

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 September 1993

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon

Members:

The Hon. H. Allison

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore

Mr M.R. De Laine

Mr C.D.T. McKee

Mr E.J. Meier

The Hon. J.P. Trainer

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that I need go through the ground rules to any great extent as all members are fairly experienced in these Committees and their procedures. In some cases it is more appropriate for a written answer to be provided if information is not readily available or if it is questioned in tabular form or something of that nature. In that case, two copies should be submitted no later than Friday 1 October to the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

I propose to allow the lead speaker for the Opposition and the Minister to make opening statements if they so desire, but I should like them to be confined to about 10 minutes, or no longer than 15 minutes, because the primary purpose of the Committee is to question the estimates and obtain information.

The usual rule of three questions will apply with a little flexibility if there is a logical supplementary question or two. I will go from side to side as questions flow, but we do not want one member hogging the whole of the proceedings. I assure members that all possible questions will be allowed to be asked.

The questions must be based, under the Standing Orders, on the lines of expenditure as revealed in the estimates of payments and receipts. However, reference may be made to other documents—Program Estimates, the Auditor-General's Report, and so on. It would help if members would identify the page numbering in the relevant financial papers when asking their questions in order to aid the retrieval of information.

At each point of changeover I will ask the Minister to introduce the advisers who will be participating in the Committee's proceedings. Questions are to be addressed directly to the Minister. Of course, the Minister may refer questions at any time and in whatever way to advisers for a response, if appropriate. That can sometimes assist the proceedings, but that is a matter for the Minister's discretion.

Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage,
\$56 535 000

Witness:

The Hon. Anne Levy, Minister for the Arts and Cultural

Heritage, Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister for the Status of Women.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms J. Caust, Director, Arts Division, Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage.

Mr H. Bachmann, Chairman, South Australian Film Corporation.

Mr G. Brealey, Managing Director, South Australian Film Corporation.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The gentlemen are with me at the moment because of an understanding reached with members of the Opposition that initially questions would be directed regarding film in this State. I will introduce the advisers behind me when we move on to other topics.

In terms of an opening statement, I do not want to take much time of the Committee but indicate that there are a few changes in the way that the estimates of payments for the Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage have been presented this year, which may assist in understanding the financial details.

Last year we indicated it and this year the receipts lines now include the receipts from Artlab's commercial activities and this coincides with the new departmentally initiated auditing arrangements for Artlab. Expenditure under the Conservation of Moveable Heritage Program has been reformed accordingly and in consequence there are changes in the way both these expenditures and receipts are presented.

Members may also note that under 'receipts' there is a new line: the new State Local Government Reform Fund, which is a transfer from the specific petrol tax imposed by the State Government on behalf of local government and from that fund there is a receipt to the department, which now provides the fund for local public libraries and community information services according to the agreement between State and local governments.

Program 1: Development of the Arts—The setting out there has been reformed to reflect the establishment of the South Australian Country Arts Trust, which came into operation on 1 January this year, though it obviously had been foreshadowed at this time last year.

Program 8: the provision of Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Services—There is now a new recurrent line called Audio and Lighting Program, which previously had not been separated out.

Finally, the Intra-agency Support Services section has been amended to recognise the transfer of the Parks Community Centre from the Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage. All information regarding the Parks Community Centre is now contained in the section of the budget papers dealing with the Department of Recreation and Sport.

There is a new line, maintenance of buildings, which has been added as it was felt it was more informative to separate that out and deal with it separately rather than have it rolled into a more global figure.

I hope that will clarify any queries members may have on the differences between the presentation of the budget information this year compared to last year.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to page 292 of the Auditor-General's Report, which identifies the accumulated loss for the South Australian Film Corporation as at 30 June. In the Committee last year, in answer to questions about the viability of the corporation, the Minister stated that the financial position of the corporation 'is

relatively strong'. She said that the corporation had turned the corner, but last financial year the corporation recorded a net loss of \$531 000, increasing its accumulated losses to \$7.511 million.

Last Friday the Minister announced that the Government had directed the corporation to cease being an active producer of films and that the corporation is to be restructured. Will the restructured South Australian Film Corporation inherit the accumulated losses generated under the current corporation structure? If not, what has the Government resolved as to those losses? Will they be simply written off? Will the Government's capital contribution be written off, including the \$2.6 million the State Government converted from a loan to equity following the *Ultraman* debacle?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The figures that the honourable member is quoting are not correct. The operating deficit of \$531 000 includes non-cash items of depreciation and amortisation. This year the corporation has made a cash surplus of \$48 000, which substantiates the remarks I made in last year's Estimates. There has certainly been a vast improvement on the previous year's figures, where a substantial cash deficit was recorded. As at 30 June this year working capital has improved and shows a surplus of \$108 000 at the end of the financial year. I can give a further breakdown of those figures.

Drama distribution made a surplus of \$117 000; there was a receipt of \$63 000 for distribution and buying of *Ultraman*, and there is another \$43 000 in back catalogue sales. The cash situation is actually better than that recorded, because there has been receipt of money from *The Battlers* production, which has continued into this financial year and *The Battlers* is now in post-production, with all shooting having finished. It is not correct to say that the Film Corporation has had a poor year. As I indicated last year, it has recorded a cash surplus of \$48 000, a highly commendable result.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a supplementary question: my question to the Minister was not about cash surpluses; I asked, 'Will the restructured Film Corporation inherit the accumulated losses generated under the current structure?' I think it is important that the Committee receives as answer to that question, the second half of which is: are the corporation's assets and liabilities to be transferred to the new structure, including its investment in drama production amounting to \$4.39 million?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The new structure for the corporation will certainly have the assets and liabilities which exist at the present time. With regard to drama production, as indicated, except in exceptional circumstances, the Film Corporation will cease being a producer of films, but obviously there are potential drama productions which are being investigated, and the exceptional circumstances referred to may well include some of those which are currently in development. The negotiations are being undertaken with regard to a considerable slate which the Film Corporation has in development at the moment. It is impossible at this stage to indicate what the outcomes of those negotiations will be, but it may well be that one or two of those will be most adequately advanced for the benefit of film production in this State by the Film Corporation continuing as a producer for some of those which are currently in development.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Auditor-General notes on page 294 that the Film Corporation's investment in productions and projects in progress, which amounts to \$776 000, includes \$432 000 in non Film

Corporation investments, which are required to be repaid to investors when projects are funded for actual production. Can the Minister confirm whether or not the Film Corporation must now repay this sum of \$432 000 because it will no longer be an active producer and, if so, does the corporation have the funds to repay these non Film Corporation investments or will the Government be required to repay these investments?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It is hard to give a definite answer to that question at the moment. It involves a large number of projects that are under development with the corporation, and there would be separate negotiations relating to each of those projects. It will depend very much on the outcome of the negotiations and on each individual project. For example, if there is a project in which the Film Corporation has invested money and that project does eventuate at some time but without the Film Corporation in the role of producer, the Film Corporation is then refunded its investment on the first day of shooting of that film.

That is the normal sort of contractual agreement in these circumstances, but it is impossible to give an overall answer because it will depend on the negotiations that occur for each of these developments. One would expect that if any of them do go ahead eventually, but without the Film Corporation as producer, there will be a recoupment of what has been invested in that project.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a supplementary question, how long might it take? Might it be two years, five years or 10 years before the Film Corporation can expect repayment of its investments as a non-producer for productions that have been passed on to other producers?

The Hon. Anne Levy: While it is impossible to be accurate in this situation (because it will vary from one project to another), one could expect to have finalisation within about two years in general, but there could be some particular projects that take longer and others of course may well be settled much earlier than that.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 156 of the Estimates of Payments under Program 1, 'Development of the arts'. In respect of the decision to increase the Government's investment in film production by \$850 000 to \$2.509 million, will the Minister clarify whether these additional funds are to be found from within her own department's budget and, if not, from what source will they be found?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think it is \$830 000, not \$850 000.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am sorry, I am looking at the line below.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The recurrent payments for the South Australian Film and Video Centre are listed as \$850 000: for the Film Corporation the recurrent payments list \$530 000 which, of course, was the sum allocated last year and put into the budget estimates for the current financial year. Since the budget was drawn up, I have announced in the past few days the restructure of the Film Corporation and its new functions, which will be accompanied by an additional payment of \$830 000.

This is not in addition to the budget: that money will be provided from the money allocated for the Economic Development program through the lines of the Minister for Business and Regional Development. That \$830 000 extra is the summation particularly of \$600 000 for a Production Investment Fund, and the remainder for a marketing and promotions program, which are crucially important compo-

nents of the new function of the Film Corporation. The production investment is for the Film Corporation to provide seeding money to encourage production in South Australia from producers interstate or overseas, and it is felt that this should very much increase the amount of production which occurs within South Australia, and will be of considerable advantage to the whole industry in this State, not least by way of employment opportunities for those who work in the industry. The use of this money can bring very large sums into the State from productions which are largely financed from outside South Australia.

As an example, I could quote that, this year, the Film South program has invested nearly \$500 000 in three independent productions, as a result of which over \$8 million has been brought into the State by outside producers who are producing within the State. Consequently, this is a very good return indeed for the money which is being invested in these films.

The Production Investment Fund will play this role on behalf of the Film Corporation, and we certainly expect that it will act as a lever to bring considerable economic benefits to the State. The other sum, which is for the marketing and promotions campaign, was recommended in the review of the Film Corporation, and has been accepted by the Government as a highly desirable program to undertake.

South Australia has often been described in film terms as one of Australia's best kept secrets, and it is said that the advantages of filming in this State are not as well known as they should be. We have considerable advantages for film production in this State: we have a large pool of highly skilled and experienced actors and technical staff; we have good facilities; we have superb locations, all within a very reasonable distance of Adelaide; we have what film makers regard as an excellent climate; and we also have production costs which are lower than those which apply in most of the Eastern States. It is felt that by setting up a marketing and production fund we will be able to inform the rest of the world about the advantages of making films in this State. This should repay itself in terms of increasing film activity within South Australia.

Mr McKEE: Some specific questions have already been asked about financial matters. On page 434 of the Program Estimates, under 'Specific Targets/Objectives' there is the statement, 'Implement recommendations of reviews into the South Australian commercial film industry'. Can you expand on the results of that review?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I am happy to do so. I have mentioned the review of the Film Corporation, which was considered recently by the Government together with the working party report from some months ago which related to the independent sector of the film industry in South Australia. Consideration of these two reviews has led to the new structure to which reference has been made.

The review of the South Australian Film Corporation had been promised for the middle of 1994, and that had been announced some time ago; but, with the departure of the then Managing Director, it was felt appropriate to bring that review forward and have it take place this year. I think the results will be of very great benefit to the film industry in this State.

The specific review of the Film Corporation recommended that the corporation cease being an active producer of films, though special circumstances could always allow that to be reversed. It also recommended that arrangements should be made for projects which are currently in development and

that, if they showed potential, they should take place within South Australia. So, whether or not the Film Corporation is an active producer, at least the film should be made in South Australia.

There was a recommendation that a new organisation should be established which would manage all the film funding programs which are currently undertaken through the department and the corporation. This would include programs directed towards the independent film producers in this State. The Film Corporation will take over the managing of all the film support programs, and the new organisation will retain the name South Australian Film Corporation, because that name is known and acknowledged and has considerable prestige not only in South Australia but in the rest of Australia and overseas. It was felt that, although establishing a new organisation, it would be beneficial to keep the old name rather than have to establish a new name which would be unknown. The Film Corporation's high reputation is very much to the benefit of this State in the film world and that should be maintained by retaining the name.

The review recommended an increase in funding of \$830 000 per annum. It recognised that establishing the new organisation cannot be done overnight and that it might take up to six months to achieve. We are moving as rapidly as possible to set up the new structure and set the film industry on its new path. Although the review said that it might take six months, I hope that it can be achieved more rapidly. I think that the sooner the new organisation can get under way, the better it will be for the film industry in this State.

The review recommended that the board of directors of the corporation should be increased in size. Presently it is limited to six under legislation. The review felt that, given the new role, a wider range of skills and experience would be required on the board and that there should be not less than eight and not more than 10 members of the board. It could then have all the skills that it requires for its new role and be able to reflect the broad interests of the entire film industry. The achievement of that recommendation will require legislation to change the Act of the Film Corporation to allow for a greater number of members on the board. I hope to be able to introduce such legislation in the very near future. I also hope that this new structure for the film industry will have the endorsement of all members of Parliament and that the necessary legislation will have a speedy passage.

The review also recommended that the new Film Corporation should work actively in association with the Economic Development Authority so that they can together explore opportunities within the Asia-Pacific area and be able to participate in the development of the media industry in South Australia as a whole. A member of the Economic Development Authority was a member of the review team. Following the preparation of the report, there have been considerable discussions between officers of the department and the Economic Development Authority, with the result of the extra funding for the new structure coming through the economic development program of the Economic Development Board.

A further recommendation in the review, which has not been touched upon, is that a business plan should be developed for the studio facilities at Hendon and that this should be undertaken with involvement of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and the Economic Development Authority. We hope to get that under way as soon as possible, but obviously some matters will need to be attended to before that can be undertaken.

The other recommendation of the review related to the marketing and promotions program, which I have already mentioned. The Government was pleased to accept all the major recommendations of the review team. We believe that they will be of enormous benefit to the film industry in this State. Certainly I am keen to get it up and running as quickly as possible.

Mr McKEE: I turn now to page 156 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, program 1. Has any support been given to low budget cultural development films this year, and, if so, what?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Film South, which is not part of the Film Corporation, receives a budget from the State Government for assistance to independent film producers or the independent film sector in this State. For some time Film South has been operating a Creative Development Fund, which is designed to assist developing film makers to develop and produce short films. This is particularly important for individuals who are starting out on a career in film production. Very often these particular films which are supported are the first ever made by a particular individual.

This year there are eight short films being supported through the Creative Development Fund. Half a dozen of them are dramas; the remaining two are documentaries. The grants which each have received range from \$17 000 to \$60 000. Some of them have also received funding through the Australian Film Commission, which of course has added to their budgets. One of these, at least, has been completed.

I had the pleasure of seeing one not long ago; a delightful little drama called *Dirty Dishes*—the musings of someone who is tackling the dirty dishes remaining from a party the night before. Anyone who has ever faced that situation will identify with it and I am sure will enjoy the film very much indeed.

I can perhaps indicate that these Creative Development Fund films are supported not only through Film South but also through the Film Corporation, to the extent that the costs associated with use of the studios at Hendon are considerably reduced for anyone who is in receipt of a grant from the Creative Development Fund. They are further subsidised by being charged only one-third of the usual costs for use of the facilities at Hendon.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to the Minister's earlier answer to my question about the corporation retaining assets and liabilities and the Minister confirmed that that would be the case. Given that all the assets and liabilities will be retained, and given that the corporation will not be a producer any more, how does the corporation propose to generate income to reduce its accumulated losses? Also, how does it propose to generate income to pay dividends on the equity which was granted to the corporation in the form of the \$2.6 million loan to which the Minister referred in Estimates Committee last year? To refresh her memory I repeat what the Minister said:

The Government loan was converted to equity and instead of repaying the loan the Film Corporation will pay dividends on that equity from any profit it is able to make.

She continued:

The corporation will be able to pay dividends.

And again she said:

The loan was converted into equity on which dividends would be payable.

Given that there will be no production, how does the corporation propose to reduce its accumulated losses and,

further, pay dividends on the loan which was converted to equity?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Film Corporation, whilst ceasing to be a producer, will not be unable to earn income. It will continue to have the studio facilities at Hendon, for which obviously charges are made for its use. There will be income generated by distribution of its back catalogue; that is an ongoing matter which will continue. Of course, through the Production Investment Fund the Film Corporation will be investing in productions. Any of those productions which are successful and which make a profit will provide a return to the investors, which will include the Film Corporation. So that there will be income sources.

One of the main differences will be that through not being a producer the investment by the Film Corporation in any production is a known and fixed quantity and there are no risks associated and blow-outs cannot occur. Any successful film returns dividends to those who have invested in it. Any film in which the Film Corporation has an investment will, of course, if successful, provide returns.

I should perhaps also mention that the Film Corporation would continue its role in ensuring the production of Government documentaries through the Government Film Fund and these documentaries also return income.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am sure we would like to believe, but it is very difficult to believe, that income from rent distribution and investment in productions will reduce accumulated losses of \$7.5 million and return some dividends into the bargain on the equity sum that has already been paid into the commission. South Australians have watched millions being poured down this sink and despite the marketing proposals, which are certainly endorsed by the Opposition, we would need something like a film-led recovery if we were going to stop this drain of funds.

My question now refers to the Hendon studios and I refer the Minister to the Auditor-General's Report (page 292) and to the report that the Minister released last week, which recommends the business plan to be developed for the studio facilities at Hendon. According to the Auditor-General, the Hendon studios cost \$615 000 to operate last year of which \$223 000 appears to be rent. He noted that the Film Corporation has renegotiated the date for the expiry of the Hendon lease from December 2001 to November next year.

It is widely recognised that the studios need major work to be undertaken if the corporation is to retain high quality production and sound mix capability. The report provides two scenarios for costs: \$1.51 million this year or \$1.56 million over three years. Can the Minister confirm that the investment package she announced last week did not include any capital funds for upgrading equipment at the Hendon studios this financial year or for 1994 as a whole?

The Hon. Anne Levy: As was made clear in my announcement, the extra funding for the corporation was for its new role and function and is totally recurrent funding which, as I have indicated, will come from the economic development program for South Australia. The review certainly recommended the preparation of a business plan. I have already indicated that we wish to undertake the preparation of that business plan as soon as possible. Obviously, as part of the preparation of the plan there will need to be a reassessment of the value of all the corporation's assets and liabilities.

The losses to which the honourable member refers have accumulated over 20 years, and an examination of the books will show that they are predominantly non-cash losses and are in the form of depreciation only. Any capital upgrade which

occurs as a result of preparing the business plan will to some extent offset depreciation losses.

The honourable member is doing the corporation a disservice if there is a suggestion that it has accumulated enormous losses over a long period without acknowledging that the losses are predominantly depreciation. I am sure the honourable member can point to one or two hiccups which have occurred and which have been extensively debated in this place, but generally the corporation has done well and depreciation losses are certainly not, in the minds of most people, in the same category as cash deficits accumulated through the years. The actual cost of the capital upgrade is yet to be determined and will come from the business plan investigation which we hope to undertake in the near future.

The report did not specify any particular amount to cover the upgrade and merely indicated that an upgrade would be required. The review said that an upgrade would be necessary and, as I have already indicated, we hope to get that business plan under way as soon as possible. It was not possible to make any provision in this year's budget, as the report from the review team was not received until after the budget had been drawn up, and that is why the budget papers indicate exactly the same funding level for the corporation this year as last year.

At the time the budget was drawn up it was not known what the review would be recommending, and it would have been irresponsible to put anything else in the budget papers. However, having got the review we are undertaking it, and the recurrent expenditure changes have been found and will be applied this year. The business plan certainly needs to be prepared before we can adequately or sensibly consider any capital requirements.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Accepting the Minister's statement that the funding for the corporation in its new role is purely for recurrent expenditure and not for capital, and accepting that there can be no provision in this budget because the report was received after the budget was drawn up, nevertheless—taking the central figure of \$1.5 million for upgrading the Hendon studios—can the Minister outline the options from where that money will come, because it obviously has not yet been provided. Obviously, it is required; otherwise, the marketing of South Australia as a desirable location for film making will be knocked back because the facilities are not up to scratch? What are the options and from where could that money come?

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is a completely hypothetical question. First, we need to know what is required. The study has not been done. No figure has been indicated at this stage and, while I certainly want to move and get such studies under way as soon as possible, I am quite unable now to say when there will be any indication of what capital upgrade requirements there will be for the corporation.

Obviously, at the time of having such a business plan prepared, that would be the time for the Government to determine whether or not any necessary funding was to come from Government sources and, if so, from where it would come. It is hypothetical to look at such questions now when the necessary work has not yet been undertaken.

I would deny strongly that the current facilities are such that film will not be attracted to South Australia. That is not the case. Numerous films have been attracted to South Australia in recent times with the existing facilities. They may require an upgrade; certainly, I am not pretending that they do not, but they are good facilities nevertheless and can

prove extremely attractive to film producers both here and elsewhere.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am advised that representatives of the ABC in Sydney visited Adelaide again last week to lobby for the relocation of the corporation's headquarters and studio operations at the ABC headquarters at Collinswood. Can the Minister confirm whether she has received a submission from the ABC in Adelaide outlining its proposal in some detail? If not, in general terms does the Minister believe the proposal has merit? Can the Minister confirm or deny whether it is being considered as part of a business plan for the corporation's studio facilities and when does she anticipate that the business plan will be completed?

Chairman:

Mr Hamilton substituted for the Hon. J.C. Bannon.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Albert Park also has a vital interest in this question.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Of course. I am well aware of the interest of the member for Albert Park and numerous members of Parliament in the question of the film industry in this State. As I have already indicated, I do not know when the business plan will be complete, but I hope it will be done as soon as possible.

As to the other questions, so far as I am aware, the discussions between people from the ABC and officers of the department have been general discussions only.

To my knowledge, no detailed proposal has been received from the ABC. Certainly, one of the objects of preparing the business plan will be the question of location of facilities, and it could well be that this will involve consideration of any specific proposals which the ABC may put forward, but at this time no specific proposals have been received. The discussions have been of a very friendly nature but they are only general discussions at this time.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I do not get to be much of a movie-goer. Like most members of the Assembly we are over-committed to things that stop us going out to see movies, but I have read a few passing references in the press to *Bad Boy Bubby* and to *The Battlers*. Could the Minister give me a bit of a review of both productions and let us know what success has been the case for *Bad Boy Bubby* and what is the expected release date for *The Battlers*?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I am delighted that the question of *Bad Boy Bubby* has been raised. This is an outstanding success which I think so far has not received the recognition in South Australia that is its due. This is a film produced by a South Australian, using the facilities at Hendon to make the film. It has been entirely staffed by South Australians, from both the acting and technical sides, and it is an outstanding success and very much to the credit of Rolf De Heer, the South Australian producer of this film. It has won a fistful of awards at the Venice film festival: it won the jury prize; the critics award; the public award for films; and the Best Film in Competition award; it also won an award from the jury of Catholic film organisations. It has scooped the pool, and is an outstanding success. When it was initially shown, I am told there was a standing ovation at the end which lasted an unprecedented seven minutes.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Are these usually timed?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I gather so. But a seven minute standing ovation is not something one would expect very often.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Except at Football Park.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Perhaps at Football Park, depending on who has won. *Bad Boy Bubby* is now very much in the category of *Strictly Ballroom* and *The Piano* as world class Australian films, and I certainly hope that the appropriate recognition will be given by the South Australian community to the producer and to the film. It is one that we can all feel very proud of indeed. I must admit to some disappointment that the announcement of its outstanding success was relegated to the bottom of page 3 in the *Advertiser*, while the outstanding success of *The Piano* and of *Strictly Ballroom*, which were Australian but not South Australian films, received front page treatment in the *Advertiser* when they had their success. I cannot understand why the South Australian film has received less publicity and less recognition from our local media than other Australian films which were not South Australian in origin.

Bad Boy Bubby is likely to prove the same outstanding success in financial terms as *The Piano* and *Strictly Ballroom*, and I would hope that South Australians will feel pride and great interest in *Bad Boy Bubby* with its cast of South Australians. Nicholas Hope is the star, who was seen recently in the South Australian Theatre Company production *Cosi*, and the producer is South Australian. I certainly feel very proud as a South Australian that this South Australian film is reaping such international recognition. I hope all South Australians will be equally interested in *Bad Boy Bubby* and that when it opens here there will be queues a kilometre long of South Australians wanting to see it. The shooting of *The Battlers* has finished, and it is now in post-production. There is still considerable work to be done on it. It is expected to be released early next year, but I am afraid I cannot be more precise in terms of a date. Channel 7 will be showing *The Battlers* first, but as far as I am aware it has not indicated a precise date apart from just the first half of 1994.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: One of the key factors in the production of films is having a good range of locations, and it is my understanding that one of the benefits of Los Angeles in the early history of the film industry, apart from the good daylight that was available for more hours than were available in New York when indoor lighting was rather primitive, was the wide range of locations in the immediate environment close by Los Angeles, ranging from mountains to desert, snow areas, dry areas, even subtropical areas, plus a wide variety of urban locations. What do we have in South Australia? Do we have a regular list of locations that is kept here, and what do we do to promote and develop locations that are suitable for on-site shooting of films?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I am informed that we have a huge range of possible locations; snow scenes might be a bit difficult to provide in South Australia, but everything else the honourable member has mentioned can readily be found, and particularly within a very short distance of Adelaide. One can get wonderful desert locations from a filming point of view simply by going not far from Two Wells, which is only an hour's drive from Adelaide, and similarly very varied locations exist throughout the Adelaide Hills. We have our wonderful coastline and there are gentle rolling hills very close to Adelaide; there is a great variety of locations which apparently fit very well with the sort of thing that producers want. Mr Brealey might care to add from his personal and practical knowledge of film-making as to whether he feels South Australia does have the wide variety of locations and the advantages that flow from those that have been mentioned.

Mr Brealey: I would support what the Minister just said: a great selection of locations can be seen. The South Australian Film Corporation already has an officer who spends a good deal of her time actually guiding interstate people to those locations. We have a very large collection of many thousands of photographs of various locations throughout South Australia. Even going back to our very earliest time, we can talk about things such as *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. We did not expect to find the beautiful old mansion that we did, which has now become famous as a tourist attraction, very much due to its appearance in the film.

There is a two way rub-off in this matter: it is a way in which people see some of the really beautiful places they can visit in South Australia. So, it has a dual role in that regard. It is one of the great strengths of having a film industry in a State that depends to a great extent on its tourist attractiveness.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 156 of the Program Estimates, 'Development of the arts', and the reference to the South Australian Film and Video Centre, which has been the subject of a review conducted by a consultant (Ms Elizabeth Connor) who was due to report on 6 September. Has the Minister received Ms Connor's report? If so, what did Ms Connor recommend in terms of the cost effectiveness of the South Australian Film and Video Centre's programs and options for the future management of those programs, and is the Minister prepared to confirm that the centre will receive its allocation of \$850 000 this year, notwithstanding the outcome of the Connor inquiry?

The Hon. Anne Levy: As I indicated earlier, the sum allocated to the Film and Video Centre was put in the budget as a figure identical to that of last year because at the time the budget was prepared the report from the review team had not been received. That applied for both the Film Corporation and the Film and Video Centre. As all members know, the report relating to the Film Corporation has been received and its recommendations are being implemented, with the considerably increased funding recommended.

The report for the Film and Video Centre has not yet been received. I understand that the consultant (Ms Connor) has pretty well finished her part of the work, but considerable discussion and consideration still needs to be given by the committee before a report will be available to me, to the Film Corporation or to the Film and Video Centre or anyone else. I am given to understand that such a report is not likely to be received before late October or early November.

I will be glad to receive it and consider any recommendations it makes as soon as possible but, in the meantime, the allocation for the Film and Video Centre is as indicated in the budget papers. Whether there will be any change will depend very much on what recommendations the review team might make. Obviously, it would be hypothetical to consider this until we actually have what the recommendations are.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to the Auditor-General's Report, page 293, for the Film Corporation income and expenditure lines. Did the *Ultraman* series contribute to the increase in income from drama production last year? Have sales been made in Australia and New Zealand and, if so, what did the Film Corporation recoup from such sales?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I indicated a few minutes ago that there have been some sales from which, in the past financial year, the Film Corporation recouped of the order of \$70 000.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a supplementary question, similarly for *Hammers Over the Anvil*: how much and from what sources was income generated from that production?

The Hon. Anne Levy: *Hammers Over the Anvil* has not yet had a release date determined, so there is no income from its distribution at this stage. I understand that a distributor has been appointed but that there has been no finalisation at this stage regarding timing of distribution and consequent income resulting from it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 156 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts and to the contract of the former Chief Executive, Valerie Hardy. What was Valerie Hardy's salary and total remuneration package and, in addition, when Ms Hardy left the Film Corporation earlier this year did the board negotiate terms that would have provided her with an opportunity to be involved in future productions and to generate income from films with which she was associated while working with the Film Corporation? If so, what were the terms?

Mr Bachmann: I do not have the details of the total salary package, but it consisted of a salary of approximately \$120 000, from memory, with some bonus performance criteria payable, subject to satisfactory completion of performance as outlined. They were in the form of \$10 000 per annum. In relation to her departure, the board has been negotiating but did not reach final agreement in relation to the continuation of a joint venture arrangement between a company owned by Valerie Hardy and the South Australian Film Corporation in relation to three projects: *Two Weeks with the Queen*; *Heart of the Dreaming*; and *Once I was a Princess*. Those arrangements have not been concluded and, as we presently stand, are not likely to be concluded.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to the Program Estimates at page 434, 1993-94 targets. I understand that the Minister is intending to establish a film location promotion fund. What is the purpose of this fund? Is it actually to find locations, to investigate locations or to promote locations?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I discussed the magnitude of the Film Location Fund earlier in this Committee meeting. The point of a location fund is not to determine locations but to publicise locations, and really to draw the attention of film producers all around the world to the benefits which they can have if they make a film in South Australia; that we have wonderful locations; we have experienced actors; we have superb technical staff; we have low production costs; we have a great variety of locations; we have a superb climate; we have everything that any film producer could want—except snow—and we need to publicise that fact so that film producers all around the world become aware of this.

Mr De LAINE: Page 434 of the '1993-94 Targets' refers to the Film Investment Fund. For what sort of projects will the new Film Investment Fund arising out of the film review be used?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It will be used to provide investment money for films whose producers come from elsewhere in Australia or from overseas. In this way it will be used to augment local production with interstate and overseas production. The type of productions envisaged are many and varied, such as feature films, a television mini-series and perhaps even some commercial television documentaries. It is envisaged to be aimed at what are regarded as medium budget films, that is, films which cost somewhere between, say, \$3 million and \$6 million to produce, which if you say it quickly is not a large amount. While obviously we would

be very happy if a producer wished to produce a film costing \$30 million or \$50 million in South Australia, the prime aim of the new Film Investment Fund would not be that type of production but more the medium range budget of \$3 million to \$6 million. Certainly, it is expected to be very effective in that budget range.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to 'Estimates of Payments' page 156, program 1. This question would be of much interest to you, Mr Chairman. How many films in production have used the facilities at Hendon this year?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Quite a number. Obviously anyone who has been to the Hendon studios at any time in the past year would have found that, at most times, they are an absolute hive of activity. There have been five commercial films which have used the studio and facilities—one of them *Bad Boy Bubby*, about which I have spoken recently. There has also been *The Battlers*, which is a Film Corporation production. I refer also to the *Adventures of Black Beauty*, *Ebb Tide*, and a film called *Under the Skin*, all of which have been produced by independent producers but using the facilities at Hendon. Also, four short films have been made which have used the studio and facilities at Hendon, one of them being *The Dirty Dishes*, which I mentioned earlier, and there have also been three films which have used the sound mixing facilities at Hendon but not the general studio. These have been commercial films, some of which have certainly been produced by local producers.

Members may be interested to know that one of them is a film called *Silver Brumby*, which has a Victorian producer. That film is about to be released in the United States and has apparently won great acclaim for its sound mixing qualities which, as I indicated, were carried out using the facilities of the South Australian Film Corporation. This will be another Australian success. Although it did not involve a South Australian producer, certainly South Australian facilities have been used, and it will be yet another reason for Australians in general to feel very pleased with the renaissance of the film industry in this country.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Auditor-General's Report, at page 294, reports that:

Drama projects in progress totalling \$186 000 were written off during the year. Included in this write-off was a film's pre-production cost of \$137 000. This amount was unable to be recouped because it was excluded from the film's production budget.

It does not say whether it was deliberately or accidentally excluded. It further states:

The exclusion of pre-production costs lowered the film's budget, enabling the production to be funded by outside investors.

It sounds as though it was a deliberate decision. Was the film in question *The Battlers*, and if so, why was the decision taken by the South Australian Film Corporation to exclude the film's pre-production costs, a decision that to me seems somewhat surprising considering the South Australian Film Corporation's recent record of financial losses in drama production and the fact that *The Battlers* was the only SAFC production that was funded over the past two years?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It is certainly true that the reference was to the film *The Battlers*, but I understand that those costs were waived to ensure that the film was made. The Federal Film Finance Corporation has rules about the amount of money which can be spent in development or pre-production and, if the Film Corporation had not agreed to waive those fees, the cost of the pre-production for *The Battlers* would have exceeded the guidelines set down by the FFC; its money would not have been forthcoming and the

film would never have been made. So, it was a clear decision to waive those fees to ensure that the production did occur. I must say that the production of the film has brought into South Australia far more money than was waived in those fees.

The FFC contributed over \$2.5 million to *The Battlers*, London Films, an overseas investor, has put in \$1.2 million, and the total budget for the film is over \$4 million, all of which is being expended in South Australia. In addition, it generated a great deal of employment within the film industry in this State. I understand that if the Film Corporation had not waived those fees, *The Battlers* would not have received its Federal financing and the production would not have occurred.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I should like to return to the previous question regarding the Hendon studios, referred to in the Auditor-General's Report at page 292. The Minister said that no firm proposal has been put to the Government by the ABC. Nevertheless, with such a major organisation, which the ABC obviously is in Australia, it would surprise me if it did not have a pretty firm idea in mind when it came over here. It seems unlikely that it would view South Australia's reputation, which the Minister has lauded in responding to a previous question, with scant regard; and it would know what it was coming over for. Therefore, does the Government view the ABC as being here on a fishing expedition or is the Government exercising some enthusiasm because the Hendon studios would appear to be grossly under-utilised with one film and minor documentaries funded in the past two years? How does the Minister see the potential, even at worst, for a joint venture with the ABC so that there can be some sort of exciting collaboration between two substantial organisations?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I take issue with the honourable member's comments. As I have just indicated, nine films were made at the Hendon facilities in the past year. The Hendon facilities are not only used for South Australian Film Corporation productions; they are used by independent film producers in this State and interstate producers who produce films in South Australia. The Hendon studios were very busy last year, as I am sure visitors would have observed, but that does not mean that they could not accommodate more films if there were appropriate timing.

I acknowledge that the ABC takes South Australia very seriously from a film point of view. However, when the senior executives came from Sydney initially to talk to me, it was obvious that one of their concerns was the under-utilisation of their building and facilities at Collinswood, not far from Adelaide. Logically, they would like to see more use being made of their building. At this stage they have not put forward any specific proposals, but discussions are continuing. Mr Brealey tells me that he has been part of those discussions and has had numerous discussions with people from the ABC regarding possible joint facilities, joint use of facilities or other joint arrangements. Those discussions are continuing. I understand that they are being approached with very good will on both sides, but, as yet, no firm proposal has been put to the Government by the ABC.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is reassuring in one way, but less than reassuring in another. If the Film Corporation's Hendon unit is more utilised than I had imagined, I still have to hark back to page 292 of the Auditor-General's Report. There we are told that we have an accumulated loss of \$7.5 million and a net loss recorded last year of \$531 000. But that still begs the question as to where the investment

funds will come from about which the Minister was talking earlier in response to a previous question. The Minister mentioned that earnings could offset the losses. If the earnings have been substantial, they still have not offset the losses sufficiently to my way of thinking to fulfil the promise that the Minister made earlier.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I indicated that all of that loss is not a cash loss; it is also a depreciation loss. In cash terms, the Film Corporation made a profit last year. It had a surplus of \$48 000 if we are looking at it in cash terms. The accumulated loss is very largely a depreciation loss which has resulted over many years. I reiterate that last year the Film Corporation made a surplus in cash terms. As I indicated in response to the honourable member in terms of the use of the studios, nine productions were made there last year and three other productions used the sound mixing facilities. There has been considerable activity with the facilities at Hendon in the past year.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: When the Minister talks in cash terms, it sounds rather dangerous accounting because the Economic and Finance Committee for many years and Governments generally across the world during the past few years have been moving increasingly towards accrual accounting, showing the complete financial picture of any institution. It is part and parcel of commonsense, practical and absolutely essential accounting to show the debits as well as the credits and not to regard cash flows as the be all and end all. Money in and money out does not present the full picture. I still have great doubt about the Government's injection of \$2.6 million. In fact, it converted a loan to equity following the *Ultraman* debacle. That was cash injected, but it still has to come from somewhere. For the Minister glibly to say that investment funds could be available and films may make a profit—they may also make a loss—is over-simplistic accounting. I hope that the corporation does account in a proper accrual fashion.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Film Corporation's accounts are presented in the form of accrual accounting. There is no question but that the accounts are accurate and present a true picture of the Film Corporation. Obviously the Auditor-General would not approve them if they were not up to his rigorous standards, and they have been approved by the Auditor-General with no adverse comments.

Mr De LAINE: In view of the outstanding success in the past of major films produced by the South Australian Film Corporation and bearing in mind the decision taken by the corporation not to produce more of these full-length films, why was that decision made?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Government accepted that recommendation, which came from the review of the Film Corporation. I suppose one of the reasons why the review team made that recommendation was that they felt it was probably not desirable for the Government, through the Film Corporation, to be carrying the risk involved in film production.

Film is a very risky business in business terms, as I am sure anyone involved in any way with the film industry would agree, ruefully or not. That applies to film industries right around the world. There is enormous risk in any Hollywood production. The only film industry which seems guaranteed never to have a flop is the Indian film industry. The people of India seem to have an insatiable appetite for any film which is made in India. Even there I may exaggerate. Perhaps there are some flops in the Indian film industry.

I certainly welcome the view that the Government should not be exposed to the enormous risks which can be involved in film production. By means of having a Production Investment Fund, the Film Corporation will be able to invest in productions and know that whatever sum it is that is the limit of their exposure; there can be no blow-outs.

The size of the return will be variable, obviously, depending on whether the film is a commercial success or not. But there is no exposure to risk of blow-out in production costs—the sort of thing which happened with *Ultraman*, where averages sent the costs sky high. Not being a producer the Film Corporation will not be exposed to those risks any more. We do hope, by means of our investment fund, to attract a much larger number of films to the State and this will maintain and increase employment for those in the film industry.

The money which these films will attract to the State will far outweigh any costs to the Government by investing in these films. As I indicated last year, an investment of between \$400 000 and \$500 000 in three independently produced films by the South Australian Government ended up attracting about \$8 million into the State, which was expended here with all the benefits that that means to the South Australian economy.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have no further questions on the South Australian Film Corporation and would be quite happy to move into the arts section.

Jennifer Cashmore, the member for Coles, left her apology. I thought it worth mentioning that she has gone to meet Colin Thiele; he is coming to lunch today. I wish to recognise the contribution that Colin and his works have made to the South Australian cultural scene and, of course, the success of the Film Corporation—a mutual admiration society I have no doubt because *Storm Boy*, *Blue Fin* and the rest are memorable films.

On behalf of the committee—and probably the Minister will extend the comments—we wish him well and thank him for his very substantial contribution to the State's cultural scene. We wish him well in Queensland.

The Hon. Anne Levy: If I can echo those remarks, although not strictly a question to me. I would certainly like to recognise the enormous contribution that Colin Thiele has made to the cultural life of South Australia, not only through his films but through his contribution to literature. He has written a vast number of books for adults and children, numerous of these have been turned into films, not all 81 as yet, though I understand one of the projects being considered at the Film Corporation at the moment is a film called *Speedy*, which is based on another Colin Thiele book.

He has certainly contributed a great deal to South Australia, and I am sure we will all miss him while wishing him a long and happy life in Queensland, where I hope the climate will have a beneficial effect on his medical problems.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Minister can assist the Chair. Do I take it that the proposed payments to the Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage examination is not complete?

The Hon. Anne Levy: No, it is not, merely on the Film Corporation.

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Dr E. Willmot, Director, Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage.

Mr S. Tully, Director, Corporate Services.

Mr M.U. Peisach, Manager, Financial Services.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My first question is a fairly parochial one in some respects but refers to South Australian Country Arts in general which is at page 156: South Australian Country Arts Trust, \$2.51 million allocation for last year and \$2.608 million for the year 1993-94. That represents a slight increase of some tens of thousands of dollars. Could the Minister outline what those increases would be for?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The increase is really because the South Australian Touring Exhibitions Program has been transferred from the grants for the arts program to the South Australian Country Arts Trust. This program, of course, predates the existence of the Country Arts Trust and has been funded separately and run with the collaboration of the Art Gallery of South Australia for many years.

As it is mainly concerned with the touring of exhibitions around the regional areas of the State, it was felt that it would be most appropriately combined with the Country Arts Trust to give the trust responsibility for the touring exhibitions program, as it is also responsible for touring programs of performing arts. It was decided that the trust should be responsible for the touring programs of a visual arts nature. That meant a transfer into the Country Arts Trust budget of \$88 000 which was allocated to the touring exhibition program and which is then deducted from where it had occurred previously.

There is also a further increase and, although not large, is support that is provided towards the development costs of a multicultural arts officer. I understand that the South Australian Country Arts Trust is interested in the development of such an officer, particularly for the Riverland region, where there is a high proportion of people of non-English-speaking background. The extra finance was provided for the development of such a position.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Based on the Minister's response I detect a change in direction within country arts generally with more emphasis towards on-the-ground performances, exhibitions, displays and local involvement. I developed a worry when I recently went backstage at the Helpmann Theatre for two productions put on by Grant High School and Gambier High School (and very successful productions, as usual, they were), and with considerable experience over the decades in theatre groups, both backstage and in front of the lights, I cannot help looking around at the fabric of buildings.

When I moved into city council I encouraged the council and lobbied former Premier Don Dunstan to provide improved facilities for drama in Mount Gambier. Wonderful though the Helpmann Theatre is, when I looked around I saw that the lights were ageing, the dimmer system was presenting some problems, the air-conditioning units now over 10 years old seem to be making more noise than one would expect (I do not know how efficient they are), and the carpets are a little threadbare.

Coupled with that is the need generally across the State for money to be spent on capital works, depreciation and apparently a lack of funds in that direction. Will this continuing thrust towards providing shows result in a further run-down in the fabric of our community theatres? The Helpmann Theatre is one of the older theatres and is therefore probably showing wear and tear first.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I endorse the comments made by the honourable member about greater on-the-ground involvement for regional arts. This was part of the setting up of the restructure of the Country Arts Trust which came into

operation on 1 January. The central body of the trust is responsible for coordination and touring of product throughout the regions but, within each region, a country arts board has far greater autonomy over local arts activity, and certainly the new country arts boards are taking seriously their mandates of encouraging local on-the-ground and grass roots arts activities in their regions.

This is illustrated by much greater expenditure on regional arts development officers. With the establishment of country arts trusts there are now more of these regional officers and they have bigger budgets to play with in terms of encouraging, fostering and providing seeding money for local arts activity.

Turning to the question about maintenance, I agree that the Helpmann Theatre in Mount Gambier is the oldest regional theatre. It is much younger than the Festival Centre, which is the main Government-provided theatre facility in Adelaide and which recently celebrated its twentieth birthday with a fair degree of fanfare, so that the maintenance and depreciation questions would be much greater at the Festival Centre than at any of the regional centres, which are much younger.

However, this does not mean that we ignore in any way the requirements of the regional theatres. Last year a total of \$300 000 was expended on theatre maintenance and arts facilities throughout regional areas. Last year no money was spent at the Helpmann Theatre but close to \$100 000 was spent on the Middleback Theatre in Whyalla. This year a total of \$250 000 is allocated in the arts budget for maintenance of theatre facilities in regional areas. I am not aware of the priorities that country arts trusts will establish regarding the expenditure of that money on regional theatres. It may be the turn of the Helpmann Theatre this year for maintenance expenditure, or it may be that the requirements in some of the others are deemed of greater priority. If the honourable member wishes, I can certainly inquire from the Country Arts Trust whether it has any high priorities or urgent plans about the Helpmann Theatre in the current financial year.

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

Chairman:

The Hon. J.C. Bannon resumed the Chair.

Membership:

Mr Such substituted for Mr Meier.

Additional Departmental Advisers:

Ms A. Dunn, Chair, Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

Mr T. McFarlane, General Manager, Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

The CHAIRMAN: We are continuing with the examination, but this afternoon we commence with the Festival Centre Trust, which is why we have at the table the Chair and General Manager of the trust.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Before we go into questions on the Festival Centre Trust, the member for Mount Gambier may be interested to know that I have been informed that in the past financial year \$25 000 was spent on maintenance on the Helpmann Theatre in Mount Gambier. This was all spent on external cladding, particularly waterproofing of the fly tower.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will ask a question about that later, because the funding is different from the normal allocation. A sum of \$100 000 has been in a fund for 10 years

for that purpose. I could be wrong, but there may be some manipulation there.

The CHAIRMAN: We will get back to that at some point. Let us commence our examination of the Festival Centre Trust.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 441 of the Program Estimates and the business plan for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Last year a review was undertaken of the operations of the trust, but the review was never released. Subsequently the Minister established a committee headed by Mr John Bastian to supervise the preparation by Leadenhall Australia for a business plan for the centre, and that plan has not been released, although I understand it was completed and forwarded to the Minister late last year. When did the Minister receive the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust business plan, and when will the plan or an edited version of the plan be released?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The honourable member is correct: the plan has not been released publicly. It was considered both by the committee which drew it up, the trust and me to contain information which was considered confidential and which if released could harm the Festival Centre Trust commercially. The plan was prepared by Leadenhall Australia and currently the Executive Director of Leadenhall is working on a version of that plan with the General Manager of the trust so that the information which is considered commercially in confidence is removed and there can be a version available for public release. It is expected that this will be finalised in the next few weeks, and I will certainly be happy to make it available publicly once it is available to me.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a supplementary question, which I hope the Minister will agree to answer: did the Minister approve of the plan, irrespective of the commercially confidential aspects of it, and, if so, what were the main recommendations of the future operations of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, including particularly future control of the drama complex, that is, the Playhouse and the Space, and the future operations of BASS?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I was asked to approve the implementation of the plan, which I was happy to do, as I understand the trust itself was very happy with the plan. I realise the questions which the honourable member has asked are not necessarily in the commercial confidentiality area, but I think it would be better for me not to comment on any aspects of the plan which could open up the question of where one draws the line on what is commercially confidential. The questions she has asked will certainly be dealt with partly at least in the edited version of the plan, which should be available soon. It was a matter which was considered by the consultants, but I think that details of it should wait until the edited version is available.

I am advised that the trust would certainly not feel compromised if I indicate that the plan proposes maintaining the present balance of programming and to move progressively in the development and extension of existing activities in South Australia and other States. It certainly recognises that the trust will continue to bear costs by maintaining non-commercial activities.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I would like to draw to Minister's and the Committee's attention to the fact that the excuse, reason, call it what one will, of commercial confidentiality is one of the reasons used to justify depriving Parliament of information that we all know in respect of the State Bank has led us into very deep trouble. Because the

taxpayer finances the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the excuse of commercial confidentiality is very inappropriate and open to very strong criticism in the light of recent catastrophes in South Australia, and in the Budget Estimates Committee I believe Parliament is entitled to information that relates to the expenditure of taxpayers' money. I hope the Minister will bear that in mind when I ask my next question, which is: has the Festival Centre Trust implemented all the recommendations; if not, what matters remain outstanding and when will they be implemented; and what costs were associated with preparing the business plan?

The CHAIRMAN: It is possible for officers to address us directly on technical matters.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I would be happy for the Chair or the General Manager to answer the specifics.

Ms Dunn: We probably both have something to contribute. It is difficult to talk about individual recommendations, in view of the Minister's intention to release a copy of the report. However, we would be happy to say that the report made some proposals about the direction of the trust that related to maintaining the balance of our programming and increasing our commercial activity and having those things in parallel, and that the outcome of the recommendations would reduce the State's financial contribution to the trust of the order of \$700 000 over a period. These estimates demonstrate the first round of that, where the trust's budget has been reduced in line with recommendations that were made and as a result of some restructuring with the staff that has occurred.

The trust is pursuing the recommendations and directions. We are happy to report on the details of recommendations at the time at which the Minister releases the report, on the preparation of which report we spent \$60 000, which the department paid for, rather than the trust.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Unlike the State Bank, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is audited by the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General's Report gives a great deal of information about the Festival Centre Trust, and that is freely available to anyone in South Australia. Certainly, there are no adverse comments on the Festival Centre Trust in the Auditor-General's Report. He is quite happy with the financial situation applying there.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I was not dealing with the Auditor-General's Report but with the details of the business plan, which I believe Parliament is entitled to know, and in due course we will. My next question relates to the Bass system and the Entertainment Centre, page 214 of the Auditor-General's Report under 'Theatre hire and associated income'. What investment did the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust incur when it upgraded the Bass facilities to cater for the increased business anticipated to flow from winning the contract to sell tickets for activities at the Entertainment Centre?

What annual income did the trust propose to make from winning this contract, considering that when it bid the Government was speculating that there would be 500 000 attendances at the Entertainment Centre each year; the Festival Centre Trust estimated 350 000; but last year the Entertainment Centre would have been fortunate to attract 200 000. So, the anticipated income and the actual income were considerably different. I think the Committee should know what income the trust made last financial year through the Bass contract with the Entertainment Centre.

Mr McFarlane: I cannot answer the question about what we made last year, but I would be happy to get back with the

answer. In relation to the other parts of the question, the trust spent approximately \$40 000 buying additional equipment to handle the ticketing for the Entertainment Centre, the system having been previously upgraded, so there was no large capital expenditure associated with that contract.

Mr McKEE: On page 441 of the Program Estimates there is mention under 'Broad objectives' of a philosophy to 'facilitate the presentation by others of theatrical and musical performances'. Can you tell me what productions the AFCT was involved in or will be involved in over 1993-94?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Last financial year the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust had a very varied and comprehensive program. There are about 400 different performances throughout the complex throughout the year (there is, of course, more than one site available within the complex, which is how we can get more than one per day). As I understand it, in the Festival Theatre there were 82 different performances; in the Playhouse there were 135 performances; and in the Space there were 73 performances. Also, of course, under the auspices of the trust there were 100 performances at Her Majesty's Theatre, which is run by the trust.

Then there are regular programs that occur, like *Something on Saturday*, which runs throughout a large part of the year; there are rural access programs; and there is the *Late Show* program, which goes on at 11 clock at night two nights a week, I think, for a large part of the year. This is in the area of performing arts. There were, of course, also visual arts programs with exhibitions both in the foyer of the Festival Centre and in the art space of the Playhouse. I understand that 22 visual arts programs throughout the year were held in those two art spaces.

I do have all the titles if the honourable member would like them, but the figures that I have given indicate that an enormous amount of activity occurred in all the venues of the Festival Centre Trust throughout the year.

Mr McKEE: Being a former Secretary of Actors Equity, I take it that the policy of union membership is still firmly intact in the Festival Centre Trust buildings and surroundings.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Certainly.

Mr McKEE: I refer to page 158 of the Estimates of Payments, and the totals. I note there has been an overall reduction in the allocation to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Will the Minister explain that to the Committee?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The reduced allocation to the Festival Centre Trust is partly because of lower interest rates. One of the components of the grant to the trust is its requirement for debt servicing costs. With falling interest rates, the amount required to service the debt of the Festival Centre is reduced, so the grant allocated to it is reduced accordingly. This of course has no effect on its operations: it is granted whatever it requires for debt servicing. While it is part of its global figure, it is calculated separately as to what it requires.

As the interest rates fall, the requirement for debt servicing is thereby reduced. The overall recurrent allocation to the Festival Centre represents an increase for this year of \$150 000. This results from quite a number of pluses and minuses. Members may not know that during the year an enterprise bargaining agreement was negotiated between the trust and its staff. This granted the employees a salary increase of 4.5 per cent, which is in line with many other enterprise agreements that have been struck around Australia.

The increase was in recognition of improvements that have been made in cost efficiencies and productivity at the Festival Centre with the complete cooperation of all staff, which will result in an annual saving of \$475 000.

The enterprise bargaining agreement, with its salary increase, was also given in exchange for commitments by staff to work through a consultative process to identify a further improvement in the trust's bottom line of \$700 000, and that work is certainly proceeding. Restructuring has been occurring at the Festival Centre Trust, and there were provisions from outside the trust's normal resources for targeted separation packages, which were picked up by the Government, not by the trust itself. In terms of the trust's capital program, there were reports from a sound and lighting expert about 15 months ago regarding stage lighting, sound control, stage communications and general technical mechanisms, and it was estimated that these were in need of attention, and would require a capital outlay of roughly \$4 million to bring them up to complete 1990s standard.

At about the same time there was a SACON report which identified a range of capital works that were needed to bring the venue up to a 1990s standard, as the fabric of the building is now 20 years old. This work includes things such as improving toilet accommodation, seat coverings, curtains, floor treatments and refurbishment of some of the areas that are getting a bit shabby, and the total cost tag for that is quite considerable also.

Resulting from these, \$350 000 has been reallocated from the trust's operating grant to a recurrent provision to provide audio and lighting and other technical requirements: it has been earmarked specifically for that purpose. There is an extra \$150 000 which was provided to the trust for this purpose. Hence, there is a total provision of \$500 000 for sound and lighting upgrading, of which \$350 000 was reallocated within the trust resources and an additional \$150 000 was provided by the Government for this purpose.

So, while overall it may look as though the allocation has fallen, this is only because of the reduced requirement for debt reduction. In actual resources for the trust to work with, there has been an increase towards the upgrading of the audio and sound equipment and a further capital provision of \$750 000 to continue the capital upgrade for the fabric of the building, as indicated by SACON.

Mr McKEE: I notice that the State Opera is staging a production of *Carmen* towards the end of next month. Is this a co-production between the Festival Centre and State Opera, or does State Opera hire the facility as a normal entrepreneur would hire the facilities at the Festival Centre?

The Hon. Anne Levy: State Opera hires the facilities at the Festival Centre. The Festival Centre Trust is not entrepre-neuring the opera with State Opera: State Opera hires the facilities, as do many other organisations, both within South Australia and from outside, such as the National Ballet a couple of weeks ago.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Was the decision to take \$350 000 from the operating grant and use it for capital works for upgrading audio and lighting with a supplement from the Government a decision of the trust to remove money from its operating funds, or was it a decision of the Minister and/or the Government?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was done with full consultation between officers of the department and the trust. It is quite consistent with the recommendations of the Leadenhall report, and there was a discussion and agreement that this was an appropriate course of action to take. The trust member informs me that it is completely achievable from their point of view in terms of their recurrent operations.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Page 11 of the Auditor-General's Report refers to capital works for the trust,

as does page 158 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts. On the subject of technical and maintenance services, in reply to a question asked in this Committee last year the Minister stated that in round figures the two reports recommended work amounting to \$7 million over three years with \$3 million expenditure in the first year and another \$4 million over the following two years.

As the Minister has said this afternoon, the trust business plan is pursuing some of those matters. Did the business plan revise the maintenance needs outlined by the Minister in September last year, because I note that in the capital works budget for 1993-94 it is estimated that the trust requires technical upgrading to the value of \$10.2 million and revises the date for completion of this work to June 1998?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I understand that the business plan did not make detailed comment on the capital requirements, while certainly noting that capital upgrading is necessary. Again, the discussions between the trust and the Government meant that the \$1.25 million being provided this year in two parcels—\$500 000 for the audio and sound and \$750 000 for other capital upgrading—would adequately provide what was needed at the current time; it would be an ongoing program, but that the allocation for this year will deal with minimum requirements for the time being, and are certainly achievable by the trust.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: What additional expenditures have been identified over the past year to explain the increase from \$7 million to \$10.2 million in the work required to be undertaken at the Festival Centre to ensure that it remains a top-class venue?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I may not be completely comprehending the question. The SACON study indicated capital upgrading of the fabric of the building of \$5.75 million total requirements, whereas the sound and lighting expert, Intertech, drew attention to a total capital requirement of \$4.25 million for specific technical equipment, and that makes a total of \$10 million. These studies were completed in May of last year, and they may be updates of some previous study to which the honourable member is referring.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In the Estimates Committee last year the Minister said that in round figures the two reports recommended work of \$7 million over three years. However, when we look at page 11 in the Capital Works Program, the increase is from \$7 million to \$10.2 million for the work required to be undertaken at the Festival Centre. What is the disparity between the \$7 million and the \$10.2 million.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I understand that a correction was made to the \$7 million in responses made later to questions asked in the Estimates Committee. It was taken on notice. I shall be happy to look into it. No later information is available other than the estimates of May 1992 which give a total requirement, over a number of years, of \$10 million, of which over \$1 million has been provided this year.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I could not hear what the officer was saying to the Minister, but I believe it is the answer to the question.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The officer was pointing out that the timing of making estimates is important and that the timing for the carrying out of the work is also important in terms of what the actual figures will be. The latest estimate was May of last year, and that indicated a total requirement of \$10 million.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I note in the program descriptions on page 441 a reference to a Brave New Works

program. It has an Aldous Huxley ring to it. I do not know whether that means you rate them according to whether they are alpha pluses or epsilon minuses. Can the Minister expand on that?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I should be happy to do so. *Brave New Works* is an evocative title, as the honourable member indicates. It is the main focus of the trust's effort to foster new talent in South Australia. In 1993-94 it will consist entirely of plays which are written and produced by South Australians. The first work, which has already taken place, was a representation of Junction Theatre Company's topical musical comedy, satire, call it what you will, named *Hello Down There*. It was developed and performed by members of the South Australian community, including many members of trade unions who were involved in developing and producing this show.

The second brave new work, which is a double bill of two plays by David Paul Jobling, is to be shown next week. In addition to putting on new works by South Australian authors, the trust has ongoing programs such as *Something on Saturday*, which is a children's entertainment. At one time it used to be called *Alternative to Football*.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: There is no alternative to football. One can only supplement it or complement it.

The Hon. Anne Levy: As it was realised that it was possible to be interested in football and programs at the Festival Centre, it was renamed *Something on Saturday*. It certainly delights many thousands of young South Australians.

There are also winter foyer concerts and concerts in the amphitheatre, when the weather becomes more clement, and these focus on South Australian artists. I understand that the trust is also working to encourage many of the small theatre companies to make greater use of the Space auditorium so that there can be more public awareness of their existence and performances.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I hope the Minister is optimistic that the more successful of these endeavours will get greater support from the *Advertiser* than *Bad Boy Bobby* did.

The Hon. Anne Levy: One can only hope so. I imagine it will depend which critic they send to review them.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I guess some are Goers and some are not.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I should like the Minister to advise the Committee whether a question on the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra and the Australian Chamber Orchestra would fit appropriately within this line as the Australian Chamber Orchestra has indicated, by mail to the public of South Australia, that it will be having a subscription season of five performances in South Australia, plus an appearance in the Adelaide Festival Centre, which would seem to indicate that it is appropriate to ask this question on this line, and an appearance at the Barossa Music Festival. This has been arranged without any consultation with the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra, which, of course, could be substantially hit by the intrusion of this Sydney based orchestra upon South Australia's cultural scene.

I understood, as did the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra, that the Australian Chamber Orchestra will be coming to Adelaide with support from the Playing Australia scheme, funded by the Federal Government, a scheme which was really intended to bring culture to the remoter centres which normally did not have access to orchestras such as this. Yet, here it is, intruding upon metropolitan Adelaide's cultural scene,

looking for box office which the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra would normally be looking for. The implications for the South Australian orchestra are quite considerable, as the implications are for the many groups and individuals who will benefit from the operations of the Adelaide orchestra.

Is there anything at all that the Minister can do to respond to a request from the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra for help by way of protesting to the Federal Minister about potential misuse or misinterpretation, shall we say, of the Federal Government's intention for that Playing Australia funding?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I have been informed that in fact the Australian Chamber Orchestra is not hiring the Festival Centre Trust. It is proposing to present concerts at the Adelaide Town Hall, the same venue as used by the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra. To that extent it does not relate to the trust at all.

I appreciate the importance of the question and it certainly has been drawn to my attention. I think perhaps there is a misunderstanding of the purposes of the Playing Australia Fund, which is set up by the Federal Government. The State Government in no way contributes to it. It is certainly designed to enable far more touring of performing arts to occur within Australia. In the past 12 months or so of its existence it has certainly enabled many performances to occur in more isolated areas, which would otherwise have not received those performances but it is not limited to that.

Adelaide companies have received grants from Touring Australia to go to Sydney, and one could not say that Sydney is an isolated area. It provides an opportunity for the South Australian or Adelaide based companies to receive exposure and appreciation from audiences in the eastern States, even be they mainstream audiences such as occur in Sydney. It is of advantage not only to audiences but to companies to perform for different audiences who can then be more cognisant and appreciate the totality of cultural activity in Australia.

I do not think it is correct to say that subsidy for the Australian Chamber Orchestra to come to Adelaide is going against the charter of Playing Australia. As I indicated, there is no State Government contribution to Playing Australia or, I may say, to the Australian Chamber Orchestra, whereas the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra is, of course, supported by the grants program of the South Australian Government and certainly receives support from it.

I certainly hope to be able to meet soon with representatives of the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra to discuss this issue. They have been in contact with me but I am afraid there has not been time to organise a meeting before today; we certainly hope to have one very soon.

Also, it must be realised that the fact that the Australian Chamber Orchestra has received touring money from Playing Australia in the current financial year is in no sense an indication or a guarantee that it will be continued in subsequent years. I do not think Playing Australia takes the view that any particular organisation will get continued subsidy year by year, and programs put to it are judged on their merits each year.

So that while I appreciate there may be problems caused for the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra in 1994 it may be a one year phenomenon only or it may not. It will depend very much on the market and the reaction which occurs. I would certainly hope that there could be at least discussions between two such organisations on the question of dates. One can get an unfortunate situation if one orchestra is giving a concert one night and the other orchestra has planned for one the

following night. They are obviously competing for the same market far too closely to one another.

This lack of discussion between organisations is not limited just to the particular case which the honourable member raises. I am sure members are very aware of the current Honda Fiesta—in fact, one of the members of this committee is very much involved with it. I am given to understand that when it decided to change the dates of its program from March to September they in no way consulted or had discussions with the Barossa Music Festival, which had dates set down beginning 1 October. Likewise, the Barossa Music Festival has concerns about competition occurring between two events which happen to be situated virtually back-to-back in the calendar. It has concerns that it was not consulted about any change of dates so that neither festival would be in the business of adversely affecting the other one.

These situations are regrettable. I do not know that there is very much one can do about it except encourage organisations to maintain dialogue one with another, which is not to inhibit their activities but at least to ensure that they consult with each other, with the aim of not doing one another in but assisting each other or at least not harming each other by their programming times.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The question really was based on a cry for help from the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra and it was directed towards exploring whether the Minister was personally prepared to protest to the Federal Minister about this use of funds. The Minister made it fairly clear that competition is not a bad thing, and who can argue with that. But another point which the Minister did make is that the ACO is State subsidised. The Adelaide Chamber Orchestra employs 75 up to 110 individual musicians and they are professionals, freelance and student players.

They contribute substantially towards the education and training of State musicians, and they contribute directly towards the State's cultural set-up. They see themselves threatened and I suppose the longer-term implication is that, if they cannot cope with this non-negotiated intrusion (I emphasise that no negotiation was done at all) by the Australian Chamber Orchestra (and they claim that the Australian Chamber Orchestra is Sydney-based and could be supported by Federal moneys for more years than this), it could swamp the local State culture; and it could come in regularly and market it at a level that the Adelaide budget could not consider. It could take the audience growth from the box office and make the smaller State organisation unviable without making any contribution other than performances to the local cultural development. So, it is a cry for help. As the Minister will be discussing this matter with the orchestra, I am satisfied with that.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I can see that the honourable member has received the same correspondence from the Adelaide Chamber Orchestra that I have received. Certainly, I will be discussing the matter with the orchestra and I can appreciate its concerns. I stress that the orchestra is, and has for many years been, supported by the State Government, and the orchestra has contributed significantly to the musical life of the State, as inasmuch as sure you, Sir, are well aware.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to page 441 of the Program Estimates. The 1993-94 Specific Targets refer to the development of a program to assist access to disadvantaged people in the community to the performing arts. What sort of initiatives can be used to assist people with social or economic problems to attend the Festival Centre?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Festival Centre Trust has a number of programs to assist disadvantaged people. One that immediately springs to mind is the sale of tickets at a reduced rate to people in retirement villages, nursing homes and institutions for the elderly. That activity has been conducted for many years by the trust. I will ask the Chair to elaborate on some of the other programs that the trust is undertaking in this regard.

Ms Dunn: The trust takes seriously its responsibility to provide access to as many people in South Australia as possible and we do that in a number of ways. We do it by pricing differently ordinary performances, by running particular performances such as Morning Melodies for elderly people at reasonable prices. We do it by running children's programs at low prices, and we do it by specific target marketing to some of the expensive shows to a network of people who we know can access severely financially disadvantaged people in the community.

It is not a part of the program that the trust advertises in a general way. What is possible for the trust is to always provide pensioner rates and specific prices for those people who have limited means, but there are people who are more severely disadvantaged in terms of their families or physical access and, where there are shows at which the trust can see there will be spare seats, specific marketing occurs, as the Minister has said, via nursing homes or community groups.

Mr De LAINE: What support does the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust give to the Adelaide Festival of Arts?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The trust gives a great deal of support to the Adelaide Festival of Arts, if only because the trust's General Manager is also the General Manager of the festival. As I understand it, the General Manager's salary is paid by the trust and not by the festival. That is just an example. The trust does absorb many of the overheads that the festival would be required to pay if it were not housed at the trust.

Examples of costs that are absorbed by the trust and not charged to the festival include office accommodation, power, telephone, stationery and various administration costs which are provided by the infrastructure existing at the Festival Centre, and the costs are picked up by the trust.

I have mentioned the dual role of the General Manager, but likewise the Finance Manager has a dual role and thereby works to assist the festival without its being a charge to the festival. There is no apportionment of the time spent by these people with dual roles with regard to the time spent on trust work as opposed to festival work. No charge is made to the festival for work that is part of a person's time spent on festival work. Any staff employed full time by the festival are charged to the festival but, where people are employed by the trust but spend part of their time working for the festival, the festival is not charged for that time. It is difficult to estimate what the level of this extra subsidy to the festival is, but there have been estimates of about \$200 000 per annum. Perhaps the General Manager would like to comment on the accuracy of that figure.

Mr McFarlane: The estimate of \$200 000 per annum is contained in the Leadenhall report, and certainly that part of the report will be made public. The report had a fairly detailed look at the support given by the trust to the festival and that estimate comes out of the report.

Mr De LAINE: Reference is made in the major resource variations (page 441) to the enterprise bargaining agreement and payment of targeted separation packages. As to the TSPs,

what is the target in terms of numbers and how many have been taken up?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will ask Mr McFarlane to answer that question.

Mr McFarlane: There was no target when the TSPs were offered within the trust, but five people decided to take up the offer of those packages and have since left the organisation.

Mr SUCH: I would like to commend the staff of the Festival Centre for their efficient, friendly service.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Hear, hear. Particularly the front of house staff.

Mr SUCH: It applies to all the staff I have ever had dealings with.

The CHAIRMAN: Ms. Cashmore wants to pick up a couple of general arts administration topics.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Before proceeding to my question, and bearing in mind there is no provision in Standing Orders for Estimates Committees for personal explanation, I would like to preface my question with a reference to the Minister's statement about my role as Chairperson of the Honda Adelaide Music Fiesta. I had intended to declare my interest in that position before proceeding to questions on festivals later in the afternoon, but I think it should be on the record in relation to the Minister's statement that the timing of festivals is very often beyond the hands of the board when some of the decisions rest with the sponsors of a festival and with availability of venues, which was the case with the Honda Adelaide Music Fiesta. The Barossa Music Festival is a brilliant concept, which I support fully; it has a specialised market for a baroque and classical program, whereas the Honda Adelaide Music Fiesta spans a number of musical genres, of which classical is simply one. I would hate to think that anyone would comprehend that there was malice aforethought or any lack of consideration for the Barossa Music Festival by the fiesta board, because we support it most fully, and I do the best I can to promote it.

I refer to support services on page 432 of the Program Estimates. This deals with the whole notion of public sector reform, the restructuring of departments and portfolios and the relationship between previously independent departments and their role in what appears from the outside at least to be a subsumed role within a mega-portfolio. What administrative arguments have been developed to accommodate the new portfolio of Business and Regional Development; and what is the specific role and responsibility of the portfolio coordinator, Mr Bill Cossey, in respect of Arts and Cultural Heritage? Will Mr Cossey have the ultimate responsibility for this department or will he be simply responsible for initiating and implementing specific projects that involve the department? If the latter, what projects are envisaged apart from the marketing of the film, which was referred to earlier this morning; in what way does Mr Cossey's relationship with his own Minister, the Hon. Mike Rann, refer to his relationship with the other Ministers under whose broad umbrella this department will operate; and what in particular is the relationship between Mr Cossey and the CEO of the Department of Arts and Cultural Heritage, Dr Eric Willmot?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There are about 25 questions there; I may need prompting if I do not respond to them all initially. I refer first to the honourable member's comment regarding the fiesta. I fully appreciate the difficulties of programming. I was making no criticism whatever of it; I was merely passing on the comments made to me by people from the Barossa Music Festival that there had been no consultation

with them. Things may be unavoidable, but there can be consultation and explanation, and I understand there was none, at least, as reported to me by the Barossa Music Festival people.

With regard to the organisation of the new portfolio, Mr Cossey is the coordinator of the portfolio, which consists of a number of independent departments. Dr Willmot is the Director of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage; he was before this new portfolio arrangement and he remains so. There is no change in that; I remain the Minister and Dr Willmot reports to me. However, there is this grouping of departments which are concerned with economic development and I for one am delighted at this official recognition given to the economic importance of the arts in our community. It has long been accepted that the arts are of enormous cultural and social value to any community, in particular our community here, but in many circles they have been regarded as perhaps an expensive add-on which is not of fundamental importance to the economic well-being of our community. The grouping of arts with other departments of economic importance is a recognition of the economic value of the arts industry to our community, and I very much welcome this recognition.

As I understand it Mr Cossey will be coordinating activities between the different departments. There will be regular meetings of the CEOs of all those economic departments, chaired by Mr Cossey, who can then develop strategic plans for the individual departments to make sure they are all treading the same path and pursuing the same goal. As I understand it, other groupings will also be set up for particular projects. For instance, there may be something involving tourism in the arts which will not involve other departments so that one can get a working grouping involving officers from those areas. In addition, Mr Cossey will be reacting to requests made to him by the CEOs, who may feel that there is a need for a particular area to be looked at or a particular aspect to be followed up, and at their suggestion he will be able to follow this up and ensure there is the coordination across the departments so that this can occur.

Mr Cossey continues to report to the Hon. Mr Rann as his Minister, Dr Willmot continues to report to me as his responsible Minister, and I need hardly add that it is known for Ministers to talk to one another.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister's reply indicated the desire under the new arrangements for departments to be seen to be pursuing the same goals. Under this new arrangement will new directions be developed for the administration of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, with new guidelines for the arts related statutory authorities and the arts advisory committees responsible for recommending grants, which place more emphasis on the economic value and benefit of the arts and cultural activity and less on the perceived social justice and equity goals that have been underlying foundations for arts advisory grants committees in the past?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The question is quite a philosophical one. There is no doubt that the basic premise in the arts has been and always will be the maintenance and development of creative endeavour, artistic excellence and high cultural standards. That has always been there and there is no suggestion that it would in any way alter, nor are we going to change our goals of access and equity, of inclusiveness and of availability of artistic experience to all members of the community. However, the honourable member may well be aware that we have recently issued a 'Multicu-

luralism in the arts' policy that addresses the inclusiveness of artistic endeavour.

We have also recently issued a discussion paper prepared for the major grant funding body (the Arts Finance Advisory Committee) with thoughts on the directions that grant funding programs should take in years to come. I am not saying that there will not be changes in the guidelines resulting from this discussion paper, but at this stage it is a discussion paper only. Submissions on it have been urged from all members of the arts community and anyone else who is interested. I think submissions close today and, obviously, once they have been received, they will be evaluated and a further paper prepared as a result.

This may suggest changes in emphasis: I do not know. I may recommend that we continue with the same emphasis that we have had, but this is being driven from within the arts community, within the Arts Department, as to how those involved in the arts feel the arts should be developing in this State, which does not mean, of course, that many other people cannot make submissions and contribute their ideas as to what they feel is desirable.

There have been discussions with tourism and with the Economic Development Authority (EDA) relating to ideas in specific areas. Obviously, there has been a great deal of discussion with the EDA recently regarding film, and it was very closely involved with the new structure that is now being financed for the film industry in this State. Currently, there is also a paper out for discussion on youth arts policy, which may lead to changes of emphasis in our youth arts policy. Again, it is a discussion paper and we welcome any contributions that anyone may wish to make to it before finalising a document as a youth arts policy for the State.

I do not know whether that has really answered the honourable member's question, but while philosophical questions as to the direction of the arts, the emphasis and the aim of preparing a cultural plan for the State as a whole certainly come from within the arts community and from within the Arts Department, we obviously welcome interaction and ideas from the whole community in developing what is best for South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That was an interesting answer to a philosophical question, and one is not much the wiser because, obviously, as I understand the answer, the Minister is depending to a large extent on public input rather than on specific policy leadership from the department.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The discussion papers put out various proposals which feed back as requested.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I realise that the responses have not yet been examined, if the date for submissions closes only today. But given that the Government has restructured portfolios and done so with a purpose in mind, does the Minister envisage the need for any restructuring of responsibilities within the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and, if so, will this result in any reduction or increase in staffing numbers? If so, what changes are contemplated?

The Hon. Anne Levy: No changes internal to the department are being contemplated at this time. It was only 12 months ago that we had reviews of every division of the department with resultant changes both in numbers and in organisation. That has been fully implemented and resulted in considerable savings, but there is no suggestion that what was achieved 12 months ago should be further altered at this time.

Mr McKEE: In relation to the Artlab operation (and I refer to Estimates of Payments, page 158, program 7 of 'Community services'), exactly what did Artlab do with its allocation from community services?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Artlab now receives very small funding from general grants. It receives payment for most of its work, be it from the Government sector, such as the Art Gallery or Museum, or from the private sector, and it is also keen and able to provide services of top quality conservation for anyone in the community. However, there is an allocation this year of \$165 000 to Artlab for it to undertake conservation work which could be called community service work, for which it will receive no payment. There are many components to this which I can perhaps detail: once a month it runs a 'clinic day', which is a free advisory service. Any member of the public can take along any object of any type which they feel might need conservation, or perhaps they might want to know how best to preserve it and prevent it from deteriorating. Artlab's advice is provided free to those who bring along their precious objects.

Artlab wants to expand this service, and hopes very soon to be setting up an office in Sydney where it can continue this work, not necessarily just as a service to the population of New South Wales but with the aim of generating work for Artlab; people would be advised that their precious article was deteriorating and needed conservation of some sort, and obviously Artlab would then be prepared to undertake that work for them for a fee. That is one aspect of the community service.

Artlab also goes to schools and gives lectures. It has a number of school students who come in for work experience placements, which is at a cost to Artlab. I am sure it is very valuable experience indeed for the students on work placement, and many of them will become very interested and will want to pursue that type of work as a career. Artlab provides lectures and tours for various clubs and community organisations, and this is at a cost to Artlab: it is not charged for, and it is hardly part of its commercial function to do that. It has a program worth \$25 000 which it applies to conservation work done for small collecting institutions such as small museums and little galleries which may have one or two items that are part of South Australia's heritage, need conservation and some tiny little council or museum could not possibly afford to undertake the conservation work required.

So, Artlab has an annual expenditure of \$25 000 which it can provide for that sort of work. It also allocates \$15 000 a year to do conservation work for the Riddoch gallery in Mount Gambier; the Performing Arts Collection, which is currently based at the Festival Centre; and for Tandanya, all of which have works of great value which obviously periodically need to have conservation work done for them.

Artlab also spends \$50 000 a year on research and development as to conservation techniques. It wants not only to keep up with the most modern techniques but also to be actively involved in developing new techniques of conservation—better ways of doing things—and this requires a research budget which the Government is very happy to provide and which I am sure contributes to Artlab's being one of the leading conservation institutions in the country, if not the leading one.

Another matter which comes under the community service program that might interest honourable members is the contribution that Artlab makes to disaster preparedness

training for all the North Terrace institutions. If there were some major disaster, be it fire, earthquake or flood, etc., amongst the cultural institutions along North Terrace the impact on the State's heritage collection could be catastrophic, and Artlab is certainly involved in preparing for such eventualities, to the extent that one can prepare for them. Of course, they are unpredictable and their effects cannot be completely negated, but with careful forethought plans can be made and steps taken. Artlab puts resources into this every year so that, should some terrible disaster occur along North Terrace, the effects on the State's magnificent collections would be minimised.

Mr SUCH: I do not think these Estimates Committees are likely to be turned into a television series or offer any threat to programs put on by the Festival Centre or anyone else. Is the Government still committed to having the Helpmann Academy and, if so, will the Minister say what progress has been made in establishing the academy and the likely format of such an academy?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think that question should be referred to my colleague, the Minister of Employment, Education and Training because, as it is designed as a training institution, it strictly comes within her bailiwick rather than that of the Ministry for the Arts. That does not mean to say that the Arts is not very interested in the proposal, as the end product of such a training institution would be highly trained artistic practitioners and, in their employment area, would be of interest to the Ministry for the Arts.

In terms of the discussions and development of the programs for the Helpmann academy the Ministry for the Arts and Cultural Heritage has been used more as a resource: as a source of advice and assistance on artistic matters, while the responsibility lies with another Minister. I think it would be best to ask the question of her in the appropriate Estimates Committee.

Mr SUCH: My second question relates to the extensions to the Art Gallery. When is work due to begin on stages 1 and 3, why has approval not been given for stage 2, and what would be the estimated cost savings if stage 2 were commenced at the same time as stages 1 and 3?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Work is proceeding on stages 1 and 3. I understand that it is proceeding quite rapidly in terms of developing detailed designs, getting ready for tenders, and so on. If the honourable member is asking when an actual sod will be turned, that may still be some time away. Sections of the Art Gallery are going to be used for the installations program in visual arts at the next festival. I can understand that if there are bulldozers around the place, this could be distracting at festival time. I know that the Art Gallery would prefer that the bulldozers did not move in until the end of the festival, which would be March of next year. However, if the designing and tendering processes proceed rapidly, some actual physical work could possibly be done on the site without disrupting the festival program. Certainly the design work, the specifications, and so on, in preparation for tenders is proceeding apace.

Initially, approval was given for stage 1 of the Art Gallery extensions. That was the Government's commitment prior to the last election, and the Government has honoured that commitment. Stage 1 comprises a large underground gallery for travelling exhibitions, a new entrance foyer, a mezzanine floor for the display of Aboriginal art, a new bookshop, a new refreshment area, and so on. The total cost is about \$15.1 million in 1992 figures.

So-called stage 3 has undergone a few modifications. The current stage 3, which has been approved—that was not the original one—involves further extension underground to move the Art Gallery's specialised art library into an underground space, thereby freeing the old Ordnance Building, an historic building at the back of the Art Gallery, which currently houses the library for the Art Gallery. I believe its title is the Ordnance Building. I remember it as the original archives, which it was at one stage. It has obviously passed through various functions in its more than 100-year history. As I said, stage 3 is to move the library from the Ordnance Building to an underground site, thereby enabling the Ordnance Building to be developed as a lecture space, a place for installation exhibitions of a type which are not suitable within an art gallery, perhaps involving water and messy stuff like sand. It was pointed out that there would be enormous savings if stage 3 were completed at the same time as stage 1 because both involve a great deal of excavation work. It is obviously cheaper if the excavation work is undertaken at the same time.

Stage 3 done simultaneously will cost about \$1.2 million. If it were not done simultaneously with stage 1 and it had to be completed at a later time, it would be more like \$2 million, if it were ever done. After the trauma that the excavations for stage 1 will cause, I strongly suspect that no-one at the Art Gallery would want to start excavations again. However, there are enormous savings approaching \$1 million by doing stage 3 simultaneously with stage 1.

Stage 2, however, is a further addition in height to the new section which will be constructed in stage 1. While some economies can be made by continuing from stage 1 straight into stage 2, they are minimal. Stage 2, if done at a different time, will cost about \$3.7 million to \$3.8 million in 1992 figures. If done simultaneously, continuing from stage 1 straight into stage 2, there could be savings of up to \$500 000. This is much less proportionately than doing stage 3 simultaneously with stage 1.

I am reminded that when the tenders are called for stages 1 and 3 the possibility of following straight into stage 2 will be kept alive. Therefore, should the Art Gallery Board be able to find financial support elsewhere, it would be possible for stage 2 to continue straight on from stage 1. The Government is not proposing to finance stage 2 simultaneously with stages 1 and 3, but the Art Gallery Board may be able to find sufficient support from elsewhere to enable that to occur.

Mr SUCH: My third question relates to properties, which I understand the Government purchased in 1987, opposite the Art Gallery for possible expansion. Those properties are Nos 203 and 207 North Terrace. What is likely to happen to those buildings in the context of the North Terrace precinct study?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Those buildings are quite separate from the precinct study. The precinct study is concerned with the north side of North Terrace. Those buildings are on the south side of North Terrace and the precinct study is basically concerned with the north side.

The final fate is not yet determined, I think is all one can say. There have been various proposals put forward as to possible uses of those buildings. They do have heritage classification, which inhibits the form of redevelopment which could occur and consequently to what uses they can be put, and, of course, adds considerably to any costs. I think all I can say is that no decisions have yet been made in this regard.

Mr SUCH: That means those buildings that have been vacant for several years?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Yes, they have been vacant. As they stand they are not suitable without considerable expense for use as either art gallery, museum, library or any form of accommodation use. There would have to be considerable sums spent before they could be put to any such arts purpose.

Mr SUCH: What has been the cost of not utilising them, taken as an economic type question? What have you forgone in terms of keeping them empty?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Perhaps Mr Tully could give the economic answer on this. I should point out that I do not know how one measures the economic cost or value of uses such as art galleries or libraries.

Mr SUCH: Commercial rent could have obtained for housing something. I do not know what.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It depends what.

Mr Tully: I think it is fair to say that there is quite a deal of work that does need to be carried out on those premises to bring them up to a standard for almost any purpose. What we have done at the moment is to secure them: put bars across the windows and to secure the doors so that we do not have unwelcome tenants in there causing destruction. That has been done at a fairly minor cost and we have also sought the services of SACON to do a dilapidation survey of the premises so that we can take on any necessary emergency maintenance which is required and, at an appropriate time when the property market picks up, it may be more appropriate to even consider a sale of those premises as an option.

Mr De LAINE: In relation to Artlab and the recoveries from external organisations, at page 156 of the Estimates of Payments the estimate for 1992-93 was nil and the actual was in fact almost \$440 000. Can the Minister explain why that difference occurred?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This is really an accounting procedure, the sort that accountants dream up to keep everyone else on their toes. Previously, Artlab had a sum which was allocated to it for its general work. It is now treated differently from an accounting point of view. There are the expenditures and receipts of Artlab with Artlab being regarded as a commercial organisation, except for the \$165 000 for community service work, which the honourable member for Gilles was asking about. Apart from that it is run as a commercial organisation so its accounting treatment is different. There is no other reason. It is not a sudden burst of unexpected activity.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to page 438 of the Program Estimates in relation to the Museum. What does the program of gallery and exhibition upgrades in the Museum involve?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Museum is continually undertaking efforts to upgrade its gallery and exhibitions. Recently work has been proceeding in three different areas: considerable work was done in the Pacific gallery and minerals gallery, which are on level three of the Museum. Prior to the major Pacific Arts Association International Symposium which was held in Adelaide last April and which attracted hundreds of people interested in the Pacific arts there was upgrading of this area. The Museum Shop was relocated, which meant that that area could then be rearranged and upgraded and the Pacific collection displayed in a much better fashion.

I am told that the Pacific collection, which is absolutely outstanding by world standards, has basically continued in its form of presentation but considerable up-to-date information has been added and a slightly more respectful approach taken to human remains than was taken in the late nineteenth century. To that extent it is a little more tasteful. Not just

human remains but religious material generally are treated far more respectfully now than in the past to the great benefit of the exhibitions at the Museum.

The mineral collection has been relocated. At the same time it has been re-ordered and the specimens have been redescribed scientifically. It is a much more modern approach to the exhibitions of minerals. It is better displayed, better lit and consequently far more informative to the many people who are interested in minerals.

On level four a small temporary exhibition area has had a minor upgrade and now exhibits a fascinating display of local South Australian fossils, such as the giant emus and the diprotodonts found in Lake Callabonna. They are not quite dinosaurs from Jurassic Park but they are real and they are South Australian and of great scientific and general interest. They are now much better displayed than they were.

There has been some initial work on planning and preparatory work for completely redoing the specimens in the reptile and amphibian gallery. The final upgrade of the reptile and amphibian gallery is expected to occur this financial year.

As a result, although work has started, it is not yet completed, but before long there will be another completely new gallery of reptiles and amphibia for general availability.

Mr De LAINE: As to the preparation of a business plan for the Jam Factory Craft and Design Centre, what was the rationale behind assisting in the establishment of the business plan?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Government felt that the Jam Factory Craft and Design Centre could benefit by having a three-year business plan prepared, just as many other organisations have benefited from the preparation of such a business plan. We provided funding of \$14 000 for a consultant and participated in the selection of the consultant. A departmental representative is on the steering committee to which the consultant reports. Other members of the steering committee are from the Jam Factory's board, although not the whole board.

A consultant was chosen after a public advertisement and interviews to undertake this work and the term of reference for the consultancy was to review and report on the consumer expectations, on the expectations of the craft industry and on the expectation of the Government, as the major stakeholder in the Jam Factory, and to review the centre's role in training, wholesaling and retailing, which are all functions that it currently undertakes.

Certainly, the consultant is expected to make recommendations which will consider not only artistic but also commercial imperatives, so that a complete financial business plan can be prepared. The development of this business plan is not yet completed but it is proceeding very well. The consultant is reporting regularly to the steering committee, which as I said, comprises representatives of the department and the Jam Factory at board, management and staff level. I am sure that the Jam Factory Board, as do I, looks forward to the completion of the report and its implementation in the not too distant future.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Before the luncheon adjournment I asked the Minister whether the South-East Cultural Trust would have a fair allocation of capital funding. Will the Minister repeat the response that she had ready at 2 o'clock concerning the \$25 000, because I suspected that something was wrong with it?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I was informed that \$25 000 was spent last year at the Helpmann Theatre, but I gave no indication of what might be spent there this year. In this

current financial year we have an allocation of \$250 000 for cultural facilities but, of that, I do not know how much, if any, of that will be allocated to that theatre.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I was under the impression that that was what the Minister said, but I did not make a record of it. Was the Minister under the assumption that last year's financial allocation did provide \$25 000 for the Helpmann Theatre? If that is so, I believe the Minister's view is incorrect. Similarly, is she under the impression that in any of the preceding 10 years capital funds had been provided for the theatre? When the theatre was built by Fricker Carrington, which made an excellent job of it (it was designed by Hassell and Partners, the same people whom former Premier Don Dunstan had designing the Festival Centre, and Bill Brown, a theatre consultant from Sydney who advised on the project), they were responsible for building a mini festival centre in Mount Gambier that is now called the Helpmann Theatre. We had problems almost immediately because the Sydney company which had a Perth parent manufactured fibreglass panels that were sandwiched around cement in order to cover the fly tower, that is, the cladding that was repaired last year.

It started splitting and falling off, with the result that the city council, the Festival Centre, the Festival Trust in the South-East and Fricker Carrington entered into litigation with the Sydney manufacturers, unsuccessfully, because it promptly went bankrupt. As part of the wash-up-the settlement in the South-East-the Mount Gambier City Council paid money to the local trust and it placed that money in what it called the latent defects fund, which was really a trust fund against what was bound to happen, which was cracking and splitting of the fly tower and possible falling off of panels.

Prudent management meant that for the first four years the money was invested and earned interest, and for the past seven or eight years that principal and interest have been used for capital repairs, not only for the fly tower for which it was intended, but also for anything else that needed replacing in the Helpmann Theatre. So, really, that \$100 000, which is city council money paid to the trust, has seen virtually all of the repair and maintenance for the Helpmann Theatre kept up to scratch. With that having happened, would these wider defects, which I saw beginning to occur when I inspected the theatre, receive an injection of capital funds in their own right, rather than have the local cultural trust depend on the fly tower funds to do the whole job? Obviously it cannot do that, because it is too big.

I hope that clears up the background to the funding. These past 12 months, not \$25 000 but \$40 000 was spent, comprising \$33 000 that was half shared between the city council, which still keeps an interest in the repair and maintenance and the cultural trust on a dollar for dollar basis, and about another \$7 000 to \$8 000 for external repairs which came from the fly tower repair trust fund—the latent defect trust fund.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I am certainly cognisant of the fact that the City Council of Mount Gambier has been very supportive of the cultural facilities made available by the Government in the city of Mount Gambier. We are cognisant of and very grateful for the contribution it makes which does after all benefit the citizens not only of Mount Gambier but also of a much wider region throughout the entire South-East. With regard to the \$250 000 which has been allocated for maintenance of arts facilities in the current financial year, the Helpmann Theatre is eligible for that money as required. The Country Arts Trust now has the responsibility for the four regional theatres throughout South Australia, and it will be

up to it to determine the priorities amongst the four regional theatres in terms of maintenance which is required. It will determine its priorities and make application for part of that \$250 000 which has been set aside for that purpose.

As yet I am not aware of any specific list of requests from the Country Arts Trust, but doubtless this will be forwarded before very long. I know there are maintenance problems at the Helpmann Theatre to which the honourable member has referred; there are maintenance requirements in the other three theatres also. The Middleback Theatre at Whyalla has had many problems from a leaking roof, and I know there is at least one seat in the theatre which until recent repair work was never sold because, should it rain during a performance, the occupant of that seat was likely to get wet. We hope that problem has been solved; certainly, capital resources were devoted to solving the problem but we may have to await next winter to know whether it has been completely solved. Joking aside, the Helpmann Theatre will certainly be eligible, but it is for the Country Arts Trust to determine its priorities as to the requirements of its four regional theatres and make application accordingly.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My second question relates to a couple of decisions that the Government has made about the concentration of travel bookings with Westpac and the intention to centralise the placing of all Government advertisements in Adelaide. Representations have been made to my office by local travel consultants, local transport operators and local media with regard to the fact that bookings were previously made locally without any trouble and the full purchase price went to the operators, whereas when it goes through an intermediary there are booking fees and deductions which reduce the profitability of already barely viable operations, in these troubled times particularly.

With regard to the placing of media ads, there is a 10 per cent deduction to the agency in Adelaide, 10 per cent of which goes to the country newspaper's centralised bureau, which means that for every \$10 000 worth of advertising placed with a country newspaper or country television station, 20 per cent goes to intermediaries, not on the local scene but in Adelaide. So, a substantial amount of money leaves the district for no apparent purpose, because previously advertisements were placed locally by the local government agencies and the funds remained in the South-East. If, for example, you had \$40 000 worth of bookings, which the Festival Centre could probably place quite easily with the number of performances it has in the year, you would lose 20 per cent of that—\$8 000—and it is quite a substantial loss to the local media. It changes the profitability of an ad virtually to a loss. Will the Minister look at the centralised booking of travel and advertising and if possible reverse the decision?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This is not a question just for the Arts and Cultural Heritage portfolio; this is a question of across-Government media advertising, which is now all being directed through a central media organisation which, because of the total volume that occurs across the whole of Government, is able to obtain far better rates for Government.

I can appreciate the point raised by the honourable member, which is dealing not with Government expenditure but with resources going into the private sector at a local level. I will be happy to take up that question with the responsible Minister, but the experience has been that, by adopting a whole-of-Government approach, far better rates are being obtained for all the media advertising done throughout the whole of Government. This is undoubtedly having a beneficial effect for the taxpayer: that either the

same amount of advertising is being obtained at a much lower cost to the taxpayer or that for the same amount of money far more advertising is being obtained.

It is definitely of benefit to the taxpayer in South Australia in that total Government expenditure for a given amount of advertising is decreasing. Whilst I appreciate the point raised by the honourable member, the Government's responsibility is to be as efficient and effective as possible with taxpayers money. I should have thought that all members would regard saving taxpayers money as a desirable aim and something that should be applauded.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I accept that, provided that it can be shown that cheaper rates are obtained in country newspapers and that it is not simply 20 per cent leaving the State in order to pay the same amount for advertising, since the volume is not there in a smaller country town. It may be that the savings are more imagined than real and I would appreciate if the Minister could investigate that, since it was not the media alone that raised the issue; it was also raised by the Government departments in the South-East which like to feel that they can live comfortably with the people they are dealing with on a day to day basis. It was a mutual concern.

Has the Minister (or the Government) given any thought at all to having local government take even greater involvement in the country theatres? The Minister mentioned that she appreciated the Mount Gambier City Council's contributions towards maintenance. Has the Minister entered into any negotiations at any stage with regard to local government's assuming control of the theatres and, if so, what sort of *quid pro quo* would there be in such an arrangement? If it is just out of the question, I do not mind if the Minister says so and that is an end of it.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The question of local government's assuming control of the theatres has never been raised and I strongly suspect that it will not be. The financial burden could be quite considerable and to some extent it would be difficult to allocate the cost, since a theatre such as the Helpmann Theatre serves not only Mount Gambier but the whole of the South-East, so that many different local governments would be involved. We would not expect the Mount Gambier council to undertake costs that were of benefit to ratepayers of other councils unless those other councils were also contributing.

The theatres were provided by the Government for the four regions of the State, and they are now managed and run by the Country Arts Trust, which is provided with funds by Government. It is an interesting question: the interrelationship with local government in the region. As I am sure the honourable member knows, on each of the five country arts boards there is a representative of local government from each of the five regions served, and on the Country Arts Trust itself there is a representative from the Local Government Association, representing local government throughout the State. Local government obviously regarded this as sufficiently important to nominate as its member Mr Jim Hullick, the General Secretary of the Local Government Association.

So, there is no doubt that local government is interested and wishes to participate in arts development throughout regional South Australia. However, this does not necessarily extend to all local councils. In fact, there have been negotiations both prior to the final establishment of the Country Arts Trust and subsequently by the trust with local government in the different areas. There were suggestions that arrangements could be made on a fee for service basis in each of the regions for local government to undertake some of the administrative

tasks for the Country Arts Trust in the areas, but the four councils involved were not interested in cooperating with the Country Arts Trust in this.

On the other hand, there are other councils (not in the major centres where the four regional theatres are) that have been very supportive of regional arts development officers and who have provided accommodation and assistance for them, either at no cost or at minimal cost. Personally, I was very disappointed when the local councils did not wish to cooperate by undertaking some of the administrative and financial services for the theatres, even though it was suggested that they do so not as a contribution but on a fee for service basis. But they were unwilling to do so, which meant that financial and administrative servicing had to be located in Adelaide, whereas the Country Arts Trust initially would have preferred that it be located in the regions.

Perhaps at a future time the relevant local councils might reconsider that matter, which we feel could be of advantage both to the Country Arts Trust and to the local areas themselves.

Mr McKEE: I noted from the Estimates of Payments, page 156, program 1, that State Opera has been granted an additional \$10 000. What was that spent on?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This financial year an additional \$10 000 has been made available to State Opera to enable it to assist with a community development program which had already begun, with the aim of increasing the appreciation of and interest in opera throughout the community. Honourable members might know that a few weeks ago there was a joint production by State Opera with Magpie Theatre of *Macbeth* which was part opera/part Shakespeare and which was certainly enthusiastically received by all the school children who saw it.

I understand that early next year, with the assistance of this grant, State Opera is planning to present a condensed version of *Hansel and Gretel* which is a fairy tale opera by Humperdink, and this will be specifically designed for school children, and is estimated to reach an audience of over 8 000 school children. This will be a unique development prepared and presented by State Opera, and I understand that one of the plans for the production is that, at each school visited, the school children themselves will be invited to be part of the chorus of *Gingerbread Children*.

I am certainly delighted to know of this plan for community opera development by State Opera, and I am very glad indeed that we have been able to assist them with this.

Mr McKEE: I think that any money spent introducing people and students to the world of opera is very well spent: it is a pity it is not a larger allocation.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Ms F. Awock, Director, State Library.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 435, 'Provision of State Library Services'. Under the heading '1992-93 Specific Initiatives, Improvements and Achievements' there is reference to the long-term building plans developed as part of the North Terrace cultural precinct study. What long-term building plans were developed last year for remodelling, refitting and adding a new floor to the Bastian wing of the State Library as part of that study, and what are the estimated costs of this State Library project and its time construction planning schedule?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The development's future requirements for the State Library are being considered along

with the redevelopments of all the institutions right along North Terrace, and certainly a study has been prepared and is being considered by the Government at this stage. Regarding North Terrace, not only has the Government decided to proceed at this time with the extensions to the Art Gallery which we mentioned earlier but also considerable work has been done on the Institute Building, which comes under the auspices of the Libraries Board. The Institute Building, as I am sure the honourable member knows, has been completely restored exteriorly and the ground floor has been restored interiorly, which still leaves the basement and first floor to be tackled interiorly, and plans are being developed for that to occur. The longer-term requirements are certainly being considered as part of the requirements for the whole of the North Terrace precinct which is still under consideration.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Could the Minister be more specific about tenses? She has used the present tense and the future tense, but in fact the documents use the past tense and say 'long-term building plans were developed'—we assume the word 'were'—'as part of the North Terrace Cultural Precinct Study.' The Institute Building restoration has occurred in respect of the exterior and part of the interior, so that is obviously not the future, nor is it the long term. I would assume that the long-term building plans were to do with the Bastian wing. Have they been prepared and, if so, what are they and what is the cost?

The Hon. Anne Levy: As I indicated, the long-term plans were prepared not just for the library but for the whole of North Terrace. They are not detailed plans and certainly have no specifications or detailed costings, but these long-term conceptual plans are still being considered by Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I ask a supplementary question, because I do not think the Committee is any further advanced in its understanding of what has happened in respect not of the North Terrace Cultural Precinct Study of which we are aware the library is a portion but of the library itself, because the papers say that long-term plans were developed, and the Minister has not even established whether they were in respect to the Bastian wing. Have plans been drawn up for the extension of the Bastian wing and, if so, what is the nature of those plans and the anticipated cost?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I repeat: the library and all sections thereof were considered as part of the North Terrace Cultural Precinct Study, which did not limit itself to part of the library or even the whole of the library: it dealt with all the institutions on North Terrace. These were concept plans and certainly did not include any detailed plans for any of the institutions, but I can assure the honourable member that the Bastian wing, along with every other section of every other institution on North Terrace, provided part of this long-term plan. This, I repeat, is still being considered by the Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I can only assume from that that there are no specific cost projections, nor are there any specific plans for the library because the Minister continues to refer to concept plans for the whole precinct.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I do not know what detail the honourable member expects. There are these concept plans, but there are no detailed plans. This would obviously have to follow any consideration by the Government. The Government is still looking at this long-term concept plan for the whole cultural North Terrace precinct, which includes the Bastian wing of the State Library.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I do not know whether the Minister would consider a new floor on the

Bastian wing to be a detail or a concept, and it might be helpful if we knew whether a new floor for a library was a detail or a concept. I realise that would use my third question but I hope it can be regarded as a supplementary because I think thus far I, at least, am none the wiser for having asked several questions in respect of that statement that these plans have been developed. Does the concept include a new floor for the Bastian wing?

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is one of the concepts that is discussed in the plan, but there are no detailed plans for any part of the precinct.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Still on the State Library, my next question relates to staffing and the general levels of research assistants to help borrowers, particularly with respect to the Mortlock collection. The staffing levels are mentioned on page 159 of the Program Estimates, but they are not specific in respect of the Mortlock library. Mr Chairman, you and other members of the Committee will probably be aware that authors, biographers and historians are conscious of the rich resources of the Mortlock library. However, despite the wealth of information therein, it is not readily accessible because the information has not been catalogued. The Minister may wish to take this question on notice, so I will put it in precise terms. What estimated number of full-time equivalent staff would be required to catalogue the collections that have been donated to the Mortlock library? I am not sure whether these categories are the ones that the library would use, but they are the ones that come to mind: deceased estates; commercial and industrial archives of companies and firms, which could be very valuable for the State's economic history; the archives of voluntary bodies, which are valuable for the State's social history; and the papers of individuals with specialised interests. I ask this question because many historians and biographers are daunted by the fact that they have to do their own—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Their own research.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Not their own research. They are simply shown vast shelves and crates of material which could take months, if not years, to catalogue in order to obtain the wealth of information within them. For example, many members of Parliament—when you retire from Parliament, Mr Chairman, you may choose to do this—leave all their electoral office papers to the Mortlock library. Without a cataloguing system, those papers are not worth a great deal to anyone who is embarking on research in respect of the life or interests of a particular MP. Because the collection is so valuable and because its value depends on cataloguing and access, I think Parliament should be aware of the resources required to catalogue that collection and make sure that the catalogue is up to date. Will the Minister take that question on notice?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I would obviously have to take it on notice, because I do not have such detailed information here. I would ask the honourable member to specify over what period of time, because the resources required to catalogue it in three weeks will be very different from those required to catalogue it over three years or 30 years. I think a time frame should be indicated if any reasonable calculation is to be made for an answer.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I would expect the time frame to be taken into account in the provision of full-time equivalents. If, for example, we were to need 10 people working for five years on the existing collection or 50 people

working for a year, that is the kind of information I would expect the library to take into account in its calculations.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The library is moving into automation of archival records. It is proceeding with detailed specifications required for such a project, which is expected to start in this financial year. Obviously it will not be achieved in five minutes. The library is conscious of the need to have its archival records readily available and it hopes, through automation, to improve its accessibility to people who wish to have access to it.

Mr SUCH: My first question relates to the museum. In 1983 the Labor Government deferred for 10 years the staged redevelopment of the museum, stage 1 having been commenced in 1982. The 10-year period for the deferral is up this year, yet there is no commitment in the Capital Works Program to fund the redevelopment. The only reference to the project is on page 58, where a major redevelopment is mooted as an option for the next four years after 1993-94, and only if the private sector is involved. The reference also makes clear that listing as a possible future capital works program must not be construed as a commitment by the Government to proceed with the project. There are two questions relating to that. The first question relates to the North Terrace cultural precinct study. Did the museum participate in that study?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I have already said that the North Terrace cultural precinct study included all the institutions along North Terrace: the State Library, the Art Gallery, the South Australian Museum, the History Trust buildings, Artlab, and so on, which all form part of the cultural precinct. While there is no allocation in this year's budget for major capital development at the museum, I have already indicated the ongoing program which is being undertaken at the museum in terms of upgrading the exhibition and gallery space and renewing, modernising and presenting the exhibitions in a way which shows greater respect for the religious and other sensibilities of the people involved. I will not detail again the major upgrading which has been occurring at the different levels of the museum. This program will certainly continue in the current financial year.

Mr SUCH: For clarification, did the museum participate as a body or was the study involving it in a general sense?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was certainly actively involved at both board and staff level. That applied not only to the museum but to all the institutions along North Terrace. There is no question of someone sitting in an ivory tower and handing down whatever dream flashed through their mind. The cultural precinct study actively involved all the institutions at all levels along North Terrace. I am reminded that in the last financial year \$800 000 was made available for redevelopment at the museum. This involved alterations to the Armoury building, the complete relocation of the museum's shop and the provision of new toilets in the east wing. Those were the major matters, plus the gallery upgrading and renovation, which is an ongoing program.

Mr SUCH: Are there any plans to provide new galleries or to replace the north wing and, if so, what would be the estimated cost involved?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The current budget makes provision for the Museum to continue the upgrading program for its current facilities. Major questions, such as whether the north wing should be replaced or built on—I do not what else one might propose for the north wing—forms part of the cultural precinct study, which has already been mentioned.

Certainly there is a great deal occurring within the Museum in terms of upgrading galleries and exhibitions.

Mr SUCH: Can the Minister explain why the Art Gallery redirected funds which were meant for the purchase of art works to other purposes?

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is the prerogative of the board of the Art Gallery. The allocation to the Art Gallery includes sums for salaries, which obviously are paid to the staff of the Art Gallery, and also operating costs. There are funds allocated for operations, acquisitions, and development of various programs but other than the salary levels the actual distribution of those moneys is a matter for the Art Gallery board. It can make reallocations within its total budget if it so chooses.

My approval is required but I certainly respect the Art Gallery board's autonomy in this matter and would not intervene in its decisions unless I felt it were a matter that would be extremely detrimental to the Art Gallery. I may say that situation has never arisen and I have been happy to approve whatever reallocation within its budget the Art Gallery board wishes to make.

Mr SUCH: You are obviously not unhappy if money which is intended to be used for the purchase of works of art goes toward either salaries or operating expenses?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I reiterate: that is a matter for the Art Gallery board. The Art Gallery board does, of course, have access to other funds for the purpose of acquisitions. The Art Gallery's acquisitions for last year were a record in terms of monetary value. Much of this came from donations to the Art Gallery; gifts of valuable paintings; plus contributions from the Art Gallery Foundation, which exists to assist the Art Gallery in terms of acquisitions.

I am sure the honourable member realises that many old works of art have extremely large price tags and it is only through the generosity of a large number of people that the Art Gallery is able to obtain some of these very precious works of art. There have been extraordinarily generous donors to the Art Gallery and I am sure I express the appreciation of everyone to these very generous donors. Most of the donors are South Australians but Mr Bill Bowmore, who is not, has already presented a French old master to the Art Gallery. That was presented a couple of years ago and he is, I understand, about to repeat his generosity to the Art Gallery.

The value of gifts and purchases of works of art to the Art Gallery in the last financial year was an all time record, totalling \$2.7 million. Most of it was in the form of gifts and these were mainly for the heritage collections rather than contemporary collections.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to Estimates of Payments, page 157, Program 2, salaries. Was there an increase in salaries in the State Library program this year?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Thank you for that question. As was announced earlier this year the Government was able to provide extra resources to the State Library so that the question of opening hours of the library could be addressed. Three months ago I announced a Government commitment to open the State Library for full service, five evenings a week, by 1 March next year. Recent discussions with the Director of the State Library and the Libraries Board have led to a situation where we are delighted to be able to say that the library will open until 8 o'clock, four nights a week, from 12 October.

I was keen to get the extended opening hours as soon as possible, knowing the considerable number of students, both

secondary and tertiary, who use the library in studying for their exams. As November is exam time I wanted to assist the students, if possible, by opening the library in the evenings as soon as possible and preferably in time to cater for their exam studying requirements. Despite the earlier commitment to do so by 1 March next year, we are now able to provide evening opening hours for four days a week as from 12 October and the fifth evening will be added by 1 March, as previously indicated. This, of course, has meant extra allocation of resources to the library so that the staffing requirements can be met. I am delighted that the negotiations have resulted in this happy result of four nights a week as from 12 October.

I can indicate that this will mean that the library will then be open for more than 60 hours a week, with a full service provided for every one of those 60 hours, and this would not only be a considerable advance on previous opening hours but also would compare well with what is available in other State Libraries around the country, especially when we consider the hours that a full service is available. There had been discussions as to whether the library should open without providing a full service but the Libraries Board, the staff and I were opposed to that because it was believed that if the library were open it should be more than just an open door and a light on: that a full library service should be available so that people who came into the library could always expect to receive the standard of service for which our State library is renowned.

Mr De LAINE: As to the line 'Maintenance of buildings', is the asbestos clean-up work at the State Library being funded from that line and what stage has the clean-up reached now?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This line makes provision for the costs of day-to-day breakdowns and routine maintenance of State Library buildings and does not make specific provision for asbestos clean-up. Nevertheless, each maintenance project undertaken in an area of the library where asbestos is known to occur obviously includes a cost against this line for asbestos monitoring. Generally, we seek funds for asbestos removal separately from the need to provide ongoing recurrent maintenance funding.

But whenever maintenance and upgrades of an area of the library have been necessary, asbestos has been removed as part of that project. For example, the refurbishment of the Institute building, which we discussed earlier, involved a deal of asbestos removal, and the cost for that was provided from within the capital cost for the upgrade of the building.

Members may be interested to know that the removal of asbestos from the air-conditioning ducts in the Bray Reference Library is now complete. The work on removal of asbestos from air-conditioning risers within the building is scheduled for completion this calendar year, and funding for this, which will amount to about \$250 000, has been provided through the Asbestos Advisory Committee and linked with a \$750 000 upgrade for the air-conditioning of the State Library.

The department is conscious of the presence of asbestos, and precautions are always rigorously undertaken and supervised whenever any work involves any of the areas with asbestos in them. We have a management plan and register for all hazardous materials in the State Library, with priorities for attention. These priority areas have been addressed in the work which has been done and which is about to be done.

Certainly, we are committed to eliminating asbestos from all our buildings, although the State Library probably has

more asbestos than any other building, and there is a notional provision of about \$100 000 for this financial year for further asbestos removal work in different areas of the State Library. Predominantly, this will be in the lower ground floor in the coming year. We remain conscious of the need to remove it and, as I said, whenever work is done in any area where there is asbestos, it is removed from that area as part of the work that is being done.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to page 442 of the Program Estimates where the following achievement is listed:

Cultural plan statistical base paper developed in cooperation with ABS and summary paper circulated.

Can the Minister explain this project and indicate when the final paper will be available?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This project has been undertaken jointly between officers of the Policy Research and Promotions Unit in the department who worked for three months with an officer from the Australian Bureau of Statistics to undertake a research project on statistics relating to South Australian arts and culture. The project has brought together from a great range of sources information to provide a comprehensive overview of the arts and cultural industries in South Australia. An interim summary of its findings was distributed some time ago because of the great interest in the study that existed throughout the arts industry.

I can advise members with great delight that the project is now completed and the outcome is a detailed account of the arts and the whole arts industry in South Australia. Called 'The State of the Arts', the document gives a most comprehensive picture of the arts and cultural heritage. It is being released and distributed today, and I would be delighted to provide copies to any members who might wish one. It is a factual background paper and includes sections on South Australia's demographic profile, attendances at various cultural venues, Government outlays, private sector funding, expenditure on arts and cultural goods and services, employment, multiculturalism and tourism in the arts. It is a most important resource for anyone interested in the arts in South Australia, and obviously it will be a base paper on which further policy development and decision-making can be based. The complete document will be of great interest to a very large number of people in South Australia, and I have copies available if any member would like one.

Mr SUCH: I have a question relating to the library which I am happy if the Minister takes on notice. Will the Minister provide in general terms a statistical profile of the people who use the State Library, such as students, business people, male/female, age? You may already have the information.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Such studies have been done and such data are available, but I call on the Director of the State Library, Mrs Awcock, who probably has the figures more to mind than I do.

Ms Awcock: I do not have all of them in my head, but 38 per cent of our users are students, 12 per cent are unemployed people, and fewer women than men use the services of the State Library. I have forgotten the proportions, but I can provide that information, based on a survey we did in 1992. We have quite explicit details and we are continuing to run a variety of surveys over the next two to three years, examining different aspects of our user profiles so that, with the assistance of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, through which we are paying for a survey of 500 people throughout the community, we will pick up much more detail than we currently have.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The State of the Arts document has considerable detail on library attendances in South Australia, although this is not necessarily the State Library; it can include all libraries, which include the public libraries as well as the State Library system.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to page 430 and the financial assistance for the development and operation of arts programs and arts venues. At this point I feel I should declare my interest as Chairperson of the Fiesta Music Festival. I put this question on notice, because it will require a lot of detailed work that the Minister may not have available. Will the Minister advise the details of the salaries and functions of all personnel for all bodies, excluding statutory authorities, which are funded by the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and, secondly, can she provide the committee with details of the amounts and purposes of all grants disbursed by the department under that program? I realise that will be a detailed consolidation of information, some of which may well appear in the annual report, and therefore it may not be up to date for the budget estimates.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will certainly be happy to provide that. You want the salaries and functions of all personnel?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: From bodies excluding statutory authorities.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Funded by the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage? There is a wide range of non-government bodies.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Everything from Magpie Theatre to whatever the bodies are. Because those funds are so important, it may well be that some of that information is in this report, which we have not had a chance to look at. We are talking about a proposed sum of \$20 281 000.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That includes statutory authorities.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: We would exclude statutory authorities, which would subsume most of that. I do not want to ask for unreasonable detail, but I think it is fair that Parliament be given a clear picture of the way grants are disbursed across the board. It is only in that way that we can discover which particular areas of the arts are receiving the greatest proportion of funding, and it provides a very good background in light of the Minister's earlier statements about the relationship between the arts and the economic development of the State.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It would be very easy to provide figures on relative funding of different art forms. Those data are readily available. I do not have them right here, but they are in the AFAC discussion paper, anyway. The details of salaries of people employed by non-government organisations might well be regarded by those organisations as a matter of privacy which it is not anybody else's business to know. I realise that taxpayers' money is going to these organisations, but they are certainly not fully funded by Government. Government provides a contribution to their work, but the proportion of their total budget provided by the Government would vary considerably. For some it may be as low as 10 per cent to 20 per cent; for others it may be as high as 60 per cent or 70 per cent.

In addition, many of these organisations receive Federal Government grants through the Australia Council, so that their Government funding is not just South Australian Government funding. I fear it could be very difficult to get that information from a very large number of non-government organisations which might well feel that that was private information that it would be an invasion of privacy to

provide. It is certainly not my prerogative to require them to give such information. I could only request it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am not asking any non-government body to provide any information to the Parliament. I am asking the Minister to provide to the Parliament details of funds that her department disburses to non-government bodies, not the other way around.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Details of what is provided are very readily available, and that material is published. I am certainly happy to get that, but I thought you asked about the salaries and personnel of these bodies.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: No; I asked for detail of what salaries are provided by the Government to these specific non-government organisations.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We do not provide salaries; we provide a grant to an organisation which can be used for salaries, administration, productions or a great variety of functions undertaken by a non-government organisation and it is most unlikely that the grant we provide is 100 per cent of its income.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I do not want the Minister to misunderstand me, and I think she does misunderstand me. I am asking for the sums provided by Government and specified by Government for specific purposes to non-government organisations, that is, taxpayers' money and the use to which the Government specifies those funds be put. I am not asking any non-government organisation to provide details of its private budget to the Parliament, only what is in the public interest, namely, taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is fair enough. The Minister can make an attempt at it and if it does not match what is required we can always ask again.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will certainly provide that; it is freely available and published data.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Page 437 refers to provision of cultural venues, specifically, Carrick Hill. I note that visitors to Carrick Hill last year fell by 17 000 to 37 000. Does this fall in attendance fully explain the fall of \$90 000 in the revenue of Carrick Hill last year, or were there other factors that contributed to the drop in revenue; is the proposed cut of 2.4 full time equivalent jobs at Carrick Hill this year, on top of the cut last year of 1.1 per cent, a response by the board to the drop in visitor numbers; and are the positions to be cut from security, administration or gardens?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Visitor numbers certainly have fallen at Carrick Hill. However, whilst the current economic circumstances undoubtedly play a part in this, Carrick Hill is very cognisant of the fact that its visitor attendances seesaw considerably from one financial year to another. In one calendar year it will have some sort of festival exhibition (which always increases visitor numbers) and late in the following year there is the major embroidery competition exhibition (which is currently on display at Carrick Hill), which again draws a very large number of visitors. These two major events, although in different calendar years, always fall in the same financial year: one in September and the other in March of the following year.

Therefore, the increased visitor numbers will occur in one financial year due to these two major programs run at Carrick Hill. The following financial year will have neither of these two major programs, so visitor numbers go down. The visitor numbers published for the past financial year were for a year when neither of those two major exhibitions occurred, and one could expect them to rise considerably next year because of those exhibitions. There is one major exhibition per

calendar year but they both happen to fall within the same financial year, which distorts visitor numbers, giving a seesaw effect from one year to another. That is not the only explanation, but it is a very important contribution to the visitor number differences.

There has been a work force reduction of two full-time equivalents at Carrick Hill. These two individuals took targeted separation packages, which were not funded by Carrick Hill itself but from other Government sources. There has been considerable discussion and consultation with the work force at Carrick Hill, the unions have been involved and there is complete agreement on a multiskilling program, the result being that there is no significant reduction in either the security of Carrick Hill or the attention that will be given to the gardens. There has been a reorganisation of the work force, with the complete cooperation of that work force.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: What are the terms of Ms Denzil O'Brien's appointment and contract as Chief Executive Officer and is the contract performance based? If so, who is making the assessment of performance?

Mr Tully: Ms O'Brien is a permanent employee under the provisions of the Government Management and Employment Act at the ASO6 level. Her tenure, therefore, is permanent and she is assigned to the position at Carrick Hill.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister confirm that in late 1991, early 1992, when a number of reviews were being made of the operations of arts and cultural authorities and agencies, Carrick Hill was also the subject of a review? If that was the case, why have the results of this review not been released?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There was of course a review of Carrick Hill, as with every other division and section of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage. It was at the request of the board of Carrick Hill that the review not be released. A number of recommendations were made in that review that the board has been happy to undertake and implement. There were other matters that it did not want made publicly available, and I was happy to accede to the board's request.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Notwithstanding the wishes of the board (which is appointed by the Minister and the Government), because Carrick Hill is funded through an allocation from Parliament there are some questions to which Parliament is entitled to have answers. One of them is: was a recommendation that the trust aim to raise \$5 million by selling or developing appropriate land or selling a combination of real and personal property?

The Hon. Anne Levy: In the review, a proposal similar to that mentioned by the honourable member (although I cannot recall whether it was identical in every detail) was raised as a suggestion, but discussions on the matter did not proceed very far and the board of Carrick Hill subsequently has gone along a different development track and implemented a number of changes, as have been mentioned. I think that certainly was a suggestion, but discussions on it never proceeded very far, in terms of being an option to be considered.

Mr De LAINE: This question is particularly relevant to me as the member for Price, and I refer to page 439 of the Program Estimates. Recently there has been some publicity about the financial problems and problems with dwindling numbers of volunteers at the South Australian Maritime Museum at Port Adelaide. The relevant item in the Program Estimates states:

A redevelopment strategy for the Maritime Museum was substantially completed.

Will the Minister outline to the Committee that redevelopment strategy?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Certainly, there is a redevelopment strategy for the Maritime Museum which has been worked on and which is substantially completed at this stage. The South Australian Maritime Museum is not just on one site: as I am sure the honourable member knows, it occupies a range of buildings in the historic centre of Port Adelaide. As a result of major redevelopment plans which are under way in Port Adelaide itself, the Maritime Museum will have to vacate two of its premises that are currently mainly used for storage, and it will also have to relocate its two historic vessels, the steam tug *Yelta* and the motor vessel *Nelcebee*, and another berthing area will have to be found for them.

The premises concerned are the western half of wharf shed 1 and the Koch building store, which are due to be developed for other purposes as part of the Port Adelaide redevelopment. The wharf shed mainly contains large and robust items which are not suitable for display in the main bond store exhibition space, and include things such as the hull of the historic ketch *Annie Watt* as well as a collection of cabins, engines and wooden sailing craft.

Negotiations are still proceeding relating to the redevelopment of that central part of Port Adelaide because the overall redevelopment of Port Adelaide is a very complex matter, which is being looked at in a major study by consultants Woods Bagot. The museum has been guaranteed alternative and appropriate housing for its collection, which will be displaced from those two buildings, and it very much hopes to use the opportunity of relocation for an upgrading of the attractions of its display. There will also have to be further negotiations regarding relocating the *Yelta* and the *Nelcebee* in such a way that they are readily available for visits by the public when they have to leave their current sites.

Mr De LAINE: The former Director of the Maritime Museum, Roger Garland, resigned several weeks ago to take up a position in Canberra, as you no doubt know. Roger did an excellent job during his directorship of the Maritime Museum under somewhat difficult circumstances. When is a new Director likely to be appointed?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Obviously this is really a matter for the History Trust, which is a statutory authority rather than a Government department. However, I understand from officers of the History Trust that they would expect it would take two to three months to go through procedures, such as reconsidering the job description, calling for applications, then advertising, selecting, interviewing, and so on. So, it may well be two to three months before someone is appointed to take Roger Garland's place.

I would certainly like to take the opportunity to reiterate the remarks made by the honourable member as to the enormous contribution that Roger Garland has made to the Maritime Museum and how much it benefited from his stewardship while he was there. We obviously wish him well in his future career in Canberra.

Mr SUCH: I refer to the Adelaide Festival of Arts. Has the Minister withdrawn her nomination of Mr Stephen Spence as one of her representatives to the Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts, and if so, why? Has the Minister subsequently nominated Ms Noni Hazelhurst, a Sydney based actor, and has Ms Hazelhurst agreed to accept that nomination?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think that the way members of the Opposition mention names publicly on what are private matters for these individuals before they are public knowledge or public consideration is deplorable. I never made public the fact that I had nominated Mr Stephen Spence for membership of the Festival Board, my having been invited to make a nomination. Mr Stephen Spence's name was raised in this place by the Opposition: it is the Opposition which has made a great song and dance about it. I do not know whether it was sorry as a result of that, but, in any event, well over a month ago Mr Spence wrote to me indicating that he did not wish to be considered for that position. That decision was made of his own volition, and I quite understand his reasons for doing so. I can only reiterate my disappointment that members of the Opposition do not behave responsibly and that they throw names around without any consideration for the feelings of the individuals concerned.

Since receiving that correspondence from Mr Spence, I have had discussions with representatives of the board of the Festival, in particular with the Chair and the Deputy Chair of the board. We had discussions as to the particular characteristics of an individual whom I could nominate to be a member of the Festival Board and, following such discussions, I made approaches to at least two people, both of whom have indicated great interest in the position but for specific personal and private reasons have not been able to take up my invitation. So, discussions are continuing on this matter. I deplore Opposition members throwing names around in this way, without any consideration of the feelings of the individuals concerned.

Mr SUCH: In the budget last year the Government announced it would amend the State Lotteries Act to provide that 50 per cent of the annual level of unclaimed prizes be used as a sole source of Government funds for the Festival. As we know this proposal was later withdrawn. Since that time has the Minister or her officers canvassed with the board and/or the management of the Festival and Treasury other options to provide the Festival with an alternative but steady source of Government funding?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Government reverted to funding the Festival from consolidated revenue and has allocated a record sum for next year's Festival of Arts: the sum of \$2.5 million will be provided for that Festival, which is a substantial increase of 13 per cent over Government funding for the previous Festival. There have been no further discussions with the Festival Board regarding the source of Government funds for the Festival.

The Government has taken the decision that it strongly supports the Adelaide Festival and it will provide generous funding for the festival from consolidated revenue. It has done so in the past and I have no doubt it will continue to do so in future.

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

Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and Minister
for the Status of Women—Other Payments, \$586 000

Departmental Advisers:

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

Ms L. Sweeney, Executive Officer, Women's Suffrage Centenary.

The Hon. Anne Levy: In view of the time, I shall not make an opening statement on the status of women program. One of the very important programs is the suffrage centenary celebrations next year. I am sure that the Hon. Ms Cashmore is very well informed on that, being her Party's representative on the all-Party and wide-ranging steering committee.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a member of that committee, I know the answer to the question that I am about to ask. Nevertheless, it ought to be placed on the public record for historical reasons, if no other. What are the terms and conditions of Ms Sweeney's appointment as Executive Officer to the Women's Suffrage Centenary steering committee?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It is a position to the middle of 1995. Ms Sweeney was appointed after the usual Public Service selection procedures. She is on reassignment from her substantive position as Executive Officer for the committee throughout the centenary year and for a period past that, if required, for completing any work left over from the celebrations.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I think that other details can be placed on notice. On page 15 of the Program Estimates there is a reference to the Government's target to increase the number of women on Government boards and committees. What is the percentage of women on all Government boards and committees at the present time; and, if health and community welfare-related boards and committees are excluded from that figure, what is the percentage of women on all other boards and committees?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The second part of that question will have to be taken on notice. An investigation of all Government boards and committees was carried out about 15 months ago and it came up with the figure of 25 per cent overall. I understand that the proportion has risen in the intervening time, though it is a preliminary figure only at this stage. I would not like to be held as to whether it is now 26 per cent or 27 per cent. The percentage varies across different areas of government.

In the arts area, for which I have responsibility, 50-50 has been achieved. It varies in other areas of government. It also varies according to whether individuals are nominated to boards and committees by the Government or outside organisations. This can be a problem for the Government in achieving its target of 50-50 by the year 2000. When individuals are nominated to Government boards and committees by outside bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Local Government Association, the UTLC, the Real Estate Institute and any of a vast number of outside organisations, unless those organisations also accept a target by the year 2000 of 50-50 representation in their nominees, it will be very difficult to achieve the target that has been set. We have no control over the nominations from some of these bodies and, unless they accept that the position of women is grossly under-represented, it would be difficult to achieve the target. But amongst those who are actually appointed by Government the figures are much more encouraging. For instance, the recent Tourism Commission had over 30 per cent of its membership female and these were all appointed by Government, not by outside bodies.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Can the Minister advise the committee how many women have responded to the Government's register for women indicating that they are

prepared to be considered for appointments to Government boards and committees?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I understand that up to very recently the number was about 300, though there are more nominations coming in all the time. Certainly, I would welcome the assistance of any members present in distributing copies of the register form, so that the numbers can increase even more rapidly.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Can the Minister identify the total cash sum allocated by Government to the Women's Suffrage Centenary celebrations, excluding those sums allocated by various departments for programs which they may or may not have set in place in any event for 1994, regardless of the celebrations?

I do not wish total Government expenditure; I wish to know the cash sum allocated for the celebrations directly to the steering committee.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The allocation in the 1993-94 budget is a total of \$310 000, plus the salaries of people like Ms Sweeney and other people working in the secretariat.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: With respect to the tapestry, that will presumably be placed on the walls of the House of Assembly Chamber. This will probably necessitate the removal of a couple of the portraits which have been there for quite some time. They will, of course, be male portraits. Does the Minister have in mind the removal of any particular candidates because I suggest that Torrens and Butler are the two biggest crooks up there and that they could possibly be the ones?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think it would be most inappropriate for me, as a member of the Legislative Council, to in any way suggest what might occur within the House of Assembly. I agree that at least two male portraits will have to come down. I would not mind if they all came down. I would hate to sit in that Chamber and have those gloomy looking individuals staring down at me through the proceedings of Parliament. I am most grateful that in this Chamber we are spared such monstrosities.

However, I suppose the official responsibility will lie with the Speaker, but I would presume that there would be consultation between the Speaker and various members of the House, so that a consensus view could be obtained as to which of those gloomy looking portraits should come down. As I say, if they all came down I for one would cheer.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: What financial support or other logistic support has the suffrage centenary received other than directly from the Government? What has been received from outside bodies?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There has been considerable sponsorship received from, particularly, the corporate sector, but also from trusts and bodies, such as Foundation SA, which is taxpayers' money also, but taking a different route. I understand that currently there is about \$300 000 worth of cash sponsorship, which, as I say, includes bodies like Foundation SA, but also includes major contributors from the corporate sector such as Ford, Ford dealers, South Australian Brewing Company, SANTOS, plus, of course, other corporate sector companies.

There has also been in-kind sponsorship, which has an estimated value of about \$500 000. The in-kind sponsorship includes Qantas, providing air fares to bring individuals from overseas for the international conference being held in October next year on women, power and politics. Distinguished women politicians from around the world have been invited to participate in this conference. I do not want to

mention names at this stage because while there are some firm acceptances there are others saying, 'I hope so.' Certainly the in-kind sponsorship, as I say, includes air fares from Qantas. The Submarine Corporation is providing air fares and accommodation for two conference speakers. I think they have indicated that they should be Swedish individuals.

Actil is providing material for banners. Australia Post will issue a series of commemorative stamps. I will not detail any more at this time but I can assure members that full recognition will be given to all sponsors of the celebrations, be they in-kind or in cash. The committee and I are very grateful indeed for the way the citizens of South Australia are supporting the centenary celebrations. I hope everyone shares with me the view that next year should be an extremely exciting year with celebrations right throughout South Australia, such that every woman in South Australia will be proud she is a South Australian.

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

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

Public and Consumer Affairs, \$4 110 000
Minister of Consumer Affairs—Other Payments \$50 000

Departmental Advisers:

Ms M. Beasley, Chief Executive Officer, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

Ms J. Taylor, Acting Director, Corporate Services, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

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

The Hon. Anne Levy: In the past year the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has had an interesting and busy year. The biggest change was recently announced by the Premier, namely, that the department is absorbed into the new Department of Justice, but this in no way means any diminution of our commitment to protection of consumers and consumer rights, which maintain the high priority that has always been given to them by this Government. That point was emphasised by the Premier in announcing the new department with the emphasis that there remains a Minister of Consumer Affairs who is responsible for that part of the portfolio.

In other areas members will be interested to know that in the past year almost 250 000 inquiries were made of the department and these were handled by the Office of Fair Trading. About half of these related to residential tenancy inquiries, both from landlords and tenants.

In terms of specific complaints brought to the Office of Fair Trading for conciliation, almost 17 000 complaints were dealt with by the office. This is a record number and indicates the great respect and confidence that the South Australian public has in the Office of Fair Trading.

Public Trustee is part of the department and continues to be the largest trustee organisation administering deceased and protected estates in South Australia. The value of trusts under administration has grown from \$257 million in 1989-90 to \$354 million in the past financial year, a considerable growth.

Another important component of the department is the Office of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, whose responsibilities extend far and wide with the recently added

responsibilities under the gaming legislation passed by this Parliament. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner also deals with many complaints by patrons or neighbours of licensed premises, all of which are dealt with most efficiently. The revenue from activities regulated by the office contributed more than \$67 million to the Government's coffers.

The other important area in the department is that of consumer education, where there were important developments. The consumer rights program 'Know your Rights' was broadcast in many different community languages through Radio 5EBI. Progress is being made in the national primary school project, which is aiming to produce consumer material for primary schools. South Australia is chairing the national working party in this following the successful implementation of its consumer rights programs for secondary school students developed a few years ago.

There are also particular projects relating to the needs of Aboriginal consumers which were begun in the last year and which will be continued in the forthcoming year. On those matters and any others I am happy to answer any questions.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My first question relates to policy and is in response to the Minister's opening statement about the absorption of the department into the new Department of Justice. Considerable concern has been expressed about that absorption into the Department of Justice, particularly in the light of the fact that the Queensland, New South Wales and Tasmania Governments have decided that their respective consumer affairs agencies should be removed from the justice portfolio and returned to an independent status. Given that three States have come to that conclusion, why has the South Australian Government decided to absorb the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs into the Department of Justice?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There has been a misunderstanding in making that comparison. In Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria the removal of consumer affairs from Justice Departments was to ensure that a completely different Minister would be responsible for the policy and administration of the most important portfolio but, as I already indicated, the fact that there is to be an amalgamation into the Department of Justice is purely for administrative efficiencies, but there remains a Minister of Consumer Affairs, who has complete responsibility for policy development in the area of consumer affairs.

Of course, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is a statutory position and is responsible to me and not to the Minister of Justice. While there is an administrative amalgamation, there is this separation of responsibilities, and that is what I think the Eastern States were trying to achieve. We are not abandoning that in any way.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Given the Minister's statement that this decision was purely for administrative efficiency, will she outline to the Committee exactly what are the administrative efficiencies and what are the cost savings as a result of those efficiencies?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The implementation of the amalgamation has not occurred at this stage, and discussions are continuing as to the rate of implementation of the amalgamation. The initial stages will obviously be to have a common corporate services section, and it is certainly expected that efficiencies can be achieved in this and savings made. I am not aware of any figure having been placed on this. I suggest it is probably more a question for the Minister of Public Sector Reform.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Again, in response to the Minister's reply, if the rate of implementation of the amalgamation has not yet been determined but administrative efficiencies are said to result, can the Minister assure the Committee that the Commissioner's independence in respect of establishing staff numbers, budgets and standards of performance will in no way be compromised as a result of the amalgamation?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I can assure the committee that the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, which is a statutory position, will maintain all statutory responsibilities and in no way will that be affected by the amalgamation. The process is not due to start until 3 October; that is the date which has been indicated. I reiterate there is no effect on the responsibilities of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. It is a statutory position and will be reporting to me in the same way as has occurred up to now.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My next question is a standard question to several Ministers, and I would not seek a reply from the Minister this evening. I am happy to ask her to put it on notice and give it to her in written form. In respect of the general operations of the department, for what boards, committees and councils does the Minister have responsibility as Minister of Consumer Affairs, or within the portfolio responsibility of Public and Consumer Affairs? In respect of each board, council or committee: who are the members; when do the members' terms of office expire; what is the remuneration of the members; who appoints the members and on whose recommendation or nomination is the appointment made; and what is the role or function of the committee or board? Again, I would expect those answers on notice.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Obviously, I do not have that detailed information with me here, but I will certainly be glad to get it. I ask the honourable member whether by the question she wishes to include such things as members of the Commercial Tribunal and members of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, which are not boards or committees but which are tribunals with a quasi-judicial function?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, I believe I mentioned or if I did not I should have mentioned the word 'councils', which is an embracing term involving all authorities under the Minister's jurisdiction.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will be happy to do so. I am rather glad the same question was not asked of me as Minister for the Arts, given that there I am responsible for at least 33 boards, committees and statutory bodies. The number is far less in Consumer Affairs, but we will provide that information by the due date, whatever it may be.

The CHAIRMAN: It is 1 October.

Mr McKEE: I wish to ask a question in relation to births, deaths and marriages (I always wonder whether those words are in the right order). I believe there is a new system in births, deaths and marriages for those seeking certificates and information from interstate. There is no detail here, so could you elaborate how that system operates?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will be very happy to. I agree that births, deaths and marriages should perhaps be births, marriages and deaths, but births, deaths and marriages it has been for many years, and I would not necessarily suggest altering the order of the words. Certainly in South Australia, the births, deaths and marriages office has moved to improve service to clients—either people interstate who want a certificate from South Australia or South Australians who want a certificate from interstate. The most common certifi-

cate requested is a birth certificate, which is used as proof of identity in a number of areas, such as obtaining passports, opening bank accounts and a number of such situations, although of course there are people who at some time need copies of marriage certificates or death certificates of relatives.

Previously, for people who wanted such a certificate from interstate, the procedure could be quite lengthy, with letters going backwards and forwards and the usual delays in posts and considerable inconvenience to people who might require a copy of such a certificate with a fair degree of urgency. What has been set up is a system called Interfax, which is a cooperative arrangement between the Registrars of Births, Deaths and Marriages in all Australian States and Territories by means of which a person can apply at any capital city office for a copy of a birth, death or marriage certificate which is held in any other State or Territory. The applicant fills in a form at the office where they happen to be; the fee payable is the fee applicable in the State from which they want the certificate plus a \$5 addition for the BDM office where they are applying for the work they are undertaking.

The application is then faxed to the registry concerned on the same day, from which point it is handled in exactly the same way as an application received by mail, but obviously considerable time has been saved in that the application is received at the appropriate registry office a few minutes after it has been lodged in another capital city. There is also a priority service available for particularly urgent cases.

This Interfax service was started early this year between South Australia and the Northern Territory. In a few months, considerable use was made of it between Adelaide and Darwin, but it has been extended to all States now as from 1 July this year and, in the first month of operation only, 89 applications were received from interstate for South Australian certificates and 133 applications were received in Adelaide for requests for certificates from other jurisdictions.

Given the fact that there was hardly any publicity associated with the launching of this service, we are confident that as it becomes better known it will become a very popular facility and will be used a great deal. Whilst I rejoice in the instigation of this new service, which results from cooperation between all States, I have been considering how the service could be extended to assist South Australians living outside the metropolitan area or even those who live within the metropolitan area but at considerable distance from the central office in the CBD.

I understand that discussions are currently under way between Births, Deaths and Marriages and Australia Post to see whether it might be possible to use the faxing service available in Australia Post offices, which could speed the obtaining of appropriate certificates for people who do not have ready physical access to the central office in Adelaide. I hope these discussions will prove fruitful, as I think this is a service that could be usefully extended to other areas of South Australia as well as operating so successfully interstate.

Mr McKEE: On the same subject, I understand that Births, Deaths and Marriages has developed a program of placing district registers at public libraries. How much did this cost and how is the public expected to use the system?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The cost was minimal and involved only the physical transportation of the records from one place to another. An estimate has been made of the order of \$1 500, but it is hardly a significant sum. What has occurred as a policy decision is that, now that there are no longer district registers of births, the documents that were

compiled over the years in many of the district offices are being returned to those local areas. They are on indefinite loan from the Registrar in selected public libraries and will be available for reference under the usual rules of any library material.

A requirement has been imposed in that people who wish to examine these original registers may not photocopy or photograph the pages, because many of them are ancient and it is felt that it would be detrimental to these original documents to have them undergo these processes, particularly if they occurred frequently. This also serves to protect the revenue that is obtained by the sale of copies of certificates, but it is principally a preservation measure to protect what can be fairly fragile material. All the State's material is now computerised within the central office, but these original records are of interest to local historians, local individuals who may want to trace their families, and it was felt that it would be a service to the public if they could be returned and made available in the areas where they originated.

Not all material has been returned, of course, for privacy reasons. Registers of births prior to 1906, registers of marriages prior to 1916 and registers of deaths prior to 1967 have been returned. It is felt that in connection with later material there will still be people living, and their privacy should be protected from random searches in public libraries. I have a list of all the libraries around the State that now hold this material, the libraries being selected on advice from the State Library and the Director of Public Records.

The material is now held in 22 different public libraries around the State, both metropolitan and non-metropolitan, such as Pinnaroo, Robe, Burra, Port Pirie, Clare, Kapunda, Gawler, Port Adelaide, Hindmarsh, Norwood, and the Adelaide district registers are now held in the Unley Library Service. If any member is interested in any particular district register, I would be happy to indicate where it is currently located. Historians round the State and people interested in local history are absolutely delighted at this move.

Mr SUCH: The Minister may wish to take this on notice, and I am happy for that to occur. Within the department how many officers are now on contracts of service rather than permanent employment and at what levels or classifications are they serving? Who, if any, of these officers are subject to performance reviews? How is performance measured? Who measures it? Who reviews performance and what are the consequences of failure to perform? Are any performance bonuses paid and, if so, what are they and how are they measured?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I can assure the honourable member that no performance bonuses are paid to anybody in the department. I am sure the honourable member does not expect me to provide that detail here and now, but we will ensure that it is provided by the due date.

Mr SUCH: There have been significant changes in senior staff in recent times and various allegations have been put to the Opposition. I do not want to turn this place into any sort of Star Chamber, but can the Minister assure the Committee that, in respect of promotions at the senior level since the start of this financial year, all appropriate procedures have been followed that can reasonably constitute due process?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I should perhaps first indicate that processes within the department are strictly the responsibility of the Chief Executive Officer of the department, but I am assured that correct process has always been followed. In any change that requires it there has been full consultation with the Commissioner for Public Employment, and on behalf of

my staff I would resent any suggestion that proper processes are not followed.

Mr SUCH: As I say, allegations were put to us, although I believe it is unfair to identify particular individuals—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Really? You didn't earlier.

Mr SUCH: I think it reasonable to seek that assurance from the Minister. If people put allegations it is our obligation to raise them, but I do not want to turn this into a Star Chamber.

I did seek the assurance that all proper procedures had been followed, and you assure us that that is the case.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Perhaps I could get the Commissioner to answer the question.

Ms Beasley: I think that this has arisen because the Director of the Office of Fair Trading was transferred to other duties before I became the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, and until recently the Director of Operations has been acting in this position. The former Director of the Office of Fair Trading is not returning to this position. However, he has not been permanently reassigned to another position.

Given the senior level of this position, the reassignment can only be effected by the Commissioner for Public Employment. I intend to fill these positions on a permanent basis in the proper and normal manner once the former Director has been permanently reassigned. I am not able to do this until that reassignment occurs. There is a line of acting positions, and I think that this may, in some way, allude to those allegations. So, there are senior people acting in various positions simply because I cannot, at this point in time, do anything about the former Director of Fair Trading. If there are any other issues that you would like to raise with me, because there are some sensitive personnel issues, I would be happy to write to the members and let them have all the information.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest to Mr Such that if in fact he does want to put some particular allegations it might be better to do it in writing and get some formal response, and he can then consider what he would like to do about that. I appreciate the way in which he has approached it tonight.

Mr SUCH: I am not in the business of a witch hunt. I refer to the Tilstone report, which was highly critical of management of the Office of Fair Trading. What structural changes have been made to address the problems raised by the report and when were they made? What staff changes have been made in consequence of the report?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There is a very lengthy summary of all that has occurred. Basically 55 different recommendations were made by the Tilstone report, and more than 35 of them have already been implemented and others certainly are under consideration. Some of them require legislative change, which I am sure honourable members appreciate cannot be achieved overnight. Certainly, a number of Dr Tilstone's recommendations related to the whole system of business licensing. A discussion paper has been prepared and circulated widely for comment, and when comment has been received and consultation has occurred with a very large number of individuals and groups the appropriate legislative changes will be prepared for the Parliament. However, this is not something which can be achieved rapidly, certainly not in view of the large number of individuals and groups who need to be consulted on the changed system which was proposed by Dr Tilstone. I am sure members are aware of the discussion paper on proposed changes to the licensing system which has been circulated.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On page 100 of the Program Estimates, under 'Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Consumer Services', the compliance line indicates that the number of staff in Consumer Services is falling by seven in the compliance area, and resources are being reduced by approximately \$400 000. Is there a reduction in the need for compliance or is this a cost saving measure or, if not, what is the reason for such a substantial reduction?

The Hon. Anne Levy: One explanation which accounts for a large part of the reduction in compliance staff is that there has finally been a settlement of all the claims against the Agents Indemnity Fund which arose from the fiduciary default of the Swan Shepherd group of companies. This involved millions of dollars and has been an ongoing problem requiring a great deal of time and effort by compliance officers for over 10 years. However, following the court cases, which were about 18 months ago, a further burst of activity has meant that all the matters relating to Swan Shepherd have now been finalised. As a result the staff requirements in the area have been reduced considerably, and the particular officers would, of course, be deployed elsewhere within the department productively allocating their time.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister's answer gives me the opportunity as a local member to commend the departmental officers who were involved in that compliance area. I think very few of us would not have had constituents who suffered as a result of that collapse. We were all conscious of the very diligent way in which those officers of the Minister's department fulfilled their obligations in sorting out what was an unholy tangle.

In her introduction the Minister referred to the large amount of advice given and complaints investigated by the department, and on page 105 of the *erratum* booklet those figures are documented. The figures show a very substantial increase in advice given and a less substantial increase in complaints completed. What is the reason for the advice? Is it a greater demand for advice because of greater consumer awareness, or is it a greater need for advice because of lax practices by commerce and industry? To what does the department attribute the significantly expanded quantity of advice given?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Certainly, the view of the department is that this is due to greater consumer awareness. The department believes that the considerable education programs which are run by it, not only through schools but also through many other avenues, is leading to a much greater awareness of consumer rights amongst members of the population, so that if they feel that their consumer rights have in any way been infringed they will head straight for the Department of Consumer Affairs to initiate inquiries. In my experience I would confirm this. It seems to me that if one talks to anyone in the community about some consumer matter, they will immediately say 'But what about consumer affairs?' There is a great awareness of the existence of Consumer Affairs and of the service which it can provide to the members of the public; hence they are using it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I note that that expanding demand is being met by an increase of 4.1 staff members in the advice and conciliation area. In this period of economic recession, what is the Government's policy in respect of the department to maintain and restore consumer confidence which can contribute to getting the economy moving again in the retail sector?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think that consumers will have confidence if they feel that they can turn to Consumer Affairs for advice and assistance if they have any problems. I stress that Consumer Affairs works with the traders and has their confidence as well. There are forums for working with the Retail Traders Association and other industry bodies. There is consultation with these groups and explanations are given of their rights and responsibilities under the law. A considerable effort is made to ensure that not only consumers but traders know what their rights and obligations are under the law. If there is this confidence on the part of retailers and consumers, it can only be beneficial to trading relations throughout the State.

Mr McKEE: With reference to the Office of Fair Trading, I understand from the Program Estimates, page 106, that there has been a computerisation program. Has that computerisation program been finished and has it improved the efficiency of the office and the system?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There are several systems of computerisation at various stages of development and implementation within the Office of Fair Trading. Those mentioned in the line to which the honourable member referred are the occupational licensing computer system and the residential tenancies computer system.

The occupational licensing computer system has been developed and is being trialled by running it in parallel with the existing system. While this increases the workload, it will be temporary until it is felt that the new computerised system is functioning adequately, in which case it can take over and lead to considerable efficiencies. The changeover date is expected to be in a couple of months. At that stage the obsolete computer systems will be abandoned. The benefits will include a much faster processing of annual returns, penalty notices, suspension notices and cancellation notices. There will also be a much faster response time for any inquiries from licensees and for consumer inquiries as well.

The other system being developed is the residential tenancies computer system. This is at a much earlier stage of development. The funding for the acquisition and implementation of the new computer system was approved only in May of this year, so it will take some time before it can be fully implemented. I understand it will be done in three stages. Stage 1, which is a system designed for it, is expected to be completed very shortly. The full stages will take longer to implement. At this stage we cannot predict what the final implementation date will be, but it is expected that stage 1, which will relate particularly to the bonds paid by tenants to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, should be in operation no later than the middle of next year. Further developments will take a little longer. The cost for stage 1 over six years is estimated at \$714 000. This will be funded through savings in the present computer system, in staff savings that will result from the implementation of the system and a contribution from the Residential Tenancies Fund, the interest on which is used for paying for the administration of residential tenancies matters.

Mr SUCH: The Minister has had some publicity recently relating to the dispensing of spirits in hotels and so on. Has that shown signs of improving; is there still non-compliance in regard to the proper measure; and how widespread is it?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Officers of the department undertake random checks. Earlier this year we were disturbed to find a high degree of non-compliance by a number of establishments not only in the metropolitan area but also in country areas. Publicity has been given to some of the cases

taken before the courts. Some are still *sub judice*, so I cannot comment on them. The officers, probably due to the publicity, have found in other random tests that the compliance level seems to be rising and there are fewer occasions on which short measure is being provided.

To some extent the problem will solve itself from May next year. Under the uniform Trade Measurements Act, which was passed by this Parliament a few months ago, it will be illegal to use spirit measures of certain types, particularly those which are notoriously inaccurate. The only approved measures will be far more reliable and much less likely inadvertently to provide short measure. While that became the law in May this year, I did announce at the time that licensed premises would have 12 months in which to make the changeover from whatever measures they were using to the approved measures.

As a result of the non-compliance which was found by officers from the department the amnesty, if you like, particularly for entertainment venues, was shortened so that they will be expected to comply with the approved measures as from 1 October this year. Many of the short measures which had been detected had been found in venues with entertainment licences. Because of this, and after consultation with the Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, it was agreed that the compliance window for these licensees would be shortened to 1 October this year.

However, despite the fact that the new legislation makes illegal the use of certain spirit measures, our previous legislation certainly did not permit short measures ever being sold to consumers, regardless of the device used for making the measure. Certainly, as from May next year, all licensed premises will only be able to use the approved standard measures and in consequence one would expect far fewer inadvertent short measures being dispensed to consumers.

Mr SUCH: Supplementary to that—and I realise this is not currently covered—in terms of dispensing soft drinks by glass or paper cup there seems to be an enormous variation in terms of what people get. In conjunction with the addition of ice, has the department looked at the question of people getting fair measure for soft drinks dispensed by glass or cup, as this relates mainly to children and upright teetotalers?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Next time you go to Pizza Hut, tell them 'no ice'.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The interjection from the member for Walsh probably sums up the situation. Dispensing of soft drink, of course, is not part of the function of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner; it is hardly an alcoholic problem. The advice which is routinely given to people who feel they are paying for soft drink they are not getting is that they should request it without ice. In that way they will get a larger measure of whatever they have ordered. Presumably once you have drunk a little you could ask to have some ice put in.

Mr SUCH: It is not the most important question but it is something that often involves young people and tends to get overlooked as being not important.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I can indicate it is something to which we have given a great deal of thought but it is difficult to see a solution other than to give the advice to ask for the drink without ice.

Mr SUCH: In relation to the used car industry, which in the past was often portrayed in an unfavourable light, would the Minister agree that nowadays it is a very honourable industry and few problems arise within that industry?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The complaints which the department received in the past 12 months totalled 16 834, of

which 722 referred to purchase of used motor vehicles, which is an increase on the number for last year. Last year 668 complaints were recorded relating to second-hand motor vehicles.

Mr SUCH: Does that relate to licensed dealers, backyarders or anyone?

The Hon. Anne Levy: This would be from licensed dealers, which is a considerable number. I can perhaps indicate that all complaints relating to motor vehicles totalled 1 475, so that about half of all complaints relating to motor vehicles related to the purchase of second-hand motor vehicles.

The other greatest area of complaint received by the department came under the real estate heading where leases under residential tenancies resulted in 10 326 complaints or inquiries. I would indicate that that number consists of inquiries by both landlords and tenants. They are put together as inquiries relating to residential tenancies.

In summary, I can say that the purchase of second-hand motor vehicles was a considerable proportion of all inquiries regarding motor vehicles, certainly the major contributor, and that the proportion of all complaints relating to vehicles has risen. They are now approximately 50 per cent of all complaints relating to motor vehicles.

Mr SUCH: Do these tend to come from the same sort of licensed dealers? Are there certain repeat offenders, shall we say, in the trade?

The Hon. Anne Levy: It will vary, of course. The department's policy is obviously to investigate any complaint. If there are a number of complaints which relate to the one trader then the department will proceed to have discussions with that particular trader and investigate the matter more thoroughly to see whether anything can be done about that trader. If it is just one complaint involving a trader, it could happen to anyone. If it is a series of complaints about one trader, that matter is certainly followed up.

Mr SUCH: Has there been a problem with backyard dealers: people using private premises to sell vehicles under the pretext that it is a private sale?

The Hon. Anne Levy: A number of allegations have been made on this matter about people trading from a back yard and pretending that each sale is a private sale so that a licence is not needed by the seller, and so the normal warranties and conditions of sale do not apply. A number of complaints or comments have been made that this is occurring. If ever evidence can be found of this the department pursues it most vigorously, and individuals have been prosecuted for acting as secondhand car dealers without a licence when it has been established that they are selling not just one car personally but a number of cars. Whilst allegations to this effect are often made, an allegation made without any specifics is hard for the department to follow up. When given any concrete evidence it will certainly follow up and investigate matters fully, but assertions without any evidence make it difficult for the department to take any action. The matters brought to the attention of the department are sufficiently frequent for one staff member to be almost exclusively occupied in dealing with these allegations about backyarders.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Are you saying that the department does not actually monitor those classified ads that purport to be from individuals seeking to sell their own private vehicle? Do you rely entirely on complaints from members of the public? Does anyone go through the list and say, 'We have seen that phone number half a dozen times

before. This person is obviously operating as a trader.'? Is there no monitoring?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Monitoring is done in that regard but, unless the same phone number appears frequently, the fact that it appeared last week is not much help. If there are lengthy intervals between advertisements it becomes harder for monitoring to detect that. It is not dependent entirely on consumer complaints, but they are frequently a very good lead.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: How difficult would it be to devise a simple computer program so that advertisements could be keyboarded in each day and you could immediately see the numbers that came up a few times?

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is planned for the future as part of the department's computerisation program. It would have to follow on from the occupational licensing computerisation being related to that. Whilst planned, it is not at the forefront of the agenda at present, but it will certainly be implemented when possible.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I now refer to a matter that is fairly dear to my heart: football ticket scalping. When I first heard complaints about this I telephoned the department, and an officer gave me the impression that present legislation did not cover this at all: that basically it was left to the market. He was of the view that the Grand Prix Board had a regulation under the Grand Prix Act which covered Grand Prix tickets. I checked this with the board and found there was a fine of about \$1 000 (or perhaps more) for the offence of reselling a Grand Prix ticket. That is of minimal relevance to the general concept of scalping, which applies only where there is a demand that is vastly in excess of supply.

In the case of Grand Prix tickets, although they sell very well, they do not sell to the extent that there are people clamouring for a number of tickets in excess of what is available. I checked with the Department of Recreation and Sport and was referred, I think, to the Places of Public Entertainment Act or some other Act. I was told that a regulation which applied to Football Park had been introduced as a result of the sell-out grand finals a few years ago. A ban was specified only in terms of SANFL tickets and only in regard to sales of tickets at the ground.

It did not cover any scalping offences that might be committed by way of classified advertisements. The same Department of Recreation and Sport officer advised that on anecdotal evidence legislation had been successfully introduced following the 1989 grand final in Victoria, where there was a major scandal regarding scalping for that Hawthorn-Geelong match; there had been a successful crackdown; and scalping had not disappeared but had been almost eliminated.

I have subsequently been advised that that legislation did not actually pass through the Victorian Parliament. Is there any information on what the actual situation is in Victoria? How does it compare with the situation in South Australia? What does the legislation cover here and what is proposed in the near future?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The situation is not quite as it is described by the honourable member. Legislation not under the Places of Public Entertainment Act but under another Act applies to Football Park. It is not limited to SANFL fixtures at Football Park and would apply to any matches there, including Crows or anything else. It applies only within the vicinity of the ground and, as the honourable member says, it is of no relevance in terms of tickets advertised through the classified advertisements.

The Victorian legislation to which the honourable member refers was not passed, and the legislative provisions in Victoria are virtually identical with those that apply in South Australia now. I have asked officers to investigate why the Victorian legislation was not passed and whether we should consider similar or identical legislation for South Australia.

The honourable member raised this matter with me a few weeks ago but, as yet, I have not had that comprehensive report from the department. As soon as I receive it, I shall be happy to inform him of the contents and whether it is considered that something can be done here to prevent scalping. It is a difficult matter to deal with because, if there is a much greater demand than supply and if people are willing to pay a price which far exceeds the face value of the ticket one virtually has a victimless crime and, in such situations, as we know concerning many other victimless crimes, where everyone is happy, there is no-one to complain and none of the individuals involved in the transaction will complain. As a result, it is difficult for the legal authorities to monitor this and attempt to stamp it out. So, there are practical difficulties as well as theoretical difficulties.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I do not know whether I would agree with you that the person who pays an extortionate amount is necessarily happy. They may be in a situation of the person in the Wild West town who kept playing in the local casino, even though he knew the roulette wheel was crooked. When people asked him why, he said, 'I know it is crooked but it is the only one in town.'

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr B. Pryor, Liquor Licensing Commissioner.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer the Minister to page 100 of the Program Estimates, which shows that the cost of regulation of the Casino and gaming machines is to rise by about \$1.5 million with an extra 20 staff, 16 of these in relation to gaming machines. What is the full year additional cost of gaming machine regulation; why is the increase of three persons necessary for casino regulations; and how much gaming machine licence applications have been received so far, how much granted and how many refused?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The increase in staff is because of the extra responsibility given to the office with the passing of the gaming machine legislation. I may say that the increase in staff in South Australia is considerably less than in other States which have passed similar legislation. I think the increase in staff expected in South Australia is 23 and for a lesser role in Victoria the staff increase is of the order of 65, the difference being attributable (in my book) to the considerable efficiency and dedication of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner and all his staff here in South Australia.

With regard to the question of how many licences have been applied for and granted, I ask the Liquor Licensing Commissioner to give those figures; he probably has them at his fingertips.

Mr Pryor: As at today we have received 132 applications for gaming machine licences. They would account for about 3 500 machines, and I have granted 60 applications as at today.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Has the monitoring licence yet been granted and if so on what conditions, and what is the date by which gaming machines will be in operation?

Mr Pryor: The gaming machine monitor's licence has not been granted; it has been set down for call-over on 8 October. I am awaiting a report from the Commissioner of Police. All applications under the Gaming Machines Act must be referred to the Commissioner of Police for thorough investigation; the Commissioner's representative has indicated to me at regular meetings that he will require the time to 8 October to complete his investigations. Depending on whether or not the Commissioner decides to intervene, the matter will either proceed to hearing in the week following 8 October or, if the Commissioner decides to intervene on the grounds that the Independent Gaming Corporation is not fit and proper, I have set aside a week late in October to determine that matter.

We then have a question of the monitoring system being proposed by the Independent Gaming Corporation. I have engaged the Department of Defence to undertake quite complex investigations of the security monitoring system; I have engaged the University of South Australia to look at the computer configuration itself; and I was also fortunate in being able to have a senior analyst seconded from the Treasury to look into the corporate structure of the Independent Gaming Corporation. When I get all those reports I will be in a position either to approve the monitoring system or refuse to approve it. At this stage I cannot give any indication whatsoever on when gaming machines will be introduced.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: As a supplementary question: the Department of Defence's involvement is novel to most of us. Can Mr Pryor tell the Committee whether the Department of Defence has been engaged by any other State to investigate security aspects of gaming machine operations and, if so, what States?

Mr Pryor: I am not aware of the Department of Defence being engaged by any other State, but the Department of Defence has an evaluation bureau and that bureau is internationally recognised as an evaluation authority. That is why I have engaged them; on all the advice given to me they are experts in the field of risk analysis of computer systems.

Mr SUCH: Could the Commissioner outline briefly what the duties of the inspectors will be, and will that extend to things such as under-age drinking on premises or will that strictly be focused on gaming aspects?

Mr Pryor: This is with respect to the Gaming Machines Act and the Liquor Licensing Act. The whole concept in South Australia has been to establish an integrated system of liquor licensing and gaming machine administration, first, to facilitate the granting of licences and monitoring of the industries, because they are the same industry. The intention would be that the Liquor Licensing Inspector will go out to premises and look at liquor licensing matters and gaming machine matters so we do not run into the problem of having a liquor inspector going into premises one week and a gaming inspector going there the following week. The inspectors in the office of the Liquor Licensing Commission will not be involved with breaches of either the Liquor Licensing Act or the Gaming Machines Act; that is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police, so detection of under-aged drinking, overcrowding, all of those activities that take place on licensed premises generally of an evening are the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police. I am responsible for standards of conduct, standards of premises, breaches of gaming, regulations and those types of matters.

Mr SUCH: The police obviously have a significant role, not only in respect of the gambling aspect but also the drinking aspect. Would the Commissioner agree that under-

age drinking is widespread and almost to the point where it is not effectively policed by anyone in this State?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Perhaps I should take up that question; I think that is probably an unfair question to direct to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. As he has indicated, detection of under-age drinking is not within his responsibilities; it is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police, and the Commissioner of Police is not responsible to me, either. I would suggest that that question should perhaps be directed to the Minister responsible for the Commissioner of Police during the Estimates hearings.

Mr SUCH: I know it is a leading question, but I am sure the Commissioner would be aware of what the real world is out there in terms of under-age drinking—it is rife.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better to pursue that through another Committee; it is a rhetorical statement by the honourable member and I think we will let it lie at that point.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: How many gaming machine dealers licence applications have been received so far, how many granted and how many refused?

Mr Pryor: To date we have received eight applications for gaming machine dealers licences; I have granted one and have four set down for the week of 18 October. They are the four principal gaming machine manufacturers in Australia. They lodged their applications at roughly the same time, and I have endeavoured to have those hearings as close to each other as possible, so that no dealer gets an unfair advantage over others.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Since there are so few, is it appropriate to ask the Commissioner the names of those dealers who have been granted licences, or does the Commissioner wish to wait until all applications have been considered before advice of any successful applications?

Mr Pryor: The one that has been granted is to a company called Victorian Gaming Systems. The others, as I said, have not as yet been granted although set down for hearing.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to Program Estimates, page 100, 'Industry/occupational licensing', and ask the Minister: will the State Government benefit through the liquor licence fees from the Federal Government's new tax on wine?

The Hon. Anne Levy: First, I indicate that the proposed Federal Government increased tax (not new tax) on wine, if it comes to pass, will not in any way benefit the State Government in this financial year. The State Government applies a licence fee on sellers of alcoholic beverages, but the licence fee is based on the sales of about 18 months previously. I say 'about 18 months', because one lot runs on a financial year and the other on a calendar year. If there is an increase in the total cost to a licensed retailer, that can affect what the State Government will receive not in this but in the following financial year and the one after that; part of each of them. If the new Federal tax becomes operative and a bottle of wine rises by \$2, say, in retail price, of that amount something like \$1.30 will be going to the Federal Government and the remainder will be going to the retailer, because the retailer's margin varies. The recommended margin is of the order of 25 per cent, but that is a 25 per cent markup on the price that he pays, which will include the increased cost due to the wholesale tax on wine.

So, if there is an increase of, say, \$2, about \$1.30 of that goes to the Federal Government; a small portion may be put aside to pay the increased margin to the State 18 months hence; and the bulk of the remaining difference certainly goes to the retailer. This means that, while of course it is up to each retailer to determine what mark-up they make, it is not

obligatory for them to apply a mark-up of 25 per cent, even though that is the mark-up recommended by their own association. They could choose to have a smaller mark-up and maintain the actual magnitude of their own margin without taking the full 25 per cent mark-up. So, in summary, the State budget this year will in no way be affected by whether or not there is an increased Federal tax on wine.

Mr De LAINE: In 1986 the Government introduced a lower licence fee for low alcohol beer. What trend has been seen in the sale of low alcohol beer compared to full strength beer since then?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The lower licence fee for low alcohol beer was introduced in 1986 and initially it was proposed as 2 per cent but that was very soon changed to nil. There has been a considerable shift in that time from normal beer to low alcohol beer. In 1987 low alcohol beer constituted only 8.7 per cent of beer sales. I am talking in volume, not in dollar terms. In 1991 low alcohol beer constituted 27.5 per cent of all beer sales. In the last financial year the proportion of low alcohol beer slipped slightly: it is now 26.1 per cent. It fell 1 per cent as a percentage of total beer sales.

I have no explanation as to why that slight slip occurred in the last year. It may be that the proportion has plateaued: that low alcohol beer will remain at about a quarter of the total beer market and that there will be fluctuations around this figure from now on. We probably need figures for a number of years more before we can accurately forecast whether or not a plateauing has occurred.

Certainly, for the five previous years there were steep rises in the proportion of low alcohol beer consumed, and this was, I am sure, due to a number of factors not the least of which was the fact that there is no licence fee for low alcohol beer. Also, I think the increasing use of random breath tests has been instrumental in seeing a shift from normal strength to low alcohol beer. The reasons for the shift are probably as many and varied as there are drinkers. The steady growth which had occurred since 1986 stopped in the last financial year and the proportion remained about the same.

Mr De LAINE: I refer to page 255 of the Auditor-General's Report. In 1991-92 the Auditor-General's Report was critical of the Liquor Licensing Commission for carrying too many debts. Has any progress been made in this area?

The Hon. Anne Levy: In 1991-92 the Auditor-General's Report criticised the debt being carried by the Liquor Licensing Commission, but in the latest Auditor-General's Report there is no such comment on debt levels. Since that comment was made, over 12 months ago, a debt recovery process has been developed and implemented. The level of debt has fallen considerably from \$728 000 12 months ago to \$261 000 now, which is only a fraction of what it was a year ago. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner is committed to tackling the remaining debt and wants to establish a position within the office concerned solely with eliminating this debt. On the other hand, we must recognise that part of the debt can come from a particular hotel that may be going through difficult economic circumstances and consequently finds it hard to pay the full licence fee, which it should pay as it is based on previous sales. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner obviously has no wish, unless extremely provoked, to bankrupt people. It may be that part of the licence fee has been paid and that, as soon as circumstances permit, the remainder will be paid by the particular establishment. As the figures indicate, there is no doubt that the debt level has been significantly reduced, and attention is being paid to this area.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Program Estimates, at page 104, refer to the performance indicator for the Casino as being the complaints received from patrons. What was the nature of the complaints; how were they resolved; and are levels of complaints the only performance indicator used by the Licensing Division in assessing the Casino's performance?

The Hon. Anne Levy: During the 1992-93 financial year 45 official complaints were made to Government Casino inspectors. They ranged from complaints over gaming rules to incorrect payment of wagers and dealer errors. A large proportion of the complaints related to roulette and blackjack. All complaints are, of course, taken seriously but it is found that approximately 10 per cent of complaints are resolved in favour of the patron, with 90 per cent being resolved in favour of the Casino. I should add that video recordings of incidents certainly prove invaluable in resolving disputes, which are often the basis of complaints. This can resolve quite clear differences of opinion.

The number of complaints in the 1992-93 financial year is significantly lower than the previous year. Whether a complaint is officially made or not is at the discretion of the patron concerned. The reduced number of complaints may be a reflection of the Casino management's new customer relations policy. Certainly the number of complaints has been reduced.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On that same page under the heading, 'Specific Targets/Objectives', is the improvement identified as, 'junket control and supplier transaction procedures were amended'. Can the Minister define what the words 'junket control' mean, and what were the amendments made to procedures? It is a rather tempting definition for a politician: 'junket control'. I am curious to see if it has the same meaning for the Casino as it does for us.

The Hon. Anne Levy: No, it does not have the same meaning that is commonly applied in certain circles. A junket could be an individual but is more usually a group that has organised to come to the Casino, perhaps from Malaysia. There is a special junket organiser. The individuals concerned buy a package, which involves fares, accommodation and a certain number of hours in the Casino. The junkets often involve individuals who gamble in very large sums. The procedures in recent times have been amended to make provision for the introduction of rebate players and commission agents, together with the introduction of irrevocable letters of credit, which previously were not permitted under the Casino rules.

There have been minor amendments made to the overseas accounts procedures to check credit procedures and to enable the value of cheque credits to be more readily identifiable by use of colours and symbols. The Casino certainly welcomes these organised junkets and is keen to encourage and make arrangements with the organisers of junkets. The Casino benefits considerably from them while making arrangements for conditions which will attract these high rollers who wish to take part in such junket activities.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I note that expanded computer facilities are currently under review. Who is undertaking the review and will the computing facilities be operated in conjunction with any other division or agency?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I think this is another reference to the computerisation to which the Liquor Licensing Commissioner referred earlier. The computerisation of liquor licensing and gaming should be integrated, as they refer to the same establishments. It would be far more efficient to do this,

and the first stage of the system should be operational in about 12 months, although it will depend to some extent on whether the tenderers for the project can achieve such a timetable. The computerisation is taking longer than originally intended, as I indicated, because the decision has been made to extend it for gaming machines as well as liquor licensing, because it will be far more efficient in the long run.

Mr SUCH: According to the Auditor-General's Report (page 256), the administration costs of the Residential Tenancies Fund amounted to \$2 603 000 in 1992-93. How was this calculated? Note 4 (page 257) refers to a write-off of \$115 000. What was the amount of irrecoverable losses and why were they irrecoverable? How much was unidentified discrepancies?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Residential Tenancies Fund consists of the bond money paid by tenants in the private rental market, and the interest thereon provides the resources for running the whole system. It is self financing and is not a cost to the taxpayer. The major cost will be the provision of the administration of the system, the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, the cost of sittings of the tribunal, administering the collection of money, recording it, paying money back on application, the investigation of complaints and, as I indicated earlier, the high proportion of complaints received by Consumer Affairs which relate to residential tenancy matters, as well as the cost of general inquiries.

Under the Act it is a charge against the interest on the fund; this involves all costs associated with the running of the residential tenancy system. I ask Mr Paul to comment further.

Additional Departmental Adviser:

Mr T. Paul, Manager, Financial Services.

Mr Paul: The reimbursement of the cost of running the fund are made purely on the basis of day-to-day or week-to-week amounts accumulated in the department's general ledger. This consists of the salaries, associated overhead costs and also costs of goods and services. It is really as straightforward as that: it is a direct reimbursement of the actual costs of running the fund.

Mr SUCH: Where are the funds invested and what is the rate of return? It appears that the administration costs transferred to Government exceeded the interest by about \$600 000; does this mean the Government is depleting the capital of the fund?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Mr Paul might like to add further details. By arrangement, the fund is invested by and forms part of the investment portfolio of the Public Trustee, who is handling and investing very large sums of money. The rate of return has been falling because interest rates are falling. The fund has built up quite substantial reserves in past years, when interest rates were very much higher. Certainly in the last financial year the cost of running the residential tenancies system exceeded the interest on the fund, but reserves were drawn on, and there are considerable reserves available for this. How long this situation will continue will depend on how long interest rates stay at their current level. I am reminded that, since the fund has gone to the Public Trustee, a much better return has been obtained on the money than was being obtained previously, reflecting the expertise the Public Trustee has in the investment of and return on funds.

Mr SUCH: Is it fair to assume that there is no incentive to contain administrative costs if you can draw on the reserves that have been accumulated?

The Hon. Anne Levy: Certainly not; there is always incentive to improve efficiency, and the tribunal, as with all sections of the department, is constantly looking at ways of improving its efficiency, hence the program of computerisation which was mentioned earlier. While this will cost money to install, it is felt that it will be far more efficient and give a much better service to both landlords and tenants once it has been implemented; there is always the search for efficiencies. In relation to this matter I could perhaps comment that, before the residential tenancies fund was passed to the Public Trustee for management, the fund was earning interest with SAFA at the 90 day bill rate, which is about 4.8 per cent, but now, under the Public Trustee's careful management, the yield is closer to 6.3 per cent, a considerable improvement.

Mr SUCH: Perhaps the Public Trustee should be managing the finances of the State. My next question relates to the agents indemnity fund, which is referred to on page 257 of the Auditor-General's Report. In respect of which agents was \$4.8 million paid out; in respect of whom does the contingent liability relate; how much is in the fund at the moment; and in what is it invested?

The Hon. Anne Levy: The \$4.8 million relates to the Swan Shepherd payments we were referring to earlier. That has been a very long, drawn out and expensive procedure, which has resulted in about \$4.8 million being paid out of the fund. The balance of funds held is about \$3.9 million and the contingent liability is about \$840 000. Of the contingent liabilities that may be called on, \$51 000 relates to P.F. Warner; \$417 000 relates to B.S. Winzor; \$31 000 relates to Montrose Realty Pty Limited; \$300 000 relates to Richard Kearns; and \$20 000 relates to P. Magafas—all land brokers who have defaulted in one way or another over a period of time.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to page 107 of the Program Estimates, under the heading 'Issues/trends', which states:

The Federal Government announced an inquiry by the Industry Commission into the petroleum industry. This inquiry includes the role of the State Government powers in relation to price setting. The report is due by the end of 1993.

Above that heading is the statement that one of the objectives of the department is to review prices and price fixation and:

... investigation and fixing of maximum prices or rates for items subject to formal control.

Until I heard the Treasurer recently issue a warning, if not a threat, that the Government would impose price control on country petrol retailers, I had all but forgotten about price control, because it seems something of an archaic remnant from the past. What items are subject to formal control in South Australia and is the inquiry by the Industry Commission likely to result in a recommendation for State Government price control of petrol in rural non-metropolitan areas?

The Hon. Anne Levy: There are two separate issues there. With regard to price control, as the honourable member is well aware, currently in this State a number of items are subject either to formal price control, to justification or to formal notification. There is a limited number of items in each category. The formal control items include infant foods, invalid foods, country milk, children's school uniforms, children's school footwear, school exercise books, towing of motor vehicles, recovery and storage of motor vehicles, quoting for repair of motor vehicles and, of course, gas, where the price of gas is determined under different legislation.

Under the justification of rises, there is ale, beer, lager, stout, wines and spirits for retail in front bars and bottle shops, not in other outlets. The list further includes flour from millers; superphosphate and sulphate of ammonia, the retail cost of gelignite at Coober Pedy and, in the monitoring category—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister assumed I might know this: I can assure her that it is all news to me.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The monitoring category includes a lot of school requisites such as coloured chalks, coloured pencils, compasses, dividers, drawing paper, pins, maps, notebooks, pens, nibs, pencils, protractors, rulers, set squares, T-squares, and so on; text books for primary and secondary schools; petroleum products other than aviation gasoline; and meat pies and pasties.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Perhaps I could get the rest on notice.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We are very happy to provide them. There is not a large number of them, as indicated. As specified in the performance indicators, constant evaluation occurs as to whether particular items should remain on the list at all and, if on the list, whether they should fall into the strict justification or monitoring categories.

We have a somewhat different situation with regard to petrol pricing. While the retail price of petroleum products comes into the monitoring situation in South Australia, the Federal Government has set up the inquiry into petrol prices throughout the country, and that obviously will be of great interest to South Australians. I do not wish to hypothesise as to what the Federal inquiry might lead to; it would seem to me that we should await its findings rather than try to guess the outcome in advance.

Certainly, however, there is a problem with the price of petrol in non-metropolitan areas in South Australia. As I am sure the honourable member would know, there is a lower State tax on petrol sold both 50 and 100 kilometres from Adelaide; in fact, the State tax is 4¢ a litre lower 100 kilometres from Adelaide. So, given the fact that the Prices Justification Tribunal allows for 2¢ a litre for transport to isolated areas, if the transport pushes the price up 2¢ a litre and the State tax is 4¢ less a litre, one might expect reasonably that petrol in rural South Australia would be 2¢ a litre cheaper than in metropolitan Adelaide. However, as we all know that is not the situation. Many and varied suggestions are given as to why this occurs. The oil companies give one answer, and most people give a different answer.

I hope that the Federal inquiry will provide some answers in this regard. Concern about these prices is not limited to South Australia. At the recent meeting of Consumer Affairs Ministers from around Australia, Ministers from every State were complaining about the same phenomenon applying in their States: that country petrol prices were considerably above those in the metropolitan area. It is only in South Australia that the State tax is less in country areas than in metropolitan areas. That does not apply in other States. Therefore, based on transport costs, we could expect at least a gap of 2¢ per litre between city and country. It is far greater in other States.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: How many workers compensation claims were made in the department in 1992-93; what was the nature of the claims; how many injured workers returned to work; and how many remained on compensation? It may be that the Minister would like to take those questions on notice.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I will take those questions on notice. I do not have all the details, but I shall be happy to provide them as soon as possible.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On page 106 of the Program Estimates, under 'Specific Targets/Objectives' one of the targets is, 'The implications of mutual recognition on occupational licences was examined and a comprehensive submission was made to the review of partially regulated occupations.' Can a copy of the submission be made available? It is obviously a document of interest to people in a number of occupations.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I shall be happy to make it available. It is an extremely thick document—it is not light reading—but I shall be happy to make it available. As well as producing the document, I point out that considerable consultation is going on with the occupational groups which are involved. In a number of respects recommendations have been made by VEETAC, the national body looking at occupational regulation. There is a category of partial regulated occupations where regulation applies in some States and not in others. The recommendations made by VEETAC are open for discussion. Certainly South Australia would like to see some of those recommendations changed. In particular, one or two occupations are licensed in all the States but not the Territories. We believe that if all States felt it desirable to apply, rather than to abolish, the licensing system, the two Territories would be encouraged to bring in a licensing system. The partial regulation could be solved in that way. However, as I said, discussions are proceeding on this matter.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Further, there is an indication of a review of occupational licensing legislation having regard to whether the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs should become the licensing authority. How far has the review progressed and who is undertaking it?

The Hon. Anne Levy: I referred briefly to this earlier. It was one of the recommendations arising from the Tilstone

Report and, as I indicated, a green paper was prepared discussing particular options which would make the Commissioner the licensing authority, with the tribunal having only a disciplinary function, an appeals function and, I suppose, arbitrating in particular situations.

A green paper to that effect has been produced, widely circulated and submissions invited on it. Also, consultation regarding this change in licensing system is being undertaken with all the relevant occupational groups. As I am sure the honourable member would appreciate, this is not a rapid process but, as I understand it, the green paper was greeted quite warmly by most, if not all, groups concerned and I look forward at some stage to having legislation result from this consultative process that obviously I will be keen to bring to the Parliament as soon as possible.

Mr SUCH: Can the Minister indicate whether there has been a rapid growth in the licensing of inquiry agents and whether there has been any concern or complaints expressed about any of the methods of operation? I mention that in the context of inquiries into fraud, workers compensation, and so on. I suspect there has been a significant growth in that industry but I do not have any quantifiable information.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Could I take that on notice? I am not aware of any great increase occurring in such licensing applications but I would like to formally check the figures before providing a response. I will certainly get the information and make it available before the due date.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 16 September at 11 a.m.