administration, Pay-roll Tax". The net reduction from \$1 545 000 is \$1 244 000, which brings the salary provision for the division, the people not directly attributable to the programme, to \$301 000.

The difference between the \$614 000 paid last year to the division for these people's time and the \$301 000 provided this year is due to an accounting change. That is because this year the amount of \$100 000, which in the past has been recouped from outside clients and paid to revenue, as we have just discussed, is now to be repaid to the department with another amount of \$250 000, and I will refer to the accountant to determine the position in regard to that sum. We are trying hard to come from the old system to the new system, which will be explainable in lay terms. The \$354 000 is a contra entry between "Salaries" and "Contingencies". It does not indicate a reduction: it never did.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is an attempt to make the accounting process a bit simpler in the future.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I note under the heading "Mining Division", in the line "Mining Inspection" there is an increase shown from an amount spent in 1979-80 of \$295 767 to \$354 000. If one compares that with "Mining Inspection—Operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries", one finds on that line a small increase on the \$173 717 spent. Is this a somewhat greater effort in the inspection of mining due to new operations which are opening or to a new policy that may be involved for this to become a rigorous new area with inspection methods, or is it an attempt to estimate what might occur in the coming year?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We advertised for a Director of Mines, a position that had been vacant for some time. We have, in fact, appointed a Director of

Mines, although he has not taken up his duties yet. He will be starting next week and the full impact of his salary, which is in the order of \$37 000 a year, will be felt in the current year. That salary is encompassed in that line. There has been an upgrading in the Mining Division of some positions as a result of deliberations of the Public Service Board.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I take it that, despite the much vaunted promises of the Government elected last year, there has not been any great upsurge in mining activity in the past 12 months that has required a large increase in the number of regulating officers in the department who control mining activities with respect to safety and other measures one expects to find under the heading "Mining Inspection". It seems that there is going to be a qualification of the promises made in this area, just as there has been in other areas—promises involving 10 000 jobs, etc. The present Administration's promise to the effect, "All you need to do is elect a Liberal Government and mining will take care of all the State's ills with respect to employment" and so on, is certainly not reflected in the figures before us.

As the Minister has just pointed out, all but \$22 000 of the salaries increase shown in the line is related to the appointment of the Director of Mining. The remaining \$22 000 is obviously not going to provide for very many more persons to be involved in the inspection of all these Eldorados we were promised at the last State election by the present Government. Does the Minister have any further information that he has not given me? The Director of Mining's salary accounts for a good proportion of the increase in the salaries line for the year 1980-81.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Again, the honourable member attributes to me statements I have not made.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Somebody made them.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If the honourable member can contain himself, what I have said is that we have a record level of exploration in South Australia at present, and that is a statement of fact. There is a record level of exploration, which honourable members wish to measure in terms of either money or number of licences issued. There are, however, developments to which the honourable member has alluded with relation to Roxby Downs. He talked about 10 000 jobs. I do not recall any spokesman (certainly not myself) talking about 10 000 jobs associated with any particular project.

Mr. BANNON: The Premier talked of 10 000 jobs.

Mr. KENEALLY: More than that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Let honourable members get up and quote, chapter and verse, statements made, telling us in what context they were made and what developments they involved. Then I will be prepared to comment on those statements. I think it is apparent that we are on the eve of developments relating to the exploitation of hydrocarbons in the Cooper Basin.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is how they sold the South Sea Bubble—"We're on the eve of development."

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What I said (and I repeated it in the House, because it had not sunk in and because the honourable member questioned me about a Mines Department document) was that we have record exploration in South Australia at present in terms of both number of licences issued and expenditure of money. That will, in due course, I trust, lead to discoveries and development. With projects such as the Roxby Downs development, which has been quoted on numerous occasions, there are lead times involved and it would be ludicrous to suggest that we should have a sudden build-up of numbers in the mining division at this time when, in fact, we are on the eve of that particular development.

Even the member realises that resource development does not occur instantaneously, and one would not expect an instantaneous increase or even an increase over a year in the size of mining development. We have recently appointed a Director of Mines, and I believe that he will make a significant contribution to the developments currently under way in the State. It is not sensible to believe that we should have an instant build up or even a build up over the years, because developments do not occur in that time scale.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This Committee has established from the Minister at least that he now denies, does not remember, or says, "It was not I", in relation to promises made in respect of the mining area at the State election last year. You, Mr. Chairman, or any other member of the Committee may question why I am choosing this area on which to canvass this point. I think the point is a fair proposition if this is the area where persons employed in the Department of Mines and Energy are involved in inspection and other duties at mines. The promises made last year, within the memory of everyone here and the public outside, were, "If you put our lot in, mining will solve all."

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Nonsense!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister says that that is nonsense. He uses terms like "lead times", which were not mentioned during the election campaign. That is the kind of equivocation used by the Federal Government and now we are faced with it on the State scene. There was nothing associated with lead time in the policy. I have the policy and, under the heading "Mines and Energy", it states:

A Liberal Government will encourage the development of Roxby Downs.

Where does it mention allowing for lead time? I ask the Minister. There is no interjection now.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I bring to the honourable member's notice that interjections are out of order. The member can make an explanation and ask a question. Then I will call on the Minister to reply.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Surely it would not be suggested that members are not allowed at least the licence of a rhetorical question. When people make promises, there is a reasonable expectation that the promises ought to be kept. The promises made did not have "lead time" in them, nor did they have, "if" or "on the eve of" in them.

I thought that that was a marvellous explanation. Many authoritative bodies outside claim that we are on the eve of the second coming of the Lord, but does anyone say that we can expect that tomorrow or in three years time? That is the type of hypothetical thing that is thrown at us. We can go on and say, "A Liberal Government will establish a State energy authority with overall responsibility for co-ordination of energy supplies." Where, in these lines, are funds provided for that?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The member does not make his point very convincingly. He has quoted from a document stating that the Liberal Government would encourage the development of Roxby Downs, which is precisely what the Government is doing.

Mr. BANNON: It has done nothing that we had not proposed.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Leader, who interjects, is on record in *Hansard* as saying that he is opposed to the project. I can get for him the reference to where, under questioning by the member for Eyre, when the plain question was asked about whether the Minister opposed the project, the answer was "Yes".

In relation to Roxby Downs, the Labor Party has not get itself sorted out in relation to the mining of uranium ore. It

is clear that the Roxby Downs project could not go ahead and would not go ahead if a Government that was opposed to mining uranium ore was in office.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Here we go.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If it is good for the goose, it is good for the gander. When members are treated in kind, their thin skins show transparently. We are encouraging the development of Roxby Downs, and the Roxby Downs project has been speeded up. Western Mining Corporation or B.P. is putting up the money and spending \$250 000 a month in the development of the Roxby Downs ore body. If the Labor Party's present policy of not knowing where it is going in relation to uranium mining was followed, there would be no Roxby Downs, let alone a Roxby Downs in the short term.

It ill behoves the member to criticise this Government, when we said we would encourage the development of Roxby Downs, which we are doing. We in our Party or in this Government do not have the ideological worry of where we are going on uranium mining. That is a statement of fact. This Government and our Party endorse the development of Roxby Downs and we have not any hangups about development of Roxby Downs.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No morals.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Obviously, the morals are mixed up on the other side. The member who interjects is bitterly opposed to it. We are encouraging the development of Roxby Downs, and Western Mining Corporation is well aware of that. We have facilitated the provision of any services required for that. We are having discussions with Western Mining Corporation on a water supply to the mine site and on the formulation of an indenture. The Mines Department has undertaken a drilling programme in the artesian basin to assess the suitability of that water.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: They would sell their mother-in-law if it made them a buck.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: They would strip the basin.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Now we are stripping the basin because we are encouraging Western Mining. Opposition members do not know where they are going or for what they are asking on Roxby Downs. If the member wants to know whether the Government is co-operating, I suggest that he contact Western Mining and find out what is the fact. We have told Western Mining and the company concerned what our policy is.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: "Go for your life."

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Government is sensitive to the environmental effects of development. We are very sensitive to all of the strictures that ought to be put on development in those sort of terms. The honourable member wants it both ways at the moment. On the one hand we have been told that we are telling them to go for their lives, but we are not that extreme.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You are irresponsible.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Now we are irresponsible! Now the honourable member is saying that we are over-encouraging them and telling them to go their hardest. It is very hard to ascertain what he means. We can deal in semantics and say we have not decided to change the name of the Energy Council, but in fact we have upgraded the Energy Council and decided to retain the name.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Here is another bit of lead time.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is not a question of lead time. Now we have done nothing!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has asked the question which the Minister is answering, but

the answer is being extended by interjections. It is the honourable member's own fault if the answer is extended for that reason. I ask honourable members to listen and they will have an opportunity to ask further questions. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If honourable members will listen carefully I will explain to them that we have upgraded the Energy Council and formed, under that council, a couple of very important advisory bodies. In essence, the council, plus the advisory bodies and SENRAC (the organisation which is now subsidiary to the council), constitute what we would term an energy authority. We have certainly acted on that. We have upgraded the membership of the Energy Council and established an Energy and Buildings Consultative Committee which has produced an excellent publication in recent times and has a continuing charter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member wants to help me with the answer. However, I cannot pick up all the interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am indicating the upgrading, first, in relation to the establishing of new advisory committees. We have upgraded the Energy Council, established the Energy and Buildings Consultative Committee, established the Liquid Fuels Utilisation Authority, made changes in relation to SENRAC, and provided considerable increases in funds to the Energy Division. What the honourable member has claimed is nonsense.

I am constrained to speak bluntly because I do not know how he can misinterpret this Government's encouragement of Roxby Downs. It is Government policy that the development should go ahead in the interests of the State and the nation. We will do all in our power to assist in the development, and that is what we are doing. Western Mining has increased its efforts and accelerated its programme as a result of decisions it has made and as a result of Government encouragement. We are doing all we can to assist Western Mining, and we are in frequent contact with them. I understand that there are to be more discussions tomorrow with Western Mining to further this development. If the honourable member does not interpret that as an encouragement and then says that we are giving them too much encouragement, I wish he would make up his mind.

Mr. OSWALD: I refer to the Engineering Services Division. On page 28 I notice a salary line for 1979-80 of \$1 470 000 and in 1980-81 there is a slight drop in salary. On page 29 under "Drilling" we see an increase in operating expenses from \$781 000 to slightly in excess of \$1 000 000. Will the Minister give us some idea of the drilling programme being undertaken at the moment around the State to substantiate the increase in operating expenses?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will ask the Secretary in charge of the Engineering Services Division to give some information to the Committee in relation to the drilling programme and other activities of the Engineering Services Division.

Mr. Hancock: There is an increase in the allocation for general drilling operations within the Engineering Services Division. This is largely accounted for by deeper and more detailed stratigraphic drilling, both in the artesian basin and connected with other water supplies throughout the State. The small savings in salaries that have been mentioned are achieved by the savings of one position of a drilling overseer and other economies within the Engineering Services Division. I am not sure whether that

answers the question, but we could supply further information.

Mr. OSWALD: It is information about the actual drilling activity going on within the department and the State at the moment to substantiate this increase in expenditure that I am after. Information about drilling, perhaps in relation to Roxby Downs or other projects going on in the State, would be helpful.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The department is not doing any drilling at Roxby Downs. There is a programme in regard to water for Roxby Downs, and I will ask the Director to comment on the effect on the Artesian Basin. A comment was made that we were stripping the basin. I will ask Mr. Hancock to comment on drilling activities.

Mr. Hancock: I have some roneoed sheets detailing the programmes that we have outlined for the balance of this financial year if honourable members would like a copy.

Mr. OSWALD: That is the sort of information that I am after if it could be distributed.

Mr. Hancock: The Engineering Services Division consists of some 143 persons—23 staff and 120 weekly paid personnel. Our drilling programmes are both for the Department of Mines and Energy, other State and Government departments and instrumentalities, and for private companies and mineral exploration companies. Basically, we are an investigation and exploration organisation, and we do not become involved in the main with production-type drilling.

Hence, we are not a competitor in production-type exploration drilling, as is currently undertaken at Roxby Downs. We have bowed out, having set examples in coal drilling, and we are no longer a competitor in the production-type exploration at Leigh Creek. The department operates a series of test pumping operations for improved water provision for town water supplies and water supplies generally throughout the metropolitan area.

This is coupled with aquifer testing for a multiplicity of hydrological reasons. We have been involved in a dewatering test pumping operation for the Electricity Trust of South Australia at Bowmans trial pit and have worked in conjunction with Australian Groundwater Consultants and Western Mining at Kingston.

The workshop and mechanical design section are involved in providing the mechanical back-up for the department as a whole, and on occasions, and when the opportunity and facilities permit, we make the service available to other State and Commonwealth Government departments, instrumentalities, private companies and mineral exploration companies. In recent times, these have included the Environment, Marine and Harbors, and Dental Health Departments and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The total value of our drilling work for the department is indicated as being over \$1 067 000, and the estimated value of our drilling for outside organisations is about \$1 000 000 this year.

Mr. Webb: Some members of the Committee were expressing concern that we were stripping the artesian basin. For the Committee's benefit, I would certainly point out that the purpose of the department's drilling and of the studies that we are doing in conjunction with the Bureau of Mineral Resources in Canberra is to determine what the effect on the artesian basin would be of drawing the anticipated needed supplies for Roxby Downs. The initial work that has been done shows that this quantity of water could be taken from the basin without any detriment to the overall use of the basin in that region. Certainly, it would be the department's responsibility to look at questions of underground water resources to ensure that they are, in fact, used in the best interests of the State.

There is no question that we would authorise the utilisation of a basic water resource that was of sole benefit to just one project and to the disbenefit of the State generally.

Mr. Whinnen: Reference has been made to the department's drilling activities. Although we have not yet touched on the Loan Estimates, the department has in this year's Loan Estimates funds for two new drilling rigs, involving a total of \$387 000.

Mr. BANNON: I do not want at this stage to pursue the Roxby Downs energy authority argument, as we obviously have more to discuss in that respect. I should like to refer to the Mining Division and to the earlier discussion that the Committee was having about the inspection function of the department, particularly in relation to opal fields, and, to be even more precise, in relation to the Mintabie opal field. Would the Minister say what is the precise situation there? What degree of inspection and enforcement is occurring? Also, will the Minister say why this field is causing so many problems in relation to the Pitjantjatjara land rights claims?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: There is an area officer (a Mr. Ian Kimber) at Mintabie. The reason for the current problems is that Mintabie falls within part of the land in relation to which the Government has been negotiating regarding land rights. In other words, the Mintabie opal field will be completely surrounded if the envisaged legislation passes into law. It is the northernmost opal field and will fall into an area that will be Aboriginal land in terms of the Bill.

So, there is a balancing of interests in this exercise. There is a mining community at the Mintabie opal field, and those people are currently mining for opal; also, they currently enjoy mining rights under the Mining Act, and so on. Further, some of the other lands in relation to which negotiations are proceeding are termed pastoral lands. Accommodation has to be reached not only with the Aboriginal people but also with the pastoral lessees.

So, it would not be unrealistic to suggest that the discussions can be solely with the Aboriginal representatives and the Pitjantjatjara people, without recognising that other interests are involved. What makes Mintabie special in relation to opal mining is that it falls within an area that is currently under discussion in relation to the land rights issue.

Mr. BANNON: I do not think that the Minister has answered the question about the actual opal field itself. Is the department satisfied that proper procedures and observances of Acts and appropriate State laws apply on that field? Also, is it confident in relation to the degree of inspection that is being provided?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In relation to the mining activities, it is true to say that the miners are being required to operate within the law as it currently stands. If the land rights Bill is brought into Parliament in due course, the laws relating to that land will be modified. However, if one is talking about mining operations only, it is true to say that the miners are operating within the law as it currently stands. This is the responsibility of the mining warden, who is not a policeman and cannot therefore act in relation to breaches of the civil law in other areas. I can, for instance, think of areas which have caused some concern and over which the mining warden has had no specific responsibility or authority.

The Government will be concerned to see that that sort of breach is minimised. For instance, there are complaints in relation to sly-grogging and that sort of activity, which really does not come within the department's responsibility. It is really a police matter, and the Government is keen to see that any breaches of this type that are brought

to our notice are dealt with satisfactorily. However, that is not really encompassed under the present Mining Act.

Mr. BANNON: Is it a fact that the existence of the Mintabie field, its occupancy and the mining activity on it are at present the only or main stumbling blocks that are preventing agreement being reached between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara people?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: One would have to examine the sequence in which these negotiations have been carried out. I am not clear what relevance this has to the line that we are discussing. Nonetheless, I am happy to answer. The fact is that that whole range of matters has been covered in these negotiations and Mintabie was the last question to which the negotiators addressed themselves. The general provisions relating to mining had to be negotiated. I refer to the order of the former Government's Bill, and it would be true to say that the order of negotiations may have broadly followed the order in which matters were mentioned in a previous Bill. For instance, the organisation of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku was one of the first matters discussed. It was discussed logically, and was followed by the question of the extent of the land involved. The question of Mintabie would not have cropped up until one dealt with the question of what was encompassed in the land.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In relation to the non-nucleus land?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In relation to land that would be Aboriginal land for which a title was to be given to the Aboriginal people. The Mintabie question could not be one of the earlier matters dealt with because there needed to be a definition of the organisation, and agreement in relation to the extent of the land. It was the last matter dealt with because other matters had to be resolved first before that became relevant.

Mr. BANNON: Is the Minister saying that all those other matters have been resolved and that this remains the one unresolved matter?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The honourable member will know the outcome of the negotiations in due course, but they are near completion.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the question is admissible so far as this interest is related to mining. I took it last time that the Leader suggested that the question was about that matter, and I ask him to keep his question to that line.

Mr. BANNON: The Minister expanded the scope of my question by talking of other matters. I am concentrating on the existence of a mining operation in a particular piece of territory which can only continue while the department allows it to do so. I will certainly confine myself to that. If this is either the final or one of the last matters to be negotiated, with which of the Mintabie miners in that community has the Government and the Pitjantjatjara people been dealing in order to resolve the matter? Are there miners' representatives in that area taking part in the negotiations?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: When the question was open, most of the negotiations in the first instance were with Pitjantjatjara representatives. I understand some of the Pitjantjatjara representatives are, or will be, talking to representatives of the Mintabie miners. I think Mintabie has a progress association. The Government has had discussions, I think last Friday, with some representatives of the Mintabie miners to outline proposals to them. There has to be accommodation and a balancing of interests. True, the initial negotiations have been with the Pitjantjatjara people, but recently there have been discussions with miners' representatives, and I understand that the Pitjantjatjara people, if they have not had them,

are about to have discussions. They are intending to have discussions with some of the Mintabie representatives.

Mr. BANNON: If agreement cannot be reached on this matter would the Government be prepared to close the field?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is a hypothetical question. I am not prepared to jump that hurdle until we come to it, if we come to it.

Mr. BANNON: What steps has the Government taken to involve the parties? The Minister talked about discussions between the Pitjantjatjara and the Mintabie miners and/or the progress association but is uncertain whether discussions have or have not taken place. Is he or his department actively involved in bringing the parties together and organising discussions?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We cannot force either of these parties into discussions, but we suggested discussions, and I understand that that suggestion was acceded to.

Mr. BANNON: What active steps has the Government taken to implement discussions?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We have been involved intimately, as the honourable member knows, in discussions with all interested parties. We have done our level best to reach an accommodation. I have been confident, and I still am, that we will reach that accommodation.

Mr. BANNON: When was the Minister's last meeting with the Mintabie miners?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think it was last Friday.

Mr. BANNON: Has the Government power to close the field?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The answer is "Yes", but the Government would be liable for compensation if it decided on that course. Just as in the case of the accommodation of pastoral interests, there would have to be negotiated terms of settlement.

Mr. BANNON: Has any figure been set as possible compensation in that eventuality?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I repeat my earlier answer: I am optimistic that we will reach a solution satisfactory to all concerned. I am not prepared to give the Leader any more details, because we agreed with the Pitjantjatjara people that, during the course of our negotiations, there would be a degree of confidentiality. It would be quite improper for me to divulge the details of what we are proposing presently, and those negotiations have been long and protracted. They have also been detailed and protracted in relation to Mintabie. I am satisfied with the progress that we have made.

Mr. BANNON: In April the Premier announced quite boldly that agreement was now imminent. It is now many months since then. Can the Minister say when he expects that agreement to be reached?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think we will be able to announce agreement in the near future. I cannot be more precise than that.

Mr. BANNON: Will legislation be introduced in this session?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am optimistic that legislation will be introduced in this session but, until we have reached final agreement, the last "t" is crossed, the last "i" is dotted and we have argued about detail, I am not prepared to be more specific than that. The fact is (and I think the negotiators on both sides will acknowledge this) that a great deal of effort has gone in by the Government and the Pitjantjatjara people. I think everyone is optimistic that agreement will be reached in the near future and that legislation will be introduced in the current session.

Dr. BILLARD: I want to pursue the question of recompense that the Government might be liable for if it closed down a mining field. It occurred to me that there might be other situations in the State. For example, at Roxby Downs, if the Government suddenly said, "You cannot go ahead", would we have to refund the \$250 000?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It has not been paid.

Dr. BILLARD: If a future Government said, "You cannot go ahead," what would be the State's position?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The State is liable for compensation. Mr. Johns may be able to elaborate.

Mr. Johns: The Act provides for compensation for deprivation of minerals. I am not fully acquainted with any particular history of any compulsory acquisition of title that entailed loss of potential from mineral development, but there is a provision for compensation.

Dr. BILLARD: There is a sand mining situation in Queensland.

Mr. Johns: That is still unsettled.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I should have thought that the curbing of dolomite mining in the Adelaide Hills was an example of that, where I understand leases were cut back, withdrawn, or something of that sort.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Some private mines are outside those provisions of the Mining Act.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is within the province of this Parliament to change such legislation and, notice having been given, that inevitably would be the case. I was interested in some comments on Roxby Downs. The first was the comment by one officer about drilling in the artesian basin for water flow testing. I am interested to ascertain whether that drilling is being undertaken as a commercial proposition and being paid for by the partners in Roxby Downs.

I was also interested in the comment by Mr. Webb, who tried to reassure us that we had no fears about the Mines Department's capacity to ensure that South Australia's ecology and environment would be well protected in any drilling that took place there.

I rather think that, if you look around South Australia, this department (and this is no reflection on present officers) has had a track record that has not been particularly good when we look at the environment and the fact that we have had to spend money at Brukunga to rehabilitate the Bremer River. The people of South Australia have good reason to be concerned to ensure that very tight provisions are made where the environment is involved, and the artesian basin is a case in point.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think it true to say that far more care is taken in relation to the environment, and far more is known about the effects of mining operations, than was known in past centuries and decades. We are aware of environmental effects and the effects in the short term and the long term are more appreciated. I suppose one can assume that some of the mistakes of the past would not be repeated. Rehabilitation and measures affecting it are very much to the fore in this day and age, as are environmental questions. Perhaps the Director-General could comment in relation to the exploitation and other use of water resources.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I want to know whether the drilling programme is a commercial venture.

Mr. Webb: The drilling that the committee refers to has been carried out. It is on the drilling programme right at the top of the plan near Clayton River. As I recall, it was one drill hole. I think the figure was \$120 000. The concept behind the work of the department in relation to the total matter was that it would undertake some initial work on the feasibility of drawing water from the artesian basin on the understanding that, if that indicated that it was

feasible, the cost from there on of development and reticulation to the project would be at the full cost of the company.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I simply want to know whether the drilling done was a commercial proposition. Was the cost of the drilling charged to the company?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In some instances, the answer is "Yes" where the department goes out with a specific project to sink a bore for water. A quote is given to those concerned, and the department recoups the cost. Some drilling is basically of an exploratory nature and I suppose it is akin to geological mapping, where the department is getting information that may be of value in future work.

The initial work done in relation to the artesian basin was exploratory, and that has been done at Government expense. When that is assessed and information is available that a company can develop, put down bores, and draw off the water that it requires, that is done at the company's expense.

Mr. KENEALLY: There is a difference, surely, between the Government spending money to help companies involved in risk capital and exploration and the Government spending money to assist projects such as Roxby Downs which, we have been told, involve profits amounting to thousands of millions of dollars accruing to Western Mining and B.P. So, this brings to mind an important point as to whether or not the taxpayers of the State ought to be called upon to subsidise mining companies whose annual turnover is larger than the State Budget (that could well be the case with one of these companies that we are talking about, namely, B.P.). Does the department differentiate between providing that sort of service to a project such as Roxby Downs? One cannot argue that there is any risk in exploratory work as against assisting companies which have little or no prospect of successions with exploration.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is a question of balance. What the Government is prepared to do in relation to exploration and the collection of data that will be of value to mining companies and others and what the Government requires the company itself to undertake are two different things. I can give an example where, in the exploratory stages, relief is given in relation to stamp duty charges. One could argue that these big companies—

Mr. KENEALLY: Roxby Downs is past that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not know. The former Government negotiated with Roxby Downs to give it some relief from stamp duty payments, and the argument is equally valid here. B.P., a multi-national, was being offered stamp duty relief by the Labor Government. Some people thought that the question of balance had fallen the wrong way. This Government honoured those undertakings and agreed that during the exploratory stages, which are still going on, it was not inappropriate that stamp duty relief be given on the transaction to get B.P. involved.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is a fact. It is still an exploratory event and holes are being drilled to establish the extent of the ore. Even before the change of Government, the former Government, of which members opposite were members, realised that there was tremendous potential at Roxby Downs. The Government knew that it should give stamp duty relief as B.P. was brought into the exercise, and B.P. is one of the multi-nationals to which the honourable member refers. So, it is a question of balance.

Mr. KENEALLY: We have never used the term.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I forget the adjective used, but the clear implication was that these companies have a lot of money. The implication is clear, and it is a question of balance. This Government believes that it has a role to play in providing information. The previous Government believed that there was a role for the Government to play in giving concessions in negotiating deals such as that involving Redcliff. My predecessor negotiated a whole range of matters which were basically a question of balance of what the Government should be considering by way of contribution and what the company's contribution should be.

We do not believe that it is unreasonable that the Mines Department should compile information on the Great Artesian Basin because, even if the profits that apply are not entirely satisfactory for the purpose, it will be useful information for the Government department to have. Any developmental work in relation to a water supply at Roxby Downs from the Great Artesian Basin will be at their expense.

Mr. KENEALLY: Other than stamp duty concessions and drilling for water in the artesian basin, what other ways is the taxpayer subsidising B.P. and Western Mining? Will the Minister tell the Committee what other services it is providing or proposes to provide for these companies?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Government is currently negotiating with Western Mining in relation to the drafting of an indenture for the development. The honourable member will appreciate that process will take some time. His knowledge of the negotiations relating to the Redcliff project would indicate that. It would be quite premature for me to comment at this moment on details. The only firm commitment that this Government has made to date was to honour the undertaking of our predecessors in relation to the relief of stamp duty. We are currently negotiating with the company on a whole range of matters which the honourable member knows involve the final drafting of an indenture for that project.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Given the Minister's, the Government's and his Party's paranoid hatred of Government enterprise, I am very interested in the way that this Government welcomes B.P. as a partner in this project, B.P. simply being an arm of the British Government—a nationalised company which operates throughout the world as a multinational but which is an arm of the British Government.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As my Leader has reminded me, it is a company which has been well served by the Liberal Party in the past, it being a beneficiary of the Menzies Government's decision to sell off the Australian oil refinery, C.O.R. It seems an extraordinary contradiction that this Liberal Government, which so hates any sort of Government enterprise on our own shores that would give our own people, the citizens of this State, some say and some share in a project such as this is quite happy to welcome an organisation as a 50 per cent partner in the development of Roxby Downs which is owned by the British Government. I cannot understand this, and many people have raised with me the apparent contradiction. I can see members on the other side of the Committee squirming a little, and they, too, are apparently thinking about this contradiction. Will the Minister say what grounds he has for allowing this contradiction?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The short answer is that the Government does not have a paranoid hatred of private enterprise. The honourable member's hatred of trans-nationals (as he now calls them) is well known and is in print. I think that the honourable member would be

hard pressed to find the same sort of documentation for his assertion. The evidence is just not visible.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is elucidated on the sheet that has been circulated that Clayton River relates to exploratory water drilling in relation to Roxby Downs.

Mr. Webb: I said that it was a well that related to Roxby Downs. At the time that the decision was made—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I thought it was an honourable member's right to complete his question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would you ask him to speak up?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not a member of the Committee.

Mr. Lewis: But it is my right to hear the proceedings. That is my request. Will you give me a ruling on it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can remain seated where he is but he cannot participate in the functioning of the Committee at this stage. I should have thought that the honourable member could hear from where he is seated.

Mr. Lewis: I could not hear.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, I suggest that the honourable member, who has tried to scold a public servant who was trying to do his job in giving the honourable member information, has cast a slur on that public servant, who is not *au fait* with the proceedings of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. MATHWIN: That the honourable member was most rude to one of the public servants who are present tonight.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The situation is that the member for Mitchell was asking a question and at that stage Mr. Webb thought it appropriate to clarify the situation. I now ask the member for Mitchell to conclude his question, and I will then give an opportunity to Mr. Webb, through the Minister, to answer.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe that I am being forced by circumstances to point out that I intended no slur on Mr. Webb. On the contrary, I was simply trying to indicate that it was my understanding as a result of rulings that you Sir, have given earlier that members were entitled to complete their remarks before the Minister was invited to reply. In that, there was no slur whatsoever on Mr. Webb, who is known to me. We have met before, and I believe that we parted on those occasions in the way in which we met. On the previous occasion, I was Chairman of a Select Committee, and I am sure that I speak for all members of that Committee when I say that we valued the information that Mr. Webb gave the Committee. Indeed, I believe we indicated that to Mr. Webb at the time. If he was allowed to interject, I am sure that Mr. Webb would agree with that, and it ill behoves the member for Glenelg to try to introduce such nonsense.

After all that, we have established that Clayton River is the reference on the sheet with which we have been provided under the heading "Engineering Services Division, drilling programmes, 1980-81". My question relates to the blue line on the sheet. The legend on the bottom states that it refers to revenue work. I understood that we were told that a hole was drilled at the Government's expense. If that is revenue work, does "revenue" refer to the fact that that term is used in the Budget, or does it indicate that it is a chargeable item against someone other than the Government? Also, I should appreciate any information that the Minister can give me regarding the finance associated with the drilling

of that exploratory hole.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think the legend is explained at the bottom of the sheet. Revenue work refers to work done within the department's budget, and recharge work is that charged to companies and individuals outside the Government.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Minister provide the Committee with any of the technical details relating to the performance of that drilling, and can the Minister advise us whether the water supply necessary for the Roxby Downs project can be obtained from that source without detriment?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that the Director-General might be able to give the Committee some information on that.

Mr. Webb: The well has been drilled but not yet pump tested. Therefore, it is not possible to give the information that is sought. I make the point about the Clayton River bore that, at the time the decision was made to drill it, it was part of an overall programme of drilling by the Department of Mines and Energy in relation to the Great Artesian Basin generally under the Water Resources Council, with which the Committee would be familiar. It was not at that time intended as information for the Roxby Downs project only: it was asked for in the light of the potential development of a number of possible projects in that regard and the options open for water for them. This work should be done to get the information on that matter. So, it is only reasonable to point out that the work was done as part of an overall programme by the department. The company that will be most interested in the result is Western Mining Corporation.

Mr. BANNON: I would like to ask questions relating to energy policy, particularly as it is apparent that the Government is allocating greater resources to this area, which move is to be welcomed. The Minister has told us that the Government's promise to establish a State Energy Authority has, in fact, been met by the upgrading of or providing further resources to the existing Energy Council and that it will remain the Energy Council. Will the Minister tell the Committee the terms of reference of that council? Will it have the terms of reference as outlined in the Government's policy, which included advice being given to the Minister on the efficient electric power generation; efficient industrial, commercial and domestic use of energy; conversion of motor vehicles to liquid petroleum gas in urban areas; utilising solar energy facilities in large Government and other buildings; energy storage; allocation of Government grants to academic and private bodies researching energy conservation and the development of alternative energy sources including solar, wind, wave and tidal power; scholarships to enable individuals to study new energy sources; and liaison with the Federal Government's National Energy Advisory Committee?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Energy Council, with the advisory committees that I outlined earlier, encompasses many of those matters raised. The short answer is "Yes". The council acts in relation to a whole range of matters, including most of those in an advisory capacity. Much of the input comes via the SENRAC committee, the Energy and Buildings Advisory Committee and the Liquid Fuels Advisory Committee. Much work has been done within the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy by way of input. True, a large number of those functions are encompassed in the terms of reference of the Energy Council, which is the overseeing body in relation to advice to the Government.

Mr. BANNON: What is the relationship between it and the Energy Division of the department? Does it have a

separate establishment and funds at its disposal, or is it totally dependent on the division for its input?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Funds are voted to the council, and funds are voted to SENRAC and to other committees. True, the Energy Division services the council and those committees. That explains the relationship.

Mr. BANNON: The Energy Division services the council, which in turn advises the Minister. What relationship has it with high management in the department itself, for instance, with the Director-General, who also has an advisory function?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They supplement one another in that regard. Some things the division does. Obviously, not everything the division does is done at the behest of the council, but the council is an advisory body. SENRAC recommends research grants to the Government but is serviced by the Energy Division. Of course, that division is responsible to the Director-General of Mines and Energy. They undertake functions other than servicing the council. I suppose that there are two lines, if one is looking for lines by which information comes to the Government. Certainly the division is responsible to the Director-General, and information flows to the Government via that channel.

Mr. BANNON: I would now like to ask questions about energy conservation in terms of the line providing for a greater effort in that area. When in Opposition the Minister's Party promised as part of its election campaign a number of things, and I desire to ask the Minister questions concerning them. Regarding the institution of a community education programme on the means by which energy may be used efficiently, what steps have been taken to establish such a programme? Where is it being promoted? What resources are being applied to it?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: One of the initiatives of this Government in relation to public information has already come to light in the form of publications under the auspices of the Energy and Buildings Advisory Committee, but the Government has also decided to establish an energy information centre. The budget provides \$135 000 this year for the establishment of the centre. There will be inputs from the advisory committee to publications that will be available through the centre. The Government has authorised three staff to man the centre, and the level of those officers has been determined. Currently, the Government is inquiring into the most suitable premises for the centre. Decisions are being made in relation to that. This centre will provide a fund of information, not only to householders and the general public in relation to energy matters—conservation of energy will be of particular importance in this area—but also in relation to energy matters for commerce and industry.

The whole range of information will be available in relation to energy conservation. That will certainly be a strong element in the provision of information by the centre. The honourable member will agree that that is a real initiative by this Government to make information available to the public. Much of that will come from the advisory committees to the Energy Council. Much of the input will come from there to the publication of information, but of course there will be other inputs. The sum of \$135 000 is voted this year for the establishment of the centre.

Mr. BANNON: The sum of \$32 000 was spent last year.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: But \$135 000 will be spent this year. We will be physically setting up the centre. I use the phrase used in relation to the land rights, that is, it will be in the not too distant future. I would not want that to be interpreted as being very specific. The near future is

relative and depends on whether one is looking at a hundred years or a week. In using the same phrase—in the not too distant future—I would expect that that information centre will open. I believe that that is a real initiative. The Government is putting money into the national energy conservation effort, I think \$109 000 this year. This is the financial level at which most States (I think Queensland was the exception last year) have agreed to put funds into a national conservation campaign, and the Government again this year has agreed to co-operate with other States and the Federal Government in a national conservation campaign. That indicates to the Leader that the Government is serious in wishing to make information available to the public in relation to conservation.

Mr. BANNON: The Government has proposed two Loan schemes, one to encourage home owners to insulate their buildings and the other to help install solar heating units. These special loans were to be made available by the Government and repaid through quarterly accounts to ETSA or the Gas Company over a three-year period. What allocation has been made this year for the establishment of those schemes?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think any specific allocation has been made to those schemes this year. Those proposals have been referred to the Energy and Buildings Consultative Committee for its consideration. I am expecting a report in the near future.

Mr. BANNON: In the not too far distant future the Minister may not be the Minister, so I suggest he gets on with it. Will that report be made public?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That decision will be made when I see the report. It is a report to the Minister, of course. The Leader knows that not all reports to Government are made public. It will be assessed and if there is any value in making it public I expect then it will be made public.

Mr. BANNON: Will the Minister undertake that the scheme will be in operation during the life of the present Government?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I will make a decision on that when I get the report.

Mr. BANNON: This is clearly a policy decision and was included in a statement made by the Government, as follows:

In Government the Liberal Party WILL— and "will" is in capitals. Then a series of points are made, the matter under discussion being one of them. It is a clear statement. Can the Minister do no more than say he will consider it when he gets a report?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think that the Liberal Government, when in Opposition, had a document about an inch thick which was called "Broken Promises" where the Labor Party had outlined all sorts of details of things it had promised. In 10 years it was a pretty thick document, but we expect to win the next election, so I do not think the document is going to get any thicker.

Mr. BANNON: Is the Minister foreshadowing that it will not be given effect to in the life of this Parliament?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No. That construction is not valid. As I think I indicated to the Leader, I am awaiting a report on this matter.

Mr. BANNON: Has the Government taken steps to provide the necessary authority by Acts of Parliament for right of access by individual land owners to solar radiation?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Mr. Noble will indicate the state of play to the Committee.

Mr. Noble: I think the question refers to a report by the Solar Energy and Law Committee. That committee made

a whole list of recommendations, many of which touched on the question of legislation and the right to solar access. Those questions have subsequently been referred to the Energy Council. I think it is fair comment to say that they touch on matters which are fairly complex. I think it will be some time before a recommendation will come from the Council.

Mr. BANNON: What steps have been taken to establish a plant to re-refine oil waste, including motor vehicle sump oil?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Mr. Owens of the Energy Division will answer that question.

Mr. Owens: The department has initiated a study with the Australian Mineral Development Laboratory in Adelaide to examine the current state of technology with respect to waste oil re-refining, and to evaluate the potential supply of waste oil from service stations and other sources in South Australia. We expect that that study will be completed in approximately nine months, the first quarter of 1981. On the basis of that study, we will be making recommendations to the Government as to what steps will be undertaken either to establish a waste oil re-refining facility or to facilitate other alternatives, which include semi-processing through to fuel oil for combustion in furnaces, or to semi-processed oil, which could be processed through a lube oil refinery.

Mr. BANNON: I must congratulate the department on the Minister's behalf, because I think he is most gratified and surprised that apparently not only has the policy been read but taken seriously by some of the officers. The conservation of petroleum products was a matter given some prominence and a number of points were put forward to encourage such conservation. Will the Minister outline what steps have been taken to implement the policy and what resources have been devoted to it?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I think Mr. Noble may be able to answer this question, but the thrust of the national campaign has been, basically, in relation to the conservation of petrol. The \$109 000 we are putting into the national campaign is put in on the understanding that the thrust of the campaign will be directed to the conservation of liquid fuel in motor cars. The other thing the Government is particularly interested in is the conversion of petrol-driven vehicles to l.p.g. I think that when the Cooper Basin l.p.g. comes on stream there will certainly be ready availability of gas over a long period as fuel. It is a matter of encouraging more outlets. That will really get under way, in my view, when there are production line vehicles which do not require conversion to l.p.g. Datsun are producing l.p.g. vehicles. What motorists and fleet owners balance off at present is the cost of conversion against the pay-back time, and the 50 per cent loading in the Federal Government policy in favour of l.p.g. does not appear, at the moment, to encourage motorists, where the mileage is moderate, to convert.

For high-mileage vehicles, that will be attractive. Probably the major thrust is the federally-organised campaign to which we are significant contributors. Mr. Noble may wish to say something.

Mr. Noble: One other matter that will hopefully lead to conservation of petroleum products in the longer term would be the encouragement of the electric vehicle, which this Government is continuing and which was initiated by the previous Government. An amount of \$138 000 is provided this year to convert 10 electric vans, using Flinders University technology. We should not think of it in the short term but, hopefully, in the long term.

Dr. BILLARD: I raise the matter of the Energy Information Centre. How does it plan to get its information to the public? So far, discussion has centred

around input to the centre from the information side. Will it advertise in the newspapers or put leaflets in letter boxes?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It will be a centre, in the sense that the State Information Centre is located on the ground floor section of the Grenfell Centre. I believe that the main dissemination of information will be via the public going to the centre and asking for it, but I think the centre will be involved in other information. If people want information from the State Information Centre, they go and get what is available. This centre will be stocked with a whole range of books, some of which I guess will be hand-outs and some for which there will be a charge. Perhaps Mr. Noble could expand on that.

Mr. Noble: I think it relates to the experience in New South Wales and Victoria, which have similar centres to the type we propose. In New South Wales about 60 000 people a year go through the centre, despite the fact that it is in the Rocks area, which is hard to find. I think that, once you advertise that a centre is operating, people come to it. People will also talk about pamphlets and brochures. I think the essential way in which it will operate is that there is a need for it, and people will be attracted to it.

Mr. KENEALLY: There are three items for the Department of Mines and Energy relating to Redcliff. Can the Minister say whether it is proposed that the money allocated will be spent during the coming financial year and on what it will be spent?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Of the three references, two are in order and one has been dealt with.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The member would appreciate that those figures were established when it was expected that the Redcliff project would go ahead, but we are now aware that a decision by Dow will not be made for two years, so I do not think it would be feasible to postulate how much of the money would be spent until we knew the result of inquiries that the Premier has made in Japan and what other interest has been generated in the project.

If no other interest was generated during the 12 months, I would not expect this money to be spent, certainly not to that extent. It is premature to say that the money will not be spent, although the Redcliff position in relation to Dow anyway is now fairly clear, but nothing is yet clear in relation to other tenders.

Mr. KENEALLY: Should a petro-chemical plant be constructed in South Australia to take advantage of the resource in our gas fields and if it is intended that the project be constructed at Redcliff, there appears no reason for this money not to be spent. We have advice about Dow, and I understand that that decision has been made because the major world economies, the United States and Japan, and the European Economic Market, have had a marked down-turn, and obviously a liquidity problem in Dow has encouraged it not to go ahead.

One argument is that the market for chlorine is not as the company would like it to be. I am speaking on behalf of a large number of people who live in that area and want to have, as early as possible, the assurance they are justly entitled to from the Government as to what the Government will be able to do to protect those people from the impact that such development will inevitably have on them. It is obvious to me and the Opposition that that sort of programme should continue. It has been suggested that it may be delayed for 12 months.

Will the Minister tell the Committee whether there is still a viable petro-chemical industry for South Australia? If there is, will the Government still insist that it be at

Redcliff and, if that is the case, how can the Minister justify any suggestion that the work currently being undertaken will not continue at the rate that it would have if the project decision had been favourable?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: As the honourable member knows, there is currently no firm proposition for a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff. Dow Chemical is the only company with which this Government was pursuing negotiations at the time of the change of Government in regard to establishing a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff. There was no suggestion of another company or another site at that time.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Liberal Government was to establish the development of a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff. It has fumbled it.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It was not a case of fumbling. We provided some of the most important aspects of negotiations in relation to the producers and the Dow Chemical Company coming to agreement on the price of feed stock. Long negotiations took place after the change of Government, when everybody thought that the project decision day was becoming more imminent. The Leader, in a public statement, suggested that a decision would be made in March or April and said that it was certain to go ahead. He was obviously highly optimistic.

The negotiations in relation to feed stock prices were basically between the producers, who were the suppliers, and the Dow Chemical Company, who were the users. The Government sought to expedite those negotiations but they were protracted. The Leader was making an announcement in relation to Redcliff and I can understand why.

Mr. BANNON: We carried the project publicly on your behalf. We were in the field while you were sitting on the fence doing nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is only fair to *Hansard* that questions come through the Chair.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Leader can claim what he likes but the Government is promoting that project. We were doing all that could be done to promote negotiations, to draw up an indenture to cover the project, and to honour the promises made by our predecessors in relation to the project. If the Labor Party had been in Government the decision may have been delayed even longer. It was in the air that the Government believed that the Dow Company owed it to the public of South Australia to make a decision. Originally, the Dow Company was given exclusivity to 30 June, and it then asked for an extension of time. There were plenty of delays in this project in the life of the previous Administration, so I do not think that honourable members can suggest that the Liberal Government is doing anything but trying to expedite the project. The Dow Chemical Company agreed to give a decision on 10 October. We gave them exclusivity until 10 October. However, no project decision will now be made under two years, and it would be irresponsible for the Government to keep the urban project group going full bore on the project, as no project has been decided upon. I would expect the work being done by the urban project team and negotiations in relation to housing infrastructure at this time not to be continued; indeed, it would be foolhardy for the Government to press on with any expedition in that area.

I take the honourable member's point in relation to the environmental studies at Redcliff. It is pertinent to point out that Dow Chemical has agreed to continue in that matter. However, I might say that I was surprised at the lack of information that the previous Government had gathered in relation to the marine environment. I do not say that with any malice but rather as a statement of fact. I

was surprised to learn that during the whole of the Redcliff history there was so little detailed knowledge of the marine environment. The previous Government must bear its share of responsibility for that situation.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What is your share?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I admit that that was not brought home to me early in the life of the present Administration but it obviously had been completely neglected previously. I was concerned, as was every Government member, about the marine environment. We required the Dow Company to conduct a further two years research as a safety measure in relation to the marine environment. We believe the recommendations of the Department for the Environment and have taken them as being correct. Nonetheless, in the light of comments in the Department of Fisheries we believe that we should err on the side of extra caution, although the Department for the Environment suggested that they were being cautious.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is that why Dow put it off for two years?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, that is not the case. The Dow Company made a public statement which I believe to be correct; that is, that the decision was a commercial decision in relation to the availability of E.D.C. I think the honourable member referred to chlorine, but the sale of chlorine was not involved. The Dow Company has not wiped the project off, but is saying that it does not contemplate making a decision or starting work under two years.

It has undertaken to continue its studies, having spent \$3 000 000 already over a fairly long period gathering information over the whole spectrum. I understand that it is prepared to spend \$1 000 000 over the next two years. I will be able to be more precise when I speak to the Premier on his return tomorrow, my information having come via a telephone conversation and a telex message. The company has undertaken to spend that much money, over, I think, two years, and that will be valuable work, even if it decides not to proceed. That information will certainly be useful to us in South Australia. However, I repeat that it is impossible to say exactly what the level of spending will be, as we know that this will not go ahead yet. It would be irresponsible to spend money in some areas, particularly in relation to the housing programme.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is on the lines.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Yes, but that was when people were confident that the answer would be affirmative.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A move can be made to reduce it.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They can do what they like. The fact is that the circumstances are now a bit different. If another firm proposal for a petro-chemical complex comes up in future, the planning will go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the Committee's attention to Sessional Orders, which provide that the debate on the remaining votes will cease at 10 p.m., and that no further opportunity will be available for debate.

Mr. KENEALLY: Do I understand from the Minister that, once Dow Chemical has finished its environmental studies into the Upper Spencer Gulf, the results of the study will be available to the Government or to other proponents that may wish to construct a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff should Dow not be the successful company?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I do not think that it would be realistic to expect that of the Dow Company. Much of this money will be spent on the salaries of people who are involved in gathering information. However, the extent to which the Dow Company would say, if it decides

not to go ahead, "Here are our books; make the most use of them" would be up to the company. I think that a fair bit of useful information will become known to the Government.

I do not think that any company would act in quite the way that the honourable member has suggested. After all, the company is not doing this research purely out of the goodness of its heart. I think this indicates that it still has some interest in the project. However, the Premier has told the company that it cannot expect the Government not to pursue negotiations with other companies over that time scale. I do not think that the company would have been prepared to spend \$1 000 000 unless it had a continuing interest in the project.

Mr. KENEALLY: As I am not completely happy with the way in which the Government has handled the Redcliff project, I move:

That the vote for the Redcliff petro-chemical works project team be reduced by \$100.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer to the Sessional Orders and advise honourable members that I am unable to accept the motion.

Mr. BANNON: You can understand the intention, Sir. We wish to express our dissatisfaction with the Government's handling of the negotiations over the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. How best can we express that intention? We will take your guidance.

The CHAIRMAN: I can accept the motion concerning the opinion of the Committee. Regarding resolutions and expressions of opinion, the report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of a Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

Mr. BANNON: I move:

In the opinion of this Committee the Government's handling of the negotiations for the Redcliff petro-chemical plant is to be condemned.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: On a point of order. What will be the form of this opinion? Is it debated in the normal form with the mover moving his motion and then an opportunity for a response?

The CHAIRMAN: A member of the Committee may move a resolution or expression of opinion relating to the vote under discussion. As in Committee of the whole House, discussion then must centre around that motion. All members of the House, including the Minister being examined, may participate in the debate. At the conclusion of the debate the question is put by the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That the motion be put forthwith.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask why the honourable member is moving that motion. If the Leader is sincere in what he is trying to do, he should give some explanation to the Committee of the motion. It is insufficient for the member for Elizabeth to try and place a gag on the debate before we have even heard an explanation of the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is debating the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must not debate the point of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr. Chairman. It was a matter of the Leader who has moved the motion, with his supporter moving the gag so that there could be no discussion, and I believe that the Leader should put forward his argument.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The committee is being conducted under the rules of a Select Committee and a committee of the House and there is no order that I can see that prevents me from accepting the

motion. The member for Elizabeth has moved that the motion be put.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did not realise that we would have such opposition from the member for Glenelg. I am not anxious to upset him further. I thought there had been adequate debate over the past half-hour over Redcliff, and the motion, in general terms, expresses the view that the matter has not been handled too successfully.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member wish to withdraw the motion?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In light of the fact that I am going to upset the member for Glenelg, and I would not want to do that, I withdraw the motion so he can contribute to the debate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan's motion negated.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I would like to say something. We have a motion virtually of no confidence in the Government for its handling of the Redcliff petro-chemical project but it is, to put it kindly, not based on very probing questions from the Opposition Party.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You are not involved.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We are in Committee and I think I am allowed to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: I will read the rule of procedure again. It states:

As in Committee of the Whole House, discussion then must centre around that motion. All members of the House, including the Minister being examined, may participate in the debate. At the conclusion of the debate, the question is put by the Chair.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am participating in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: That is in order.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We have this motion as a result of fairly immature questioning by the Opposition.

Mr. BANNON: Here we go!

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They like to dish it out but do not like to get it back. I will keep on saying that until they learn that, if they dish it out, they will have to take it back. The Leader would be well advised to study the performance of the four people who ran the Labor Party before he came to power. I had a lot of respect for them because they could dish it out but also could take it.

To put the most kindly construction on the motion, it is puerile. It is put on the basis of information given in relation to negotiations that have gone on by this Government and officers of the steering committee since we came to office. The Leader has not been privy to any of those discussions of the committee or of the urban planning group. He has not been privy to much, except that he has been involved in the same thing as his predecessors.

They announced this project *ad nauseam* back to 1973. If anyone is to blame, it is the Labor Party. In 1973, when Dow was interested in establishing a plant in this State, Connor killed it, because he shared some of the hatred of multi-nationals that the member for Elizabeth shows in his pronouncements and writings. Had Minister Connor not intervened, we could have had Dow operating a petro-chemical plant in the State, but he said, "Go home, Dow, we do not like you."

I have been privy to an examination of the files, which show what consternation that caused the former Administration in this State. There was a great deal of consternation in relation to the activities of Minister Connor. I think that the public was getting fed up with the announcements of the Opposition Party and the continued

announcements of the present Leader of the Opposition, who confidently and without being privy to any of the discussions in relation to those decisions publicly stated that the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was a sure goer, was a certainty, and was going to start in April. He must have been very confident to make those sort of predictions. He took umbrage last week in the House when I suggested that he was making those statements from a vantage point of ignorance. He got very uppity and displayed many of those traits that he so frequently displays when the truth hurts. From his position of not being privy to any of those negotiations he confidentially stated—

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I challenge the honourable member to ask Dow Chemical whether anything this Government has done has been instrumental in its not going ahead with this project. The answer would be a firm “No”. If he has such contact with Dow Chemical, maybe it would be more sensible to phone them and ask them whether they blame the Government for the failure of this project. He would quite happily withdraw his ill-considered motion. It is absolute nonsense for the Leader to conclude that the Government had not completed the negotiations satisfactorily when he was not privy to any of those negotiations.

This is the style I adopt when I am confronted with the nonsense that honourable members opposite trundle up to me. If the public servants want to go home, they can. Honourable members opposite raised it, and I want to give them a few of the facts of life. I want to put this debate into perspective. I want to deal with questions pertinent to this debate. We had a series of premature announcements and now we have this motion of no confidence in relation to those negotiations. I invite the Leader to contact the Dow Company. He claimed by way of interjection that he has been in direct contact with Dow Chemical.

Mr. BANNON: That's right.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I find it hard to believe that anything that Dow Chemical told the Leader of the Opposition back in April could lead to the conclusion that the project would be announced in April. I have been more closely involved than has the Leader of the Opposition with the negotiations, and I know the state of the negotiations in relation to the price of feed stock. I knew as soon as I read the announcement of the Leader of the Opposition that he was talking out the back of his head. If he had been privy to the negotiations, he would have realised that, too.

However, we know perfectly well that he wanted to be a part of the action. This is the Labor Party's project, and the Leader had to keep in the action and get some publicity. The Leader speaks from a position of ignorance in relation to the Government's negotiations.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You're God most of the time.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If the honourable member does not like my debating style, I do not intend to change it in order to suit his sensibilities. The honourable member will have to compose himself so that he can have the degree of patience needed to put up with this. The Government appointed Mr. Schroder as Chairman of the project team because we were entering a phase when we were to write the indenture and when commercial decisions had to be made.

Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that Mr. Schroder was not a fit and proper person to head up that project team when we were entering a stage where commercial decisions were being made and an indenture

was to be written? If honourable members want to criticise Mr. Schroder let them do so.

Mr. BANNON: We are criticising your action in relation to Mr. Bakewell.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Opposition members criticise me for replacing Mr. Bakewell. The Government appointed Mr. Schroder because it was of the view that he had the sort of expertise that was required at that time, when an indenture was being negotiated and written with the Dow Company. If Opposition members do not believe that the negotiating team had the necessary expertise, they are criticising Mr. Schroder, who put a great deal of time and effort into this project when it reached the critical stage. Indeed, that gentleman had quite a leading role in facilitating the difficult negotiations in relation to prices.

The Government undertook to get the parties together when it looked as though things would break down. The Government and Mr. Schroder took positive steps to talk to the Dow Company representatives and the producer representatives to see that the negotiations were facilitated. The Leader of the Opposition does not know, and does not want to know, about that. He accuses me of filibustering, when I am giving a few of the facts in relation to the negotiations. The fact is that it would be far more reasonable—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That the Minister of Mines and Energy be no longer heard.

The CHAIRMAN: In the event of a vote being taken on the motion and a division being requested, the Chairman shall take down the names of the members voting in any such division. Those in favour of the motion will indicate by raising their hands; those against the motion will so indicate by raising their hands. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

The Hon. R. G. Payne's motion negatived.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: To give some balance to this ridiculous motion, I should give the Committee and particularly Opposition members information that they have not had in relation to negotiations, which is what I am doing.

Mr. BANNON: You are not—you are abusing us.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: In one of the most difficult parts of the negotiations, in relation to the price of feedstock—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Let him talk to himself, I would not listen to the miserable bastard.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I withdraw that remark and say that I would no longer listen to that person.

Opposition members having withdrawn:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Let me say, in relation to those difficult negotiations, that Mr. Schroder and I, as Minister, and some of my officers, played an important part in bringing them to fruition. If the Leader of the Opposition was concerned with getting the facts, he would have waited until the Premier returned to South Australia from his negotiations with the Dow Chemical Company. He should be prepared to wait and hear what the Premier had to say in a full report to the Leader. I am sure that the Premier would have been happy to provide one.

Motion negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare that the examination of the Mines and Energy vote of \$9 560 000 is completed.

Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous, \$828 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Dr. B. Billard
Mr. J. Mathwin
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald
Mr. I. Schmidt

Witness:

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy, Acting Premier, Deputy Premier, and Minister of Mines and Energy.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. B. Webb, Director-General, Department of Mines and Energy.

Mr. K. Johns, Deputy Director-General.

Mr. R. Hancock, Director, Engineering Services Division.

Dr. C. Branch, Director, Resources Division.

Mr. M. Whinnen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. L. Owens, Manager, Energy Development Branch.

Mr. J. Noble, Manager, Energy Policy Division.

Mr. J. Hochwald, Accountant.

Mr. K. Bockmann, Director of Audits (Auditor-

General's Department), formerly Chief Administrative Officer until 31 August 1980.

Mr. SCHMIDT: What is the nature of the *ex gratia* payment to the city of Marion?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I ask Mr. Webb to provide that information.

Mr. Webb: It relates to the golf course at Marion which was built with the help of the quarry people there and the use of Government money. The land tax that would normally be payable by the council through the quarry owners is paid by the Government. That is the reason for the *ex gratia* payment.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Last year \$6 000 was paid so that members of the Pitjantjatjara council could come to Adelaide. This year I see that no allocation is made but \$8 000 is referred to in the programme papers.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: On occasions the Government has paid the expenses of the Pitjantjatjara to come to Adelaide, but it does not appear on this page. The \$8 000 is a sum carried forward on another matter.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday October 1 at 11 a.m.