

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 12 February 1991

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Adelaide Children's Hospital and Queen Victoria Hospital (Testamentary Dispositions),
Boating Act Amendment,
Building Act Amendment,
Building Societies,
Citrus Industry Organisation Act Amendment,
Corporations (South Australia),
Correctional Services Act Amendment (No. 2),
Debits Tax,
Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment,
Evidence Act Amendment,
Land Acquisition Act Amendment,
Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act Amendment,
Local Government Act Amendment,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 3),
Murray-Darling Basin Act Amendment,
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act Amendment,
Pipelines Authority Act Amendment,
Referendum (Electoral Redistribution),
Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment,
Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Merger of Tertiary Institutions),
Superannuation Act Amendment,
Trustee Companies Act Amendment.

DEATH OF Mr G. O'HALLORAN GILES

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: As the Leader of the Council, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious public services, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles was born in Adelaide in 1923. At the age of 19 he enlisted in the RAAF. A year later, in 1943, he was serving with the 78 Squadron in Australia and New Guinea. By the time his appointment was terminated late in 1945 he had qualified as a flight lieutenant. He then gained a diploma from the Roseworthy Agricultural College and became a grazier on his 1 300 hectare farm between Lucindale and Naracoorte. He also had a very successful rolled turf business at Mount Compass.

In 1959 he was elected as a Liberal member of the Legislative Council for the southern district and he served in this House for five years. He then left the Legislative Council to enter Federal Parliament and became a member of the House of Representatives, at first for the seat of Angas in 1964 and then in 1977 for the seat of Wakefield.

During his distinguished 18 years in Federal politics he was a member of a number of parliamentary committees

and with respect to the Liberal Party in the Federal Parliament he was overall chairman of the Liberal Party's committees at the time—some 18 committees—and was responsible for reporting to his Party's annual conference on the deliberations of those committees. He was also Deputy Whip.

Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles was a popular politician in his Federal electorates, and generally, and was said to be one of the most hardworking MPs for the Liberal Party in gaining representation for his rural constituents. Among some of his better known achievements, he strongly opposed and was successful in stopping an excise on wine for many years. Up until he bowed out of politics in 1983 (after being beaten the previous year for the preselection for his seat by the present member for Wakefield, Mr Neil Andrew) politics had been an almost total preoccupation for Mr Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles. He was a hardworking servant, particularly a hard working servant of rural South Australia. I am sure that the condolences of all members of the Council would go to his wife and children at this time of bereavement.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition)**: I rise to second the motion. As the Attorney-General has indicated, Mr Giles had the rare distinction of serving in both State and Federal Houses of Parliament, and he also experienced the joys of both Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament. It is perhaps only in recent years that that wider experience has been bettered by Steele Hall who has served at both State and Federal levels in Upper and Lower Houses and in three Houses of Parliament in total.

When Mr Giles first entered politics he was freshly returned from a Nuffield Scholarship in the United Kingdom, where he had been researching animal husbandry. I am told that he had a keen interest in Jersey cattle, having a property in the Mount Compass area, as referred to by the Attorney-General. One of his political colleagues at the time claimed that Mr Giles was one of the last South Australian farmers to import that breed into the State before the Channel Islands placed a ban on their export.

Mr Giles was also instrumental in opening up new farming lands in the Avenue Range area of the South-East, near Millicent, during the 1950s. His contemporaries describe him as an assiduous local member who made famous the campaigning method of whistlestopping through his large House of Representatives electorate. He would place advertisements in local newspapers saying that he would be at the local post office at such a time and date to hear constituent complaints. As the Attorney indicated, Mr Giles had a keen interest in the wine industry and the needs of his electorate.

One of his colleagues agrees with the Attorney-General's assessment that Mr Giles had been instrumental in fighting successfully for many years to discourage the Liberal Party federally from imposing a sales tax on wine. I am told that for leisure in his retirement years Mr Giles had an interest in cars. He was a member of the MG Car Club and also entered cars such as Mini Coopers in hill climb events. He was also actively involved with the Adelaide Oval Bowls Club. His political contemporaries also tell me that he was certainly a good raconteur and his company was always enjoyed by colleagues on both sides of the Parliament when he served in the State and Federal arenas.

I knew Mr Giles personally over the period between 1973 and 1983, when I was working in various capacities for the Liberal Party and with the then Leader of the Opposition (David Tonkin). I did not know Mr Giles when he served in the Legislative Council. My experience certainly during

that period supports all that his contemporaries say of him. During that period I can recall in particular the vigorous preselection battles with which Mr Giles had to contend, particularly during the latter part of his political career. Any members in this Chamber or in another place who have experienced preselection battles will know the difficulties or the vigour that preselection battles can mean for sitting members of Parliament.

Mr Giles certainly had the distinction in 1979 of warding off a strong preselection challenge, in the Federal seat that he then represented, from the then challenger at that time, Mr Steele Hall. I forget the country town in which the preselection was held; it may well have been Balaklava, but I would not stand by that recollection. However, I can recall some 200 to 250 Liberals from all over that country electorate descending into that location for what was a very vigorous contest and preselection battle. Two excellent speeches were made at the time, and Mr Giles had the distinction of warding off that challenge.

As the Attorney indicated, Mr Giles then lost the vigorous preselection battle in 1983 to the now Federal member for Wakefield (Mr Neil Andrew). I also remember that contest with some clarity. I also recall during those 10 years some experiences with Mr Giles concerning redistributions for the Liberal Party. Again, this can be a traumatic experience for members of Parliament when their electorate faces the prospect of being carved up or changed substantially and they see many of their branches perhaps disappearing out the window or going into another electorate. That can be a traumatic time for members of Parliament, as I am sure some of our Lower House colleagues on both sides of the Parliament will experience over the coming six months with the impending State redistribution.

It is a traumatic period, but during all that time when we had long discussions in relation to what might occur with respect to Mr Giles's electorate, he behaved admirably (if I can put it that way) from the viewpoint not only of himself but also of the Party that he sought to represent and, indeed, had represented very loyally and successfully for a good number of years.

I must confess that since 1983 I lost contact with Mr Giles, and the only contact I had was very briefly one Saturday morning at the local woodyard, when we were both loading a small quantity of wood in the boot of our respective cars. We exchanged pleasantries, and since then I have had no personal contact with Mr Giles. So, certainly, my personal experience of Mr Giles over that period matches that of his political contemporaries to whom we have spoken over the past 24 hours and, on behalf of Liberal members in this Chamber and, I am sure, all members, I extend my condolences to Mr Giles's family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.33 to 2.43 p.m.]

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to the following Questions on Notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4, 6-30, 33, 57, 81, 85, 87-91, and 93-9.

MARKET RESEARCH STUDIES

4. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Premier?

2. For each consultancy—

(a) Who undertook the consultancy;

(b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared, and if so, is a copy publicly available?

6. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Agriculture, Fisheries and Ethnic Affairs?

2. For each consultancy—

(a) Who undertook the consultancy;

(b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared, and if so, is a copy publicly available?

7. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General, Minister for Crime Prevention and Corporate Affairs: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister?

2. For each consultancy—

(a) Who undertook the consultancy;

(b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost of each consultancy;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared, and if yes, is a copy publicly available?

8. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Deputy Premier, Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and for the Aged?

2. For each consultancy—

(a) Who undertook the consultancy;

(b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared, and if yes, is a copy publicly available?

9. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Education and Children's Services?

2. For each consultancy—

(a) Who undertook the consultancy;

(b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared, and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

10. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Transport, Correctional Services and Finance?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

11. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism, Consumer Affairs and Small Business: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared; and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

12. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Housing and Construction, Public Works and Recreation and Sport?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

13. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister for Environment and Planning, Water Resources and Lands?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

14. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Emergency Services, Mines and Energy and Forests?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;

(c) What was the cost;

(d) What were the terms of reference;

(e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

15. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Labour, Occupational Health and Safety, and Marine?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

16. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government, Arts and State Services: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

17. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90—

1. What market research studies and consultancies (of any type) were commissioned by departments and bodies which report to the Minister of Employment and Further Education, Youth Affairs, Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs?

2. For each consultancy—

- (a) Who undertook the consultancy;
- (b) Was the consultancy commissioned after an open tender and if not, why not;
- (c) What was the cost;
- (d) What were the terms of reference;
- (e) Has a report been prepared and if yes, is a copy of that report publicly available?

Reply to question: The honourable member's question indicates that he is primarily interested in market research and related consultancies. The following consolidated reply of Questions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 is presented in chart form, by portfolio, for the years 1988-89 and 1989-90. In all cases reports have been prepared or are in the process of being prepared. If further information is required on a specific matter then inquiries should be directed to the appropriate Minister.

MINISTERIAL OFFICERS

18. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General, Minister of Crime Prevention and Minister of Corporate Affairs: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister's offices as of 1 August 1990?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' appointments and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the GME Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The replies are as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	A. Nagy	43 434
Ministerial	N. Alexandrides	47 711
G.M.E.	—	41 738
G.M.E.	—	37 529
G.M.E.	—	24 254
G.M.E.	—	28 514
G.M.E.	—	24 254
G.M.E.	—	13 829*
G.M.E.	—	9 219*
G.M.E.	—	17 926

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	A. Nagy	44 737
Ministerial	M. Duigan	50 070
G.M.E.	—	44 475
G.M.E.	—	40 479
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	30 473
G.M.E.	—	14 768*
G.M.E.	—	9 846*
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	20 050

*Permanent Part Time

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

19. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Offices of the Deputy Premier and Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and the Aged?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' appointments and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	D. McKay	47 711
Ministerial	S. Gilchrist	41 985
Ministerial	A. Roman	41 985
Ministerial	A. Joy	47 711
G.M.E.	—	41 738
G.M.E.	—	36 230
G.M.E.	—	30 918
G.M.E.	—	27 517
G.M.E.	—	23 831
G.M.E.	—	23 831
G.M.E.	—	17 926
G.M.E.	—	18 484
G.M.E.	—	16 487
G.M.E.	—	22 336

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	D. McKay	48 627
Ministerial	S. Gilchrist	43 245
Ministerial	A. Roman	43 245
Ministerial	A. Joy	49 143
G.M.E.	—	44 280
G.M.E.	—	38 473
G.M.E.	—	32 801
G.M.E.	—	29 193
G.M.E.	—	19 824
G.M.E.	—	19 492
G.M.E.	—	23 375

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

20. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Premier's Office as of 1 August 1990?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	A. Augunas	23 048
Ministerial	B. Deed	48 611
Ministerial	C. Hennessey	24 254
Ministerial	M. Kennedy	29 455
Ministerial (0.6)	R. McDonald	18 551
Ministerial	J. Turner	49 100
Ministerial	J. Vaughan	24 953
Ministerial	C. Willis	50 878
Ministerial	P. Woodland	45 803
Ministerial	M. Wright	34 368
Ministerial (0.4)	N. Beard	10 175
Ministerial	G. Anderson	58 730
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	20 988
G.M.E.	—	20 988
G.M.E.	—	20 424
Vacancy (<i>vice</i> R. Slee)		

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	N. Alexandrides	49 140
Ministerial	G. Anderson	70 000
Ministerial	J. Appleby	32 801
Ministerial	B. Deed	50 070
Ministerial	R. Garrand	45 625
Ministerial	S. Simpson	24 614
Ministerial	J. Turner	50 573
Ministerial	J. Vaughan	26 519
Ministerial	C. Willis	54 622
Ministerial	M. Wright	43 245
Ministerial	V. Wayne	25 111
G.M.E.	—	24 614
G.M.E.	—	22 554
G.M.E.	—	22 554
G.M.E.	—	32 801
G.M.E.	—	20 860

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial officers are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

21. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: From each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Ethnic Affairs as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	K. Foley	41 295
Ministerial	P. Roberts	43 434
G.M.E.	—	41 738
G.M.E.	—	33 441
G.M.E.	—	23 675
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	23 048
G.M.E.	—	19 294
G.M.E.	—	20 424
G.M.E.	—	14 693
G.M.E.*	—	49 386
G.M.E.	—	Leave Without Pay

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	K. Foley	43 245
Ministerial	J. Kouts	49 627
G.M.E.	—	41 454
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	23 902
G.M.E.	—	24 614
G.M.E.	—	21 431
G.M.E.	—	22 554
G.M.E.	—	20 050
G.M.E.*	—	29 701
G.M.E.**	—	35 477

* Ministerial Liaison Officer, Department of Agriculture

** Research Assistant, Department of Agriculture

The Current Labour Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the names of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial officers are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial officers.

22. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Education and Minister of Children's Services offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	R. Slee	40 605
Ministerial	K. Cotter	41 295
Ministerial	D. Lewis	43 434
Ministerial	I. Short	37 629
G.M.E.*	—	56 372
G.M.E.	—	41 738
G.M.E.	—	36 901
G.M.E.	—	25 438
G.M.E.	—	24 254
G.M.E.	—	23 048
G.M.E.	—	21 483
G.M.E.	—	4 610
G.M.E.	—	16 588
G.M.E.	—	20 988
G.M.E.	—	20 988
G.M.E.	—	19 866
G.M.E.	—	19 605

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	R. Slee	42 534
Ministerial	K. Cotter	43 245
Ministerial	D. Lewis	44 737
Ministerial	I. Short	39 921
G.M.E.*	—	59 805
G.M.E.	—	44 280
G.M.E.	—	39 815
G.M.E.	—	27 720
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	24 614
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	18 292
G.M.E.	—	22 554
G.M.E.	—	4 511
G.M.E.	—	20 050
G.M.E.	—	22 865
G.M.E.	—	21 432

*Located in the Minister's Office but part of Director-General's establishment.

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

23. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Transport, Correctional Services and Minister of Finance offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	W. Chapman	41 986
Ministerial	L. Sweeney	43 434
G.M.E.	—	37 529
G.M.E.	—	27 995
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	20 735
G.M.E.	—	18 484
G.M.E.	—	12 897

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	W. Chapman	43 245
Ministerial	L. Sweeney	44 737
G.M.E.	—	40 479
G.M.E.	—	30 473
G.M.E.	—	25 111
G.M.E.	—	23 782
G.M.E.	—	17 924
G.M.E.	—	17 924
G.M.E.	—	19 492
G.M.E.	—	35 477*

*Liaison Officer, Treasury Department

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

24. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism, Consumer Affairs and Small Business: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister's offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	M. Carmichael	32 703
Ministerial	P. Hudson	43 434
Ministerial	I. Newbery	41 986
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	23 048
G.M.E.	—	38 155
G.M.E.	—	25 438
G.M.E.*	—	36 901
G.M.E.	—	19 926

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	M. Carmichael	33 684
Ministerial	P. Hudson	44 737
Ministerial	I. Newbery	43 245
G.M.E.	—	23 902
G.M.E.*	—	39 148
G.M.E.	—	40 479
G.M.E.	—	27 720
G.M.E.	—	24 614
G.M.E.	—	20 050

*Located at Consumer Affairs

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

25. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Tourism: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Housing and Construction, Public Works and Recreation and Sport offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	M. Kenny	41 986
Ministerial	R. Rains	49 100
G.M.E.	—	36 901
G.M.E.	—	33 441
G.M.E.	—	25 438
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	16 487
G.M.E.	—	19 866

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	S. Bryant	41 823
Ministerial	A. D'Sylva	44 737
G.M.E.	—	40 479
G.M.E.	—	36 412
G.M.E.	—	25 820
G.M.E.	—	29 701
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	21 743
G.M.E.	—	19 492

In addition the following Liaison Officers were located in the office but were employed by their respective agencies:

G.M.E.*	—	51 039
G.M.E.**	—	45 524

* — SACON

** — S.A. HOUSING TRUST

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

26. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government Relations: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources and Lands offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	R. Clark	43 434
Ministerial	L. Zollo	41 986
G.M.E.	—	17 926
G.M.E.	—	32 054
G.M.E.	—	11 104
G.M.E.	—	27 996
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	37 529
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	54 015

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	G. Loveday	41 823
Ministerial	D. Robertson	41 823
Ministerial	R. Clark	43 927
G.M.E.	—	35 477
G.M.E.	—	29 701
G.M.E.	—	24 614
G.M.E.	—	39 148
G.M.E.	—	25 111
G.M.E.	—	30 473
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	19 492
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	29 701
G.M.E.	—	27 008

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

27. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Emergency Services, Mines and Energy and Forests offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	D. Abfalter	40 605
Ministerial	P. Charles	43 434
G.M.E.	—	38 155
G.M.E.	—	32 690
G.M.E.	—	42 351
G.M.E.	—	24 962
G.M.E.	—	19 302
G.M.E.	—	23 048
G.M.E.	—	17 926

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	D. Abfalter	42 534
Ministerial	P. Charles	44 737
G.M.E.	—	40 479
G.M.E.	—	21 171
G.M.E.	—	19 492
G.M.E.	—	33 751
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	25 820
G.M.E.	—	20 050

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

28. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government Relations, Arts and State Services: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister's offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable for each officer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	L. Furler	40 605
Ministerial	B. Muirden	49 100
G.M.E.	—	36 901
G.M.E.	—	27 996
G.M.E.	—	30 187
G.M.E.	—	21 809
G.M.E.	—	20 177
G.M.E.	—	20 177

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	L. Furler	42 534
Ministerial	V. Purman	44 737
G.M.E.	—	39 815
G.M.E.	—	29 701
G.M.E.	—	32 801
G.M.E.	—	23 902
G.M.E.	—	20 296
G.M.E.	—	22 301
G.M.E.	—	15 972

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

29. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Attorney-General: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Labour, Occupational Health and Safety and Marine offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable to each officer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	S. Halliday	43 434
Ministerial	D. Melvin	43 894
Ministerial	L. Wright	58 362*
G.M.E.	—	19 294
G.M.E.	—	12 897
G.M.E.	—	26 129
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	36 901

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	S. Halliday	44 737
Ministerial	G. Williamson	35 046
Ministerial	L. Wright	59 793*
G.M.E.	—	27 008
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	21 171
G.M.E.	—	15 972
G.M.E.	—	39 148

*Plus sessional fees for committee work where applicable

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

30. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS** asked the Minister of Local Government Relations: For each of the years 1989 and 1990—

1. What were the names of all officers working in the Minister of Employment and Further Education, Youth Affairs, Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs Offices as of 1 August in each year?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants which officers had tenure and were appointed under the G.M.E. Act?

3. What salary and other remuneration was payable to each officer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

As at 1.8.89		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	J Russell	41 986
Ministerial	A. D'Sylva	43 434
G.M.E.	—	51 567
G.M.E.	—	34 444
G.M.E.	—	38 155
G.M.E.	—	24 953
G.M.E.	—	24 254
G.M.E.	—	18 730
G.M.E.	—	18 398
G.M.E.	—	12 586

As at 1.8.90		
'Ministerial'/G.M.E.	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	A. Martin	41 823
Ministerial	J. Gregory	44 737
G.M.E.	—	53 114
G.M.E.	—	36 412
G.M.E.	—	35 477
G.M.E.	—	30 473
G.M.E.	—	26 913
G.M.E.	—	26 519
G.M.E.	—	23 375
G.M.E.	—	19 492
G.M.E.	—	18 709
G.M.E.	—	15 972

The current Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government adopted the practice of employing a number of personal staff to the Minister on a contract basis. Given the nature of that public employment it is considered appropriate to disclose the name of the persons involved and details as to remuneration.

In addition to contract staff ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of the Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

It should also be noted that the number of officers varies according to factors such as the nature, number and diversity of portfolios held by the Minister and whether or not the Minister's office is physically located with the department. Accordingly a standard staffing formula does not exist for ministerial offices.

TOURISM OFFICE

33. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Is it correct (*Melbourne Age* 26 June 1990) that South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania propose to share a tourism office in Tokyo?

2. If so, what is South Australia's financial and staffing commitment to this venture, compared with the current promotion of the State's interests on a part-time basis by Elders Ltd?

3. As each State plus the Federal Government currently has offices/representatives in Tokyo promoting tourism, are there any plans to redress this fragmented use of resources

and effort to establish one major office focusing on Australia's product?

4. What plans, if any, are there for South Australia to open a joint tourism office in Frankfurt with Victoria and Tasmania?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The replies are as follows:

1. No. 2. Not applicable.

3. There are no plans to join forces in the short term. Various States have representation which involve long running contracts and leases. Rationalisation is not as easy as it seems. In South Australia's case, representation is for Industry, Trade and Technology together with Tourism interests. There is close liaison between the public and private sector tourism representatives based in Japan with South Australia's representative working in close liaison with the Australian Tourist Commission.

4. There are no current plans by Tourism South Australia to open a joint tourism office in Frankfurt with either the Victorian or Tasmanian State Government Tourism Agencies. However, discussions have been held regarding the sharing of resources to reduce the potential cost of representation in Germany, should an office be established at some future date.

ROAD TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

57. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** asked the Minister of Local Government Relations—In respect of the following costs incurred by private contractors, which costs are taken into account by the Department of Road Transport when tendering for construction and maintenance work—

1. State and Federal taxes, for example FID and FBT?

2. State excise on fuel?

3. Depreciation of plant and equipment?

4. Provision for the training guarantee levy?

5. Redundancy contributions?

6. Superannuation contributions?

7. Security of contract?

8. Interest costs on funds raised to finance a project?

9. Clerical accounting and project management costs?

10. Allowance for head office and branch overheads?

11. Allowance for liquidation damages if the construction period is overrun?

12. State tax?

13. Company tax?

14. Workers compensation?

15. Payroll tax?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The replies are as follows;

1. Wherever the Department of Road Transport is liable for Federal or State taxes, these costs are taken into account in its tenders. The Department is liable for all State taxes, except FID on its Main Reserve Bank account. The Department is not liable for company tax, sales tax and bank account debits tax. It does, however, pay Fringe Benefits tax.

2. Yes.

3. Yes. Depreciation is based on written down current costs of plant and equipment.

4. Yes.

5. No.

6. Yes.

7. Not considered appropriate for a Government Department.

8. A real rate of return is established on the written down current cost of assets employed.

9. Yes.

10. Yes.

11. Yes, as appropriate.
12. See (1).
13. See (1).
14. Yes.
15. Yes.

AWARD RESTRUCTURING

8. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** asked the Minister representing the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the estimated cost in the first year and the subsequent year of award restructuring on—
 - (a) the State Transport Authority;
 - (b) the Department of Road Transport;
 - (c) The Office of Transport Policy and Planning?

2. In each instance, will these costs have to be found internally or is it understood that the Government will provide additional funds to cover these costs?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The estimated cost of restructuring for the STA was \$2.307m in the first year of implementation in 1989-90. In 1990-91 these costs are expected to increase by \$5.406m.

(b) The cost of restructuring for the Department of Road Transport was \$2m in the first year of implementation. In the subsequent year the cost will be \$2.5m.

(c) Benchmark positions and translation arrangements from old to new classifications will not be finalised until 31 March 1991. Implementation of award restructuring within the Office of Transport Policy and Planning is not scheduled to occur before 30 June 1991.

2. The costs for the STA in 1989-90 were funded by Treasury. In 1990-91 approximately half of the additional costs will be absorbed by the STA.

Direct costs of award restructuring will be met within existing allocations by the Department of Road Transport and the Office of Transport Policy and Planning.

YOUTH ARTS BOARD

85. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** asked the Minister for the Arts: It is correct that the Youth Arts Board of South Australia had engaged a public relations consultant or company and if so—

1. What is the rationale for the appointment?
2. Who has been appointed?
3. What are the terms of the appointment, including funding arrangements and length of engagement?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Youth Arts Board has engaged Farrell Adams McEwen as a public relations consultant. The company has been appointed to help promote the range of new services provided by Carclew and to assist in the raising of private sector support and programs. (Carclew has had similar arrangements in the past, contracting Norman Hudson as publicist until his death in December 1988).

2. Farrell Adams McEwen.

3. The consultant's fee for 12 months is \$6 000. Staff reductions at Carclew have released the necessary funds, the remainder of which have been redirected into arts activities for young people. The contract is ultimately significantly more cost-effective than a staff appointment. The consultant was appointed by SAYAB in response to a public tender advertisement, and selected from a shortlist of four agencies.

STOCK FOODS REGULATIONS

87. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Stock Foods Regulations, 1967, exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Stock Foods Regulations, 1967, were exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990 to allow sufficient time for replacement regulations to be drafted.

STOCK DISEASES REGULATIONS

88. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Stock Diseases (Prevention of Footrot) Regulations, 1966, exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Stock Diseases Regulations 1962, and the Stock Diseases (Prevention of Footrot) Regulations 1966 were reviewed during 1989 to meet the revocation date for this legislation of 1 January 1990. Proposed new Regulations incorporating the changes seen as necessary to meet the current and emerging needs of the industry, were forwarded to Parliamentary Counsel by Cabinet in August 1989 for drafting. Parliamentary Counsel advised that the proposed changes could not be made within the intent of the Stock Diseases Act 1934, and that a new Act and Regulation would be required. As drafting of this new legislation could not be completed by 31 December, Cabinet approved an extension to the current Regulations under the Stock Diseases Act 1934, in November 1989 to ensure maintenance of disease control measures until new legislation can be prepared.

89. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Stock Diseases Regulations 1962 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Stock Diseases Regulations 1962, and the Stock Diseases (Prevention of Footrot) Regulations 1966 were reviewed during 1989 to meet the revocation date for this legislation of 1 January 1990. Proposed new Regulations incorporating the changes seen as necessary to meet the current and emerging needs of the industry, were forwarded to Parliamentary Counsel by Cabinet in August 1989 for drafting. Parliamentary Counsel advised that the proposed changes could not be made within the intent of the Stock Diseases Act 1934, and that a new Act and Regulations would be required. As drafting of this new legislation could not be completed by 31 December, Cabinet approved an extension to the current Regulations under the Stock Diseases Act 1934, in November 1989 to ensure maintenance of disease control measures until new legislation can be prepared.

RECREATION REGULATIONS

90. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Recreation Grounds Act Regulations 1931 relating to Woodville Oval exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In late 1988 a green paper was prepared on the Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act 1931, recommending that twelve sets of regulations then in force under the Act be merged. In December 1988, at the wish of four of the councils managing ovals and the South Australian Cricket Association leasing Adelaide Oval, five sets of regulations in force under the Act and about to expire due to the sunset provisions of the Subordinate

Legislation Act 1978 were exempt from expiry. The green paper was not acted on any further at that time.

The Woodville Oval Regulations were made in 1965 and would have expired, due to the sunset provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act, on 1 January 1990. These regulations had not been exempted with the previous set as they had been prepared at a later date.

Late in 1989 consideration was given to the continuation of these regulations. At that time the third stage of the ongoing review of the Local Government Act, dealing among other things with the use of park lands, reserves and other property owned or managed by Council, had just commenced. It was considered that the need for regulation under the Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act should be assessed as part of that review and as a consequence the Woodville Oval regulations should be continued for the time being.

As a result these regulations were declared exempt from expiry on 1 January 1990.

Since that time the ongoing review of the Local Government Act has been suspended pending the negotiations now under way between State and Local Governments. It is possible that this act may ultimately be repealed and private recreation grounds managed by conditions attached to entry or other relevant existing legislation.

MOTOR VEHICLE ACT REGULATIONS

91. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Local Government Relations: For what reasons were the Motor Vehicles Act Regulations 1968 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The following reasons were approved by Cabinet on 18 December 1989 to exempt the regulations under the Motor Vehicles Act from expiry until 1 June 1991:

1. Regulations under the Motor Vehicles Act are significant and a review of the regulations necessitates a review of the Principal Act. A review of the Act could not take place in the short-term.

2. There were a number of national initiatives under review such as a national scheme for points demerit, a national heavy vehicle driver's licence and a move to bring South Australia into line with the national program for Federal/Interstate registration.

3. The new motor registration and driver licensing computing system introduced in July 1990 was being developed and it was desirable to avoid changes to the Act and Regulations during implementation of the new system. Changes during the implementation were likely to add significantly to the cost of the project.

MINES REGULATIONS

93. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Mines and Works Inspection Regulations 1965 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Due to the provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act, the Mines and Works Inspection Regulations were due to expire with effect from 1 January 1990.

The opportunity to update, modernise and streamline the regulations as suggested in the 'Regulation Review Procedures' issued in July 1987 by the Attorney-General was taken with reference being made to the Chief Inspectors of

Mines 'Code for the Safe Operation of Mines and Quarries' and recent mining legislation from other States.

Redrafting of the 'mining specific' regulations has been completed. The more general matters will be covered by the General Regulations under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act which are currently being redrafted in a consolidated form.

Because the consolidation of the General Regulations could not be completed by 1 January 1990, Cabinet approved that the Mines and Works Inspection Regulations be exempt from the automatic revocation program of the Subordinate Legislation Act for a period of 18 months following the completion of the 'Consolidated Regulations' under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act.

HEALTH REGULATIONS

94. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the regulations under the Health Act 1935 relating to lodging houses at Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Salisbury exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

95. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Health Regulations 1968 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Public and Environmental Health Act 1987 will replace the Health Act when it becomes fully operational. By December 1989, the only part of the new Act which was operational was Part IV relating to notifiable diseases; the relevant portions of the Regulations under the Health Act were revoked at that time.

The balance of the Health Regulations were continued in operation while Regulations under the Public and Environmental Health Act were drafted, circulated for comment, and finalised. This has now occurred and the remainder of the Act will be implemented progressively over the next year, resulting in the repeal of the Health Regulations. This includes local Regulations made by Local Boards of Health under the Health Act.

CITRUS REGULATIONS

96. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Citrus Industry (Licensing) Regulations exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Regulations under the Citrus Industry Organisation Act (1956) which were due to expire under the timetable for expiry of regulations on 31 December were exempted because a review of the regulations was incomplete at that time.

Submissions received following the release of a Green Paper, were reviewed in early 1990. The honourable member would be aware of the release of a White Paper in May, 1990. That White Paper is the basis of a Bill for a new Citrus Industry Act which will be introduced to Parliament early in 1991.

The honourable member would also be aware of the need for a recent amendment to the Citrus Industry Organisation Act (1965) to extend the term of the Citrus Board beyond February 1990. This will enable the completion of the whole process of review of citrus industry regulation and introduction of a Bill for a new Act to be completed in 1991, without the need for a costly election of a new Board which may have only a very short term of office before a new Act is proclaimed.

BUSINESS NAMES REGULATIONS

97. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Corporate Affairs: For what reasons were the Business Names Regulations 1964 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There are currently in the order of 80 000 business names registered under the Business Names Act 1963. The Corporate Affairs Commission also satisfies approximately 30 000 requests for information from the public register regarding business names each year. Approximately 12 500 new business names are registered per annum.

The Regulations under the Business Names Act set out the fees payable on lodgments and other transactions and prescribe the forms under the Act.

In the near future the Government will be considering amendments to the Business Names Act and Regulations consequential upon introduction of the Australian Securities Commission. At this stage it is my view that the Business Names Regulations will continue to be active for some time to come.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL REGULATIONS

98. **The Hon. J.C. BURDETT** asked the Minister of Tourism: For what reasons were the Agricultural Chemical Regulations 1962 exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Agricultural Chemicals Regulations 1962, were exempted from expiry on 1 January 1990 pending a review of legislation relating to agricultural chemicals in South Australia.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

99. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** asked the Minister for the Arts: In relation to the decision to close the South Australian Film Corporation Documentary Division—

1. Did the corporation canvass the option and gain the endorsement of the independent consultant?

2. What savings are envisaged to stem from the closure and are these funds to be dedicated to help pay off the *Ultraman* debt; to be retained by the corporation to augment some other area of activity; or be returned to general revenue?

3. Does the Minister intend to amend section 11 of the Act to ensure the corporation does not retain the exclusive right to produce or arrange for the production of film for or on behalf of the Government or any instrumentality, and if not, why not?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

1. The decision to close the Documentary Division was made by the Board of the South Australian Film Corporation following the redirection of funds away from the Sponsored Documentary Division. At the time the Board of the Corporation made its decision, the Consultants had not formally reported. However, as can be seen from the Consultants' report, they have recommended the closure of this Division.

2. No savings are anticipated from the closure of the Documentary Division. Rather, the 1990 and 1991 allocations to the Documentary Fund have been redirected to meet costs incurred on the production of the *Ultraman* series.

3. Although it is proposed to review the South Australian Film Corporation Act, no decisions relating to the Corpo-

ration's role in production of films for the Government have been made.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

RN3500 Port Augusta-Port Wakefield Road, 5 km North of Redhill to Collinsfield.

RN6726 Panalatinga Road, Main South Road to Wheat-sheaf Road.

Windsor Gardens High School (Amalgamation of Strathmont and Gilles Plains High Schools).

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—

Reports 1989-90—

South Australian Finance Trust Limited.
WorkCover Corporation.

Architects Act 1939—By-laws—Fees.

Justices Act 1921—Rules—Evidence Fees.

Friendly Societies Act 1919—

Rules of the Savings and Loans Friendly Society.

General Laws of the Friendly Societies Medical Association Incorporated.

Manchester Unity-Hibernian Friendly Society—
Amendment of Rules.

Regulations under the following Acts:

Boating Act 1974—Kellidie Bay.

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972—
Oaths and Sick Leave.

Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Evi-
dence Fees.

Pay-roll Tax Act 1971—General.

Public Finance and Audit Act 1987—Local Govern-
ment Finance Authority.

Referendum (Electoral Redistribution) Act 1990—
Referendum.

Voting Majority.

Subordinate Legislation Act 1978—Exemptions from
Expiration.

Summary Offences Act 1953—Expiation Notice Fees.

Superannuation Act 1988—Tertiary Salary.

Supreme Court Act 1935—Evidence Fees.

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act
1986—

Employee Exemption.

Building Work and Contractors.

Rules of Court—Local Court—Local and District Crimi-
nal Courts Act—Motor Vehicle Claims.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sum-
ner)—

Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990—Regulations—
Companies Code.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—

Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982—Report on
Administration of the Act 1989-90.

Forestry Act 1950—

Hundred of Wanilla—Revocation of Proclamations.

Mount Brown Forest Reserve and Willowie Forest
Reserve—Variation of Proclamation.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Uniform Poisons
Standard.

Drugs Act 1908—

Contine and Cotarine.

Uniform Poisons Standard.

Electrical Products Act 1988—Labelling.

Food Act 1985—Bread.

Fruit Juice Labelling.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1975—
Entitlement Card and Fees.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—

- Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Report, 1989-90.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Builders Licensing Act 1986—Advertisement of Applications.
 - Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Advertisements of Applications.
 - Consumer Credit Act 1972—Advertisement of Applications.
 - Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Advertisement of Applications.
 - Agents Indemnity Fund Payments.
 - Small Business Exemption.
 - Liquor Licensing Act 1985—
 - Liquor Consumption—Adelaide.
 - Port Adelaide (Amendment).
 - Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Applications for Licences.
 - Travel Agents Act 1986—Applications for Licences.

By the Minister for Local Government Relations (Hon. Anne Levy)—

- Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Report, 1989-90.
- The Flinders University of South Australia—Report, 1989.
- Public Parks Act 1943—Disposal of parklands at Clare.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Clean Air Act 1984—Salisbury Backyard Burning.
 - Dog Control Act 1979—District Council of James-town.
 - Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Amenity Horticulture.
 - Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Fees.
 - Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Authorised Agent.
 - National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Hunting Permits.
 - Road Traffic Act 1961—Inspection Fees, Footpaths and Signs.
 - Surveyors Act 1975—Designated Survey Areas.
- Corporation By-laws—
 - Campbelltown:
 - No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.
 - No. 14—Parks and Reserves.
 - Glenelg:
 - No. 2—Foreshore.
 - No. 11—Bees.
 - No. 13—Tents.
 - Tea Tree Gully:
 - No. 11—Repeal of By-laws.

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. Anne Levy)—
Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The PRESIDENT: With reference to the resolution passed by the Legislative Council on 12 December 1990 concerning the National Crime Authority's investigation of activities in South Australia and the schedule of questions to be submitted to the Federal Attorney-General for transmission to the NCA, I have now received the following letters from Mr Michael Duffy and Mr Justice Phillips, Chairman of the National Crime Authority. First, the Attorney-General's letter reads as follows:

Dear Mr President,

Thank you for your letter of 17 December 1990 advising me of a resolution passed by the Legislative Council on 12 December 1990 concerning the National Crime Authority's activities in South Australia. The National Crime Authority Act 1984 provides that the authority is answerable for its activities to the Inter-Governmental Committee of the NCA (of which the South Australian Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, is a member) and the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the NCA.

The Act does not provide for direct accountability to individual jurisdictions other than through the relevant Minister of the Inter-Governmental Committee. This forms part of an agreed scheme

designed to operate across all the jurisdictions involved, and supported by State as well as Commonwealth legislation.

Given the existing provisions regarding accountability, I do not propose to ask the NCA to respond to the questions attached to the resolution. Any proposal to vary the arrangements so far as they apply to the States would be for State Ministers to raise. I am, however, forwarding a copy of your letter and the resolution to the Chairman of the authority, the Honourable Mr Justice Phillips, for his information.

Yours sincerely (signed) Michael Duffy.

The letter from the National Crime Authority is addressed to me and reads as follows:

Dear Mr President,

I refer to a number of questions submitted by you to the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth for transmission to this authority by resolution of your House on 5 December 1990.

The extent to which this authority can provide reports of, and information about, its activities and the manner of such provision are matters governed by the National Crime Authority Act 1984. That Act does not authorise the supply of the information requested by the Legislative Council by the method that has been adopted. Specifically, there has been no relevant request to the authority pursuant to section 59 of the Act.

The National Crime Authority Act provides for the monitoring of the activities of the authority by the Inter-Governmental Committee and the Parliamentary Joint Committee of the Federal Parliament. Essentially, the Act requires reporting by the authority to these committees or members thereof. It is my understanding that the latter committee has heard evidence—and will hear more evidence—touching the events surrounding the 'Ark' report. I would be confident that the committee would, on request, provide the Council in due course with a copy of any report containing its findings on this evidence.

My policy is one of cooperation with this committee and includes support for legislative amendments designed to remove any impediment to the provision of such information to it as is necessary to enable it to properly appraise the authority's activities. I mention this matter of legislative amendment because it is raised in paragraph 4 of the resolutions of the Council. For your information and that of the members of the Council, I enclose a copy of a speech I made in this connection on the 5th inst.

Yours sincerely (signed) Mr Justice J.H. Phillips.

If any honourable member is interested in a copy of that speech, it is available. With reference to the other resolution also passed by the Council on 12 December 1990 inviting certain persons to appear before the Bar of the Legislative Council, the following responses to my letters have now been received: from the Personal Assistant to Mr Justice Stewart, who will refer my letter to him when he returns from leave; from Mr P.M. Le Grand, who is seeking advice concerning the invitation to appear; and from Mr P.H. Clark, who has declined the invitation to appear as, in his capacity as a member of the authority, he did not participate in the supervision of Operation Ark, was on leave from mid-June 1989 until the expiration of his term of office, and played no part in the preparation of the report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement on the question of the National Crime Authority's Operation Hound report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to table the report of the National Crime Authority on Operation Hound, together with the report from the Commissioner of Police to the Minister of Emergency Services in response to the National Crime Authority's report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Operation Hound was one of several investigations conducted by the National Crime Authority pursuant to South Australian Reference No. 2. It followed investigations conducted by the South Australian police into an allegation that it was possible to have a traffic

infringement notice withdrawn for a fee. The police investigations led to the charging, in October 1988, of a retired police officer, Mr R.R. Baskerville, with the offence of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. Mr Baskerville pleaded guilty and was sentenced in the Central District Criminal Court on 9 January 1990 to three years imprisonment with a non-parole period of 15 months.

Prior to his trial, Mr Baskerville, through his solicitor, approached the National Crime Authority, alleging systematic corruption, within the Police Prosecution Services and irregularities in the granting of an immunity. Given this information, the National Crime Authority launched its own investigation, Operation Hound. The National Crime Authority found that two former police officers admitted being associated with Mr Baskerville in the illegal scheme but there was no evidence of institutionalised corruption. To quote the report:

The authority found no evidence that withdrawals occurred on a regular basis by agreement between any persons and has reached the view that there were deficiencies in the prosecution process which were exploited by isolated groups of people, such as Baskerville and his colleagues. The evidence before the authority did not indicate widespread corruption.

There was no evidence that senior police officers improperly withdrew traffic infringement notices. However, the National Crime Authority did note deficiencies in the prosecution process within the Police Department which might permit improper practices to occur. These deficiencies were in the process of being remedied prior to the report of the National Crime Authority being made.

The National Crime Authority endorses the changes which have been made, while other changes which are being made by the Commissioner of Police will satisfy the additional recommendations made in paragraph 41 of the report.

The centrepiece of the improvements is a computerised Brief Enquiry and Management Systems (BEAMS). In his report, the Commissioner of Police has gone to considerable lengths to explain the significance of BEAMS and other improvements to the system now in place or being developed by the Police Department. I refer members to the Commissioner's report for detailed information. The effect of these improvements will be a system which will mean that any report of an offence by a police officer will be traceable and auditable from the time the report is submitted until the report is finalised by prosecution or withdrawal in accordance with policy. The gaps in the system exploited by Mr Baskerville will be closed.

As for the allegation of improper behaviour in the granting of an immunity in the Baskerville case, the National Crime Authority found there was no improper conduct on the part of Crown Law officers or the police concerned. The Government has determined that this report can be tabled in full because there is no prejudice to the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE BANK

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement given today by the Premier and Treasurer on the State Bank of South Australia.

Leave granted.

QUESTIONS

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Beneficial Finance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Last Saturday the *Advertiser* carried a story on page one under the heading 'BFC lent \$1 million to a criminal'. The story states that Beneficial Finance Corporation lent more than \$1 million to a well-known Sydney underworld figure and employed him to take over a building project when it apparently went into default. The story also states that a case alleging fraud, negligence and breach of fiduciary duty by Beneficial Finance regarding this development has been lodged in the Federal Court in Sydney.

The article alleges the case could cost Beneficial millions of dollars in damages and legal expenses. The man concerned was convicted criminal Wayne Maurice Dunne, although he was also known by about a dozen aliases. According to the *Advertiser* he was known to be linked to the notorious Sydney standover man Ned Smith and disgraced former Darlinghurst detective Roger Rogerson.

Other information sighted by the Liberal Party included a quote by the then State Operations Manager of Beneficial Finance in Sydney, Mr Michael Mooney, that Detective Sergeant Roger Rogerson used to come into Beneficial Finance to collect money for Mr Hindmarsh (an alias for Wayne Dunne) and that Roger Rogerson was on the payroll of Wayne Hindmarsh as well as being a detective sergeant with the Police Force. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney-General, any Minister or other officer of the Government been briefed on the allegations made in the *Advertiser* story and have any investigations been initiated by the South Australian or New South Wales police, or has the National Crime Authority been invited to investigate?

2. What was the nature of the dealings between Beneficial Finance Corporation and Detective Sergeant Rogerson?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have not received any briefing on this matter. I cannot say whether any other Minister has. I am not aware of what actions have been taken in relation to this matter by the South Australian police or others, but I will seek the information for the honourable member.

CREDIT CARDS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about credit cards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last week the Australian Bankers Association and a number of banks in submissions to the Federal parliamentary committee reviewing the banking industry submitted that either banks should charge interest on all purchases by credit card from the date of purchase or that there should be an up-front charge of about \$40 per credit card if the interest free period from purchase to payment by a due date is maintained. Such a charge would require approval within the States. This is an issue that has been around for several years and on each previous occasion the proposal has been rejected by State authorities. However, I notice that at least one bank has recently reduced

from 55 to 44 days its interest-free period on credit cards and I presume that that was done with State Government approval. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Has the Minister been approached formally or informally to support the up-front fee proposal or the proposal for payment of interest on credit card purchases from the date of purchase?

2. Did the Minister support the reduction from 55 to 44 days by at least one bank of the interest free period on credit card purchases?

3. Does the Minister support the up-front fee proposal or the proposal for interest on purchases by credit card from the date of purchase?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member has quite rightly indicated that over a period of years Australia's banks have put propositions to State Governments for the introduction of up-front fees on credit cards. It has been the consistent view of the States that there should not be any such fees, and this is a policy decision that has been made by individual States. I add that it is also a decision that has been confirmed as recently as last year by the Ministers of Consumer Affairs at a SCOCAM meeting. The matter came before us again during the course of our discussions on the terms of the proposed uniform legislation. The banks, too, have been consistent in that they again last year put to us the proposal that there should be up-front fees, and it was necessary for Ministers to consider the matter yet again.

As I have indicated, we decided on that occasion that there should be no up-front fees. Last week I was approached by one of Adelaide's newspapers for comment on the most recent suggestion made by banks that fees should be introduced. I indicated to the newspaper that, if there was a new proposal, obviously Ministers would want to listen to that but, in my opinion, there would have to be some new information or some new pressing reason to lead us to change our minds on this question.

I am not aware of any formal approaches that have been made to me about this issue in recent times. Certainly, I have not received any informal approaches but, of course, if the matter is raised with me formally, it would be something that I would prefer once again to refer to SCOCAM, because it seems to me that there needs to be a national approach on questions of this kind. As I have already indicated, unless there has been some enormous shift in circumstances, which I cannot envisage, then I do not envisage that the South Australian Government would be changing its position on this question.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Did the Minister support the reduction from 55 to 44 days by at least one bank of the interest free period on credit card purchases?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I was not asked to support the decision made by the bank to which the honourable member refers. As far as I know, it is a decision that the bank is able to make itself without Government approval. In the interests of consumers, I hoped that it might have maintained the original period of time that applied to these things, but the decision has been made.

Whether or not that ought to be a matter that is subject to approval is something that I have not turned my mind to, and I am not sure that Ministers at previous SCOCAM meetings have considered this matter either. It is certainly not an issue, as far as I can recall, that has come up as long as I have been attending SCOCAM meetings. As to the specific decision that has been taken, it certainly did not require my approval.

TANDANYA DIRECTOR

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the Director of Tandanya.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The concept of Tandanya and the Aboriginal Cultural Institute grew out of a belief among Aboriginal Australians that programs promoting cultural development and self help would help to restore the pride and identity of Aboriginal people. In June 1987 State Cabinet endorsed plans for the establishment of Tandanya which over the previous year, as part of a working party report, had escalated from being a modest facility run by seven staff to a grand design involving 17 staff and trainees, plus an ambitious range of enterprise activities and a vast exhibition gallery. Since that time the Government has provided some \$1.5 million in recurrent funds plus capital funds for renovating the old ETSA building and a further \$400 000 for relocating the previous tenants, TAFE.

I provide this brief background which confirms that, when Tandanya finally opened its doors in October 1989, there was a lot at stake for both Aboriginal Australians, in terms of their high hopes for the success of Tandanya, and for the related sense of self respect and also for taxpayers generally in ensuring the project would be a successful, well managed enterprise. I therefore ask the Minister:

1. Why was the position of Director not advertised publicly, let alone within the confines of the Public Service, acknowledging that such a course would not have been an acceptable practice for the appointment of a Director to institutions such as the Art Gallery of South Australia, the Museum, the State Library or the Festival Centre?

2. On what grounds was Mr Peter Tregilgas considered to be such an exceptional candidate for the position of Director that initially the Government, in terms of the working party, and ultimately the board, were prepared to accept Mr Tregilgas as the only suitable person for this responsible position?

3. Prior to Mr Tregilgas's appointment, was any consideration given to the fact that when he held the position of Director of the Fringe Festival he was involved in the extravagant use of Government funds through his access to and the abuse of a Department for the Arts order book?

4. Prior to Mr Tregilgas's most recent departure from Tandanya on an extended leave prior to termination of his contract, what was the financial position of Tandanya compared to budget forecasts?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In responding to this question, I point out that the ministerial responsibility for Tandanya transferred to the Minister for the Arts in 1989, very shortly (I think about three weeks) before Tandanya opened. In consequence, I do not have available any detailed information that relates to the period prior to the responsibility moving to the Arts portfolio. I can, however, make inquiries of the relevant ministries for those aspects of Ms Laidlaw's question which relate to that earlier period.

I can endorse the remarks of the honourable member regarding the great value and importance of Tandanya, not just to Aboriginal people but also, of course, to all South Australians and all Australians. It is an extremely worthwhile concept and I am sure that every member of this Council wishes it well.

Regarding the appointment of Mr Tregilgas as Director of Tandanya, as indicated, it was not a responsibility of the Arts portfolio at the time, but I point out that the appointment of Mr Tregilgas has been confirmed and extended by the Tandanya board which, of course, has the responsibility

for appointing staff. I do not know the exact date that the confirmation of Mr Tregilgas as Director occurred, but I can determine it, and his contract was continued to 2 May this year.

I point out that Mr Tregilgas is on leave at the moment, as indicated by the honourable member. As I understand it, he is taking annual leave and other leave to which he is fully entitled, and his position from the end of that leave until the expiration of his contract has yet to be determined by the Tandanya board.

The honourable member made comparisons between Tandanya and institutions such as the Art Gallery, the South Australian Museum and the Festival Centre Trust. I point out that legally Tandanya is an incorporated institution and, as such, it is governed by the provisions of the Associations Act—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: —and, in consequence, the matters relating to the affairs of Tandanya are conducted by a board, which is elected—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister is answering the question. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: If the honourable member can control her tongue, I will attempt to answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I was indicating to the Council that Tandanya is not a Government institution, as are the other organisations that the honourable Minister named. It is an incorporated body and, as such, is governed by the legislation of the Associations Act. Tandanya has a board, which is charged under the Associations Act with the responsibility of managing the affairs of Tandanya. The board is elected by the members, as applies to any associations that are covered by the Associations Act. Certainly, it was the board of Tandanya that drew up the contract with Mr Tregilgas and appointed him as Director for a contract expiring on 2 May this year.

With regard to the financial situation at Tandanya, I am not quite sure what the honourable member's question was.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I suggested that there is another financial crisis, and that it is one of the reasons why Mr Tregilgas is going, so I wanted to know what the operating budget was at the time of Mr Tregilgas's departure, compared with what was forecast this year.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Certainly, the budget was initially put forward by Tandanya when it was seeking Government support and, in August last year, Tandanya's grant was determined and communicated to it, the Government allocation being \$580 000 for this financial year. At the time, the board, or the correspondents, requested a revised budget in line with the Government grant, and quarterly financial reports were requested from Tandanya, the first being due at the end of October and the next at the end of January. When no financial statement arrived at the end of October, the Department for the Arts had frequent contact with Tandanya—with Mr Tregilgas—regarding the financial situation and producing a financial statement, as requested by the department. Numerous contacts and discussions occurred between the department and Tandanya, and in early December the serious financial situation at Tandanya became apparent, and the department—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: To the Government, to the board or to management?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It became evident to officers of the department, and I make no comment on the relationship between staff and the board at Tandanya; it is not a matter that I should enter into. In December, the financial situation became apparent and the Government made available to Tandanya an accounting consultant to look at the accounting and financial management systems in place at Tandanya. It was only at that stage that the full difficulties of Tandanya became apparent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: What are those difficulties? That was my question.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The difficulties are that Tandanya has overspent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: By how much?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: If Tandanya continued at the rate at which it was spending money for the first six months of this year, one could expect a deficit of about, I think, \$900 000 for the year.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: A deficit of \$900 000?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I would need to check the exact figure.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Is that the operating deficit? Is that over or above the State Government's generous grant?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let me draw this to the attention of the Council: when questions are asked, there are too many parts to each question, and it makes it very difficult for the Minister answering the question to keep track of it. In addition, the habit of asking questions on the side across to the Minister who is asked the question is getting quite out of hand. I ask members to keep their questions brief and for the Minister's replies to be succinct.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sorry to take so long, Mr President, but at least six questions were asked of me.

The PRESIDENT: I drew that to the attention of the Chamber.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: An immediate plan of action was devised for Tandanya to cut expenses and to reduce the anticipated deficit. The board of Tandanya has taken numerous steps already which will prevent the deficit blowing out to the extent which was suggested when the financial matters of Tandanya were examined closely. There are still ongoing discussions with the board of Tandanya. The running of Tandanya is the responsibility of the board, and I am sure that no-one would suggest that it should be otherwise. The board is made up of people elected by the members of the Cultural Institute, and all members of the institute and all members of the board are Aborigines, and they are running their own institution.

Given the situation which has arisen, the Government is trying to help Tandanya to cope and is having discussions with the board. The latest discussions were scheduled to occur at 12 o'clock today, but I do not know the result of those discussions. Tandanya has asked whether a temporary administrator can be provided by the Government until it is able to advertise for, select and appoint another director. The Government has indicated that it is happy to try to meet this request and discussions are continuing on this matter.

STATE BANK

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in this place, a question relating to the State Bank board.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Reports in the media last night suggested that there was not a run on the State Bank, although I have had a number of conversations with bank employees which have suggested that there have been quite significant withdrawals. Many branches have lost \$300 000 and that has been a fairly consistent story across the State. Bank employees and other callers—many callers—to my office have made clear that customer confidence in the institution and its board is wavering. The apparent failure of the board to be aware of the accumulation of bad debt over a significant period resulted in the billion dollar rescue which was announced on Sunday. Many callers suggested that the only way their confidence will be restored in the bank is for the Government to sack the board.

The resignation of the former Managing Director (Tim Marcus Clark) over the present crisis has raised the question in many people's mind about the amount of responsibility which should be borne by the rest of the board. In the State Bank of South Australia Act 1983, neglect of duty is ground for the dismissal of a board member (section 9 (2) (c)). It has been general knowledge in the business community since at least September 1989 that the State Bank had exposure to several large and risky ventures. Concern about this was raised inside Parliament and outside, but the only evidence of action by the State Bank board was the independent review begun six weeks ago, according to the Premier, at his behest. It is only that which is said to have revealed the full extent of the problems facing the bank. My questions are:

1. Does the Government believe the board neglected its duty in the light of its claims it did not know about the impending debt crisis until after the recent review?

2. Does the Government agree that bank customers may have reduced confidence in the bank because of the retention of the board?

3. Is the Government contemplating sacking the entire board and replacing it with a group which could restore Government and customer confidence?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answer to the first question is that the board must take some responsibility for the situation that the bank found itself in. In any event, the Auditor-General will be examining the information that was available to the board as part of the terms of reference which have been established. The answer to the second question is 'No', and to the third question, 'No'.

CENTENNIAL PARK TRUST

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Local Government Relations a question about the Centennial Park Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Last year, at the request of Mitcham and Unley councils, the Minister of Local Government set up a review committee into the Centennial Park Trust. This committee reported in August last year, suggesting among other things that the rules of the trust should be amended. There has been no announcement since then regarding the adoption of new rules for the Centennial

Park Trust. Have the new rules come into operation yet and, if not, when can they be expected?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I inform the honourable member that the new rules for Centennial Park Trust have not yet come into operation and, unfortunately, at this stage I do not know when they will. As set out in the Local Government Act, the Centennial Park Trust is a controlling authority set up jointly by the Mitcham and Unley councils. The review of the trust was requested by the two councils last year and the Government was happy to set up a review committee, which involved both councils, to conduct the review. One of the recommendations of the review which reported, I think, in August 1990, was that the rules of the Centennial Park Trust should be changed to provide in such a way that a lot more information would be provided to the constituent councils by the trust and that the constituent councils would have much greater supervision of the activities of the trust.

The review provided suggested new rules which, according to the Act, must be approved by the Minister after they have been adopted by the two councils. So, the report and the suggested new rules were sent to the two councils for their consideration. As I understand it, Unley council, one of the two councils concerned, considered the report and the rules and agreed to adopt the rules. It did this at its meeting in September 1990. However, I understand that now, nearly six months later, Mitcham council has not yet even considered the rules to decide whether it wishes to accept or amend them in any way. If it accepts them, I shall be very happy to sign them into operation at the earliest opportunity. If it wishes them to be amended in any way, it will need to consult with Unley council because the rules must come forward in the same manner from the two councils before I can accept them. I do not know why Mitcham council has not yet even considered the rules. Given the fact that there was so much controversy over Centennial Park Trust last year, I would hope that this matter could be settled and that Mitcham council is able to consider the matter soon.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Local Government Relations a question concerning the Local Government Finance Authority.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I was concerned to learn via the media that any downgrading of the credit rating of South Australian instrumentalities would include the Local Government Finance Authority, recognised far and wide as a jewel in the crown of local government. If this downgrade happens following the Government's debacle with the State Bank, we are told there will be an additional half of 1 per cent added to the cost of borrowing funds. Last year, the Local Government Finance Authority lent in excess of \$645 million, including \$254 million to councils and local government bodies.

Councils will be alarmed if, through no fault of their own or the ordinary cost of borrowing trends, they suddenly find that they have an extra imposition to pay back out of already meagre funds in a depressed economic climate. In addition, the bonus disbursement from the Local Government Finance Authority to councils of \$625 000 last year may suffer a cut-back through a credit rating downgrade. Since inception, the Local Government Finance Authority has enjoyed a \$50 million capital base provided by the State

Treasury on which it pays interest. Has the Minister been made aware that any credit rating downgrade will be costly for local government borrowings? In addition, can the Minister give a categorical assurance that the State Government will not call in all or part of the \$50 million capital base lent to establish the Local Government Finance Authority?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: With regard to the first question, I have been made aware that not only the Local Government Finance Authority but also quite a number of financial institutions in this State may well be downgraded in their ratings. However, this will not be determined until later this week or perhaps early next week, as I understand it. With regard to the second question, that is a matter for the Treasurer, and I will refer the honourable member's question to him for a response.

RURAL CONCESSION REGISTRATIONS

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to a question I asked on 13 December 1990 about rural concession registrations.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Transport has informed me that the Department of Road Transport does not have the basic information necessary to research the questions posed on rural concession registrations. While the names of members of Parliament are known, other persons may share that name or have the same initials. The records do not identify whether a registered owner is in fact an MP.

The department has no knowledge of the names of the family of members of Parliament, nor of companies of which they or the MP are owners or directors. This information is irrelevant for vehicle registration purposes. It needs to be pointed out that the key to vehicle registration records is the registered number assigned to the particular vehicle, not the name of the person or company in whose name it is registered. If members of Parliament were prepared to volunteer the registered numbers of vehicles falling into the three categories mentioned by the honourable member, it would be a simple task to compile the information sought.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: My questions are directed to the Attorney-General, representing the Premier and Treasurer. Did Beneficial Finance, acting as underwriters, promote a company called Bepac Limited, which invited investment from the public, in a factoring business, offering substantial tax advantages? What was the total value which was underwritten by Beneficial Finance? What is the total value of the recourse guarantees which have been provided in this venture by Beneficial Finance and which remain outstanding? What losses are likely to be incurred by Beneficial Finance in respect of the obligation arising out of the issue of recourse guarantees? Did Beneficial Finance hold an interest in Bepac Limited at any time? Does Beneficial Finance still hold an interest in Bepac Limited and what is the value of that investment? Did Beneficial Finance make a profit or loss as a result of its involvement with the scheme, and what was the amount of profit or loss? What was the estimated amount of Federal income tax lost as a result of the underwriting and promotion efforts of this tax scheme by Beneficial Finance?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to the Treasurer. I should say that the Auditor-General has been

appointed to investigate matters relating to the State Bank and its subsidiaries. If members have these queries to raise, I suggest that they be taken up with the Auditor-General.

PARKS AND GARDENS WATERING

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to my question of 22 November 1990 about parks and gardens watering.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Minister of Water Resources has advised that a proposal involving possible arrangements under which the Adelaide City Council could be liable for a charge for water used above an allowance, has been put to the council. The proposal included suggestions for increasing water use efficiency, the use of alternative sources of water, and consultation with the council concerning the level of the allowance, which if pursued positively could result in the council not being liable to pay for water used. Further consideration will be given to the proposal when the council has had an opportunity to respond. The question relating to the increase in water usage from 1986-87 to 1988-89 should more appropriately be put to the Adelaide City Council. Alternative sources of water which have been considered are groundwater, stormwater, treated disinfected wastewater and water from the River Torrens.

ABORIGINAL APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING SCHEMES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to my question of 7 November 1990 about Aboriginal apprenticeship training schemes.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

My colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has advised that the employment of Aborigines for any and all positions should be an automatic consideration in any recruitment process. However, to address the particular disadvantages faced by Aborigines there are two units within State Government departments: the Aboriginal Employment Development Branch in DETAFE, and the Aboriginal Employment Unit in the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations. The Aboriginal Employment Development Branch works primarily with Statutory Authorities and Local Government but as well encourages actively the employment of Aboriginal apprentices in additional positions by means of special funding support; the Aboriginal Employment Unit works with State Government departments placing Aborigines in essentially Public Service positions.

The Statewide Group Training Scheme is not located within a Government department, but is an independent incorporated organisation which applies for and receives some State Government funding under the Group Training Scheme Program which is a joint Commonwealth/State program. The Statewide Group Training Scheme is funded in a similar way to the other thirteen group training schemes in South Australia.

The total cost of operation of the DETAFE Aboriginal Employment Development Branch is projected at \$1 113 646 for the 1990-91 financial year. Of this figure \$532 646 are State moneys. A significant proportion of this budget pro-

vides direct subsidies to employers, as an incentive to employ and properly train Aboriginal employees.

The Aboriginal Employment Unit in the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations has a total budget of \$268 535. Of this figure \$190 206 is State monies.

The proposition that one unit could be given Government wide responsibility for the training and employment of Aboriginal people seems appealing in theory, but in practice would probably not be as effective as the present approach at this stage of program development.

The two units have different target groups and different approaches. It has been found for example that associating the State Public Service recruitment and development effort with the employer is highly successful. Statutory authorities and local government, on the other hand, require different types of support and encouragement to achieve their employment targets.

Nevertheless, the State Government will continue to monitor this arrangement and will review it if and when necessary.

It is an assumption by the honourable member to suggest that the current programs are not effective or achieving results. Earlier this year the Aboriginal Employment Unit reached its target of 1 per cent Aboriginal Employment in State Government Administrative Units.

To ensure this success is repeated in other sectors, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs issued the '1 per cent Challenge' to statutory authorities and councils earlier this year to improve:

- the ratio of Aborigines employed in statutory authorities and local government (i.e. to 1 per cent of the total workforce), a level already achieved in the public service;
- the median wage of Aborigines; and
- employment opportunities in all local government areas throughout the State.

Since its inception, the branch has created over 60 vacancies in a range of vocations and in many locations, including a number of apprenticeships. These vacancies are created through direct negotiations with employers.

During the current financial year, the branch has assumed responsibility for all negotiated Aboriginal apprenticeships within the State and local government sectors, when funds for additional Aboriginal apprenticeships within the State Government sector amounting to \$85 000 were transferred to the branch. This transfer gave effect to all State Government apprentices being recruited through DETAFE.

Almost all State Government employers recruit apprentices annually through the Employment and Training Division's central recruitment scheme, which in the last two years has had a target of 10 Aborigines to be offered apprenticeships.

Whilst recruitment of apprentices to the public sector is not yet finalised for 1991 it would appear that nine Aborigines will gain apprenticeships out of a total of 140 in the Centralised Government Recruitment Scheme.

RAILWAY BOOKINGS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to my question of 4 December 1990 about railway bookings.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

My colleague the Minister of Transport has advised that the normal procedure to book a rail ticket with Australian National to Adelaide from Crystal Brook on the Iron Tri-

angle was to ring the toll free number (008) 88 8417 to make a seat reservation for the desired date of travel. Such a procedure would not appear to have been a deterrent to passengers.

There is no evidence to suggest that AN has acted improperly in this matter. Following a booking the train would stop at Crystal Brook at the scheduled time. Passengers then boarded the train and paid the required fare to the Guard. Subsequent to Mr Clarke's journey the Iron Triangle Limited ceased operation on 2 January 1991.

It appears, from the experience of Mr Clarke, that on the date in question there may have been some difficulty with the telephone system. Investigation by Telecom indicates there were no complaints received by the general public that the telephone lines were not operating normally. AN have experienced no problems recently with bookings for rail travel on the 008 lines.

AN's phone reservations and booking offices are generally busy at this time of year with holiday bookings. In light of the circumstances described, the Minister of Transport does not consider any further action is necessary.

ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to my question of 13 December 1990 about the Road Safety Centre.

I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: My colleague the Minister of Transport has advised that the Government has no intention of closing the Oaklands Park Road Safety Centre, and that the use of the centre has recently increased with practical driving tests now being conducted from the centre. Survey work has been carried out at the centre to define an area of land which is considered as surplus to the day to day requirements of the driver standard and licence testing functions. Following this definition, the Minister of Transport requested the Department of Road Transport to initiate consultation with the community and, as previously indicated, this will occur before a final decision is made.

Young drivers have not been trained at the centre for many years. The main focus for the centre over the last five years has been to train trainers or professional driving instructors and high school teachers who have provided training for novice drivers either in the private sector through driving schools or through high school programs as student driver education activities. Vacation programs for high school students are still provided at Oaklands Park but these are run by the Institute of Professional Driving Instructors and privately sponsored. These programs will continue and will not be affected by the proposed disposal of property because that part of the property is not suitable for use for 'off road' training.

GLENELG TRAM SERVICE

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I understand that the Minister for Local Government Relations has a reply to my question of 21 November 1990 about the Glenelg tram service.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Minister of Transport has informed me that the State Transport Authority has completed the following items of the tramcar refurbishment program:

- 21 trams have been fitted with pantographs, ball bearing bogies and inverters; and
- 5 trams have undergone body work refurbishment.

Progress is continuing within the available funds as the work is being absorbed into the normal maintenance/recurrent program. A proposal to purchase new tramcars is one of the public transport projects being considered by the Government for submission to the Federal Government seeking funding assistance under the Australian Centennial Road Development program.

It is the Government's intention to retain the Adelaide-Glenelg tram service due to its historical and public transport significance. When funds become available, the Government will purchase new trams to replace the existing fleet, although some refurbished trams will be retained for

historical reasons and to supplement the new trams as necessary. The Government recognises that the City terminus of the tram service is not ideally located for customers visiting the City's commercial district. A study is being undertaken to consider various options available, including the extension of the tramway to North Adelaide and/or the Adelaide Railway Station. It is expected that the report with recommendations will be available around the middle of 1991.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.47 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 13 February at 2.15 p.m.