

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 5 November 1992

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and Question Time to be taken into consideration at 2.15 p.m.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 October. Page 633.)

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: I thank members for their consideration of and support for the Bill. A number of questions have been raised. The Hon. Mr Griffin raised some issues to which I will respond.

The first question related to when the whistle-blowers legislation would be introduced. It is expected that it will be introduced in the parliamentary week commencing 17 November. I hope that timetable can be met but, if not, I certainly have set a timetable to have the Bill introduced before we rise for the Christmas recess. With respect to the amendments to the Evidence Act, which are being considered to make provision for the taking of evidence by video link and telephone, I would expect these to be ready for introduction in the first half of the new year. There is a question of how much really needs to be included in legislation. The Commonwealth intends to make quite detailed provisions for taking evidence between New Zealand and Australia by these means, whereas the Victorian Complex Fraud Bill, which was before the Victorian Parliament before the recent election, was very simple.

So far as amendments to the Wrongs Act and the Motor Vehicles Act requested by SGIC are concerned, the details of what was requested by SGIC are set out in a question asked by the Hon. D. V. Laidlaw. In my response of 27 October I indicated which of the reforms requested by SGIC would be implemented. This Bill will be introduced. The amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act being considered include whether the Act should be amended to include discrimination on the grounds of AIDS and family responsibilities. Members will recall that I made a statement dealing with the question of discrimination on the grounds of AIDS some time ago. Since then the Federal Government has announced that it is looking at this issue. While that is happening I considered it prudent to withhold action in South Australia until those policy issues had been resolved at Federal level. Obviously, if the Federal Government introduces legislation covering a particular area of discrimination, there is no need for the State to do so.

The same considerations apply with respect to the proposals to outlaw racial vilification.

The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has requested several amendments, mainly of a housekeeping type. Some of the amendments are designed to make explicit what is now implied, such as racial harassment. I have already indicated the situation with respect to racial harassment or racial vilification. Superannuation and insurance exemptions are other matters that are under review. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has approved a model superannuation provision in relation to age. The Wills Act amendments cover a variety of matters including streamlining section 12 applications (new provisions) for the making of statutory wills for people lacking testamentary capacity. I am quite happy to provide the honourable member with a copy of the amendments when they are drafted. Supreme Court judges and the Registrar of Probates have already provided some comments and will be asked to provide further comments on the draft Bill in due course. Other people will also need to be consulted, including the Law Society.

The reference to disqualification of members of Parliament is a reference to those provisions of the Constitution which deal with members of Parliament having contracts with the Government and Government agencies. As the honourable member points out, this is something which affects members of Parliament and something about which they are entitled to know. I intend to discuss the Bill with all Parties before it is introduced; that is, if the Government decides to proceed with it. The cross-vesting amendments are fairly minor. The proposal is to amend the definition of 'special Federal matter' in section 3(1) of the cross-vesting Acts to include proceedings arising under section 60AA of the Family Law Act 1975 and to amend section 6 of the Acts so as to vary the rules concerning the transfer of special matters from State Supreme Courts to the Federal Court of Australia. Section 60AA of the Family Court Act provides for the Family Court to give leave for the commencement of step-parent adoptions, and the amendment to section 6 arises out of Commonwealth concerns that State Supreme Courts have not given appropriate consideration to policy considerations favouring transfers to the Federal Court. So far as complex fraud trials are concerned, it appears that the honourable member was not originally sent a copy of the consultation paper, but he should have received a copy by now.

The next issue raised by the honourable member concerned the problem of chasing criminal injuries compensation and the impediment that has occurred to pursuing offenders who owe these debts which has occurred because of the Commonwealth privacy legislation and the restriction on locating people through credit protection agencies. In the past, the Attorney-General's Office was a member of the Credit Reference Association of Australia and used this facility as one method of locating respondents who were liable to repay the Attorney-General amounts of compensation paid by him to victims of crime. Following the enactment of the Commonwealth Privacy Act and the adoption and promulgation of a code of practice for credit reference associations by the Human Rights Commission, the

Attorney-General's Office was no longer able to use that resource. It is clear that this office is not a credit provider and, as such, is not able to obtain access to any information held by any credit reference association.

When the change occurred, the Attorney-General's Office approached the Credit Reference Association of Australia and sought its assistance. That association provided this office with a booklet entitled *The Privacy Commissioner—Credit Reporting: Code of Conduct and Explanatory Notes*, published in September 1991 by the Human Rights Commission, a copy of which I am happy to provide to the honourable member. When it provided that booklet, the Credit Reference Association apologised because it was no longer able to assist.

It must be recognised that the Attorney-General's Office was not a large user of the service. No approach has been made directly or indirectly to the Commonwealth, but instead proposals have been developed in an attempt to try to maximise the use of and access to information already held by the State. A proposal to make information held by the police, the Motor Registration Division, the debtors' court, the Housing Trust, etc., is currently under consideration.

The next question raised by the honourable member dealt with the progress, or lack of it, on the draft Corporations Agreement. It was envisaged that all outstanding issues in respect of the draft Corporations Agreement, with the exception of clause 701, would be resolved at the recent Ministerial Council for Corporations meeting held on 14 October 1992. However, the new Victorian Attorney-General has indicated that she has some concerns in respect of clauses 504, 513, 515 and 704 of the draft agreement. That draft agreement cannot be ratified until these concerns and the issue of clause 701 are addressed.

Clause 504 originally purported to seek a commitment from the States and the Northern Territory not to enact legislation in relation to the formation or regulation of business entities which would be an alternative to the system of regulating corporations under the corporations law.

The concerns expressed by all State and Territory MINCO officers was that the reference to business entities was too broad, as it meant that the restriction would extend to all types of enterprises other than companies formed to carry out business activities.

On 25 October 1992 this matter was discussed by MINCO officers and the steering committee, of which the South Australian Solicitor-General is a member, and a new clause was agreed upon. The clause as redrafted will now seek a commitment from each State and the Northern Territory not to enact legislation that (a) will create what is in substance a system for the formation or regulation of business entities, that is, an alternative to the system that involves corporations regulated by the corporations law; and, (b) which would have a significantly adverse effect on the primacy of the company as the preferred vehicle for corporate business enterprises. It is evident that such an undertaking must be given by all jurisdictions if the national scheme for the regulation of companies and securities is to succeed.

Clause 513 provides that each State will not introduce a Bill that will repeal or amend a national scheme law without the approval of the Ministerial Council. Clause

515 requires consultation by any State with the Ministerial Council in respect of any other legislative proposals that would alter the effect, scope or operation of any national scheme law.

The Victorian Attorney-General indicated, through her representatives, at the recent Ministerial Council that she considers that the provisions of clauses 504, 513 and 515 place too great a fetter on State powers. The details of Ms Wade's concerns have not been forwarded to Ministers and, accordingly, until they are received and resolved the draft Corporations Agreement cannot be settled. Pending the receipt of the Victorian Attorney-General's comments, this is not a view adopted by this State, nor has any other jurisdiction indicated any concern in respect of these provisions.

The other matters which now require further consultation between State and Commonwealth Governments are clauses 701 and 704. The Victorian Attorney-General has indicated her concern that the figures contained in clause 704 are incorrect. Under the draft Corporations Agreement the amount of \$51 million to be distributed amongst the States and the Northern Territory is forgone revenue and must be distributed according to the percentage allocated to each jurisdiction by clause 704. No details have been provided as to the manner or reason as to why these figures are incorrect.

The only other matter to be resolved is clause 701, which contains the formula for calculating the forgone revenue payments to the States and the Northern Territory. The Commonwealth had proposed to change the formula, and the proposed change has been referred to the Treasury of each jurisdiction. The change is acceptable to the South Australian Treasury. Apart from the concerns expressed recently by the Victorian Attorney-General, the draft Corporations Agreement is acceptable to all other jurisdictions.

The Hon. Mr Griffin also raised a question of brochures being left at vacant households during the current habitation review. The Electoral Commissioner has advised me that clause 5 of the Joint Rolls Agreement which became operative on 1 July 1988 specifies:

The Australian Electoral Office for the State:

(a) so far as possible shall conduct in the State annual habitation reviews under the Commonwealth Act.

(b) shall be responsible for the policy relating to enrolment on, and maintenance of, the rolls but in doing so he or she shall consult with, and give effect to the requirements of, the Electoral Commissioner in that respect.

As the honourable member would know, negotiations for the Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia resulted in a rewording of enrolment claim forms to accommodate both the Commonwealth and South Australian franchise. I anticipate that similar cooperation will be afforded during negotiations on a revision of the habitation review brochures. These negotiations are expected to be completed prior to the next review taking place. The cost of non-voter follow-up associated with the February 1991 referendum totalled \$160 276, which is made up as follows. I have a list, which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

NON-VOTER FOLLOW-UP COSTS

	\$
Permanent staff costs (notional)	40 000
Casual staff costs	43 275
Postage	43 938
Printing	20 968
Serving summonses	6 560
Computer processing	5 500
Stationery (miscellaneous)	35
TOTAL	160 276

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The next question related to what the restructuring would achieve in terms of efficiency and smaller government. The situation is that the arrangements of portfolios were partly in response to the recommendations of the Arthur D. Little report that there should be fewer Government departments.

The first stage of the reform was to reduce the number of ministerial portfolios. The appointment of seven coordinators was a sign that the Government intended to continue this streamlining down through the public sector. Rather than suggesting immediate amalgamation of departments, the Government took the position that these coordinators would develop the strategic directions, particularly to promote economic growth, and to consult widely before recommending any change to structures. However, where the Government had available material to support an amalgamation, for example, in primary industries, the process of creating a merged entity is taking place.

The coordinators have a brief to ensure that within portfolios there is a common policy line and that, where change is needed to take place across departments, the coordinator will be accountable for making that happen. The coordinators have a brief to range across the issues covered by all the agencies in the Minister's portfolio, to remove duplication and to identify areas where people are working in similar ways and to rationalise those activities.

The coordinator has the capacity to recommend to the Minister the movement of money from one agency to another for priority projects. This will increase the flexibility of Government—one of the important characteristics of a responsive bureaucracy. In time, the coordinators will recommend on new structures, if any, with a view to reducing overheads and to creating an improved economic climate in South Australia.

The Office of Public Sector Reform will be working with all agencies to help them develop an understanding of their core business, to give them a customer service orientation and to develop many other forms. The coordinators will play a central role in implementing these reforms. I intend (at some in the reasonably near future, I hope) to outline more details of the principles and policies that will guide the Government in public sector reform.

That deals with the substantive issues raised by the honourable member. I understand that some other Ministers had questions which have either been answered by correspondence or which will be answered during the Committee stage. Members know and the Government has given notice that it intends to move that a new schedule be included in the Appropriation Bill as a suggestion to the House of Assembly. I will deal with that now, so that I will not need to repeat it in Committee.

Honourable members have had available to them for some considerable time information which sets out in detail the proposed changes to the appropriations passed by the House of Assembly several weeks ago. In summary, where new ministries or agencies have been created it is necessary to provide appropriation authority to enable them to carry out their functions from early October until the end of the financial year. Where particular functions have been transferred from one ministry or agency to another, it is necessary to reflect these transfers in the amounts appropriated to each ministry or agency. Where ministries or agencies have been abolished, it is necessary to provide appropriation authority for the functions which they have undertaken from the beginning of the financial year until early October.

It is important for honourable members to understand that these changes do not authorise the Government to undertake new initiatives. All the proposed expenditures which the original schedule was designed to authorise remain. It is the Government's expectation that the changed arrangements will give greater impetus to programs already underway, for example, public sector reform, but the changes represent a new way of approaching these tasks rather than the introduction of new programs.

The proposed new schedule to the Bill is divided into two parts. Above the line are those agencies and ministries which continue in existence, plus new agencies and ministries which did not appear on the schedule in the original Bill, and below the line are those agencies and ministries which have now been abolished but for which expenditure authority is needed from the beginning of the financial year until early October.

Dealing first with items above the line, it will be apparent that many of the proposed appropriations are unchanged. Examples are the appropriations for the Legislative Council, the House of Assembly, the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Treasury Department. The funds provided for these purposes will enable those agencies to carry out their functions for the whole of the 1992-93 financial year. Some of the proposed appropriations are new: examples are the Department of Primary Industries, the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, and the new ministries. The funds provided for these purposes represent the amounts necessary for these agencies and ministries to carry out their functions from early October until the end of the financial year.

There are also three appropriations above the line which have been reduced slightly. These are the appropriations for the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Housing and Construction and the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. The funds provided for these agencies represent the amounts necessary for them to carry out their ongoing functions for the whole of the financial year, plus the amounts necessary to meet the costs incurred up to early October in carrying out the functions now transferred to other agencies.

Below the line are those agencies and ministries which have been abolished. The funds provided for these

purposes represent the amounts necessary to pay for the functions carried out by those agencies and ministries from the beginning of the financial year until early October. The balance of the funds originally provided for those purposes have been transferred to other agencies or ministries to finance the ongoing functions for the rest of the financial year.

The total estimated net payments for which the Government is seeking the authority of the Council is exactly the same as the total in the original schedule. The programs which the Government proposes to carry out are the same programs which the original schedule authorised. The new schedule merely reflects the changes in ministries and administrative arrangements instituted at the beginning of October to provide for the continuing implementation of those programs. The Government believes that the new schedule A should replace the original schedule, and I will move in Committee for that to be a suggestion to the House of Assembly. This, of course, will bring the current arrangements in Government into line with the Appropriation Bill.

There is an argument that this was not strictly necessary and that after the passage of the Appropriation Bill, with the old schedule in it, arrangements could have been made within departments. Although there was some doubt as to whether that could be done under the Public Finance and Audit Act, it is possible that it could have been done by the Treasurer's authority. However, the Government believed that it was in the interests of good Government to ensure that the Appropriation Bill, when it passed the House, did reflect the new arrangements within Government. I think that is a view that members opposite shared, although it seems that it may not have been shared in the House of Assembly. Essentially, what is being suggested is basically a technical matter, to put the schedule in line with the current administrative arrangements within Government. There ought not to be any difficulty with that, and there should not have been any difficulty with it in the House of Assembly, either. As has been pointed out, the programs remain the same and a full Estimates Committee process was gone through to deal with those programs in the House of Assembly.

We have not had the Committee stage of the Bill, so the programs are open for discussion afresh. In other words, there is no suggestion that if the Council agrees to insert this new schedule there will be any restriction on debating the issues contained therein, because we have not had the chance to deal with those appropriations in the Committee stage.

Undoubtedly the most sensible approach for the Parliament as a whole would have been the one that I proposed earlier, to which the Opposition in this place agreed but which was not agreed to by the House of Assembly. Members will know that in the House of Assembly the Opposition used a tactical device basically of removing one of its members from the Chamber so that an absolute majority to recommit the third reading of the Bill could not be obtained. I will not comment on the use of that tactical device.

No doubt members of the House of Assembly can talk about whether or not it was justified in this context. Suffice to say, I do not think it was. It was a tactical device to disrupt what essentially was a technical exercise to ensure that the new appropriations reflected the

changed administrative arrangements. Now that the preferred course of action of having it dealt with in the House of Assembly first and having it sent here has been thwarted by the Opposition, I propose to move the new schedule in Committee, but I will not re-explain it. Some issues have been raised about the power of the Legislative Council in this area. I have extensive legal opinion on the topic, as members will be aware, which has been sent to you, Mr President—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I would have thought that you could have found better bed-time reading than this. I certainly by to find better bed-time reading than the opinions of the Solicitor-General, the Crown Solicitor and Parliamentary Counsel, particularly on a topic like this. The opinions have been sent by the Crown Solicitor to the Clerk and through the Clerk to you, Mr President, and I have sent copies of the opinions to the Leader of the Opposition in this place and thereby to the Hon. Mr Griffin, and also to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan on behalf of the Democrats. However, I suggest that the opinions be tabled so that they are officially on the record of the Parliament. As the Hon. Mr Griffin would know, it is not customary to table the opinions of the Crown Solicitor or of Crown Law officers, including the Solicitor-General, which are given to the Government. Although occasionally it happens, as a general rule it is not considered good practice to make opinions from the Crown Solicitor or Crown Law officers to the Government available publicly or in the Parliament. Although directed to me, they are more in the nature of advice to the Parliament about the relevant provisions of the Constitution Act. Accordingly, I think it is appropriate for me to seek leave to table these documents, and I do so.

They are a memorandum of advice from the Crown Solicitor to the Attorney-General dated 29 October 1992; a memorandum of advice from the Crown Solicitor to the Attorney-General dated 3 November 1992; an opinion from the Solicitor-General, Mr John Doyle, QC, dated 29 October 1992; a supplementary opinion from the Solicitor-General to the Attorney-General dated 30 October 1992; an opinion from the Solicitor-General to the Attorney-General dated 2 November 1992 dealing with section 63 of the Constitution Act; and an opinion directed to me from Parliamentary Counsel, Mr Geoff Hackett-Jones, QC, dated 3 November 1992.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I suggest as a final point that, as a matter of procedure, if the Opposition is prepared to agree, we deal first with any point that might be raised regarding the replacement of the schedule. As that will involve our going right through the Bill, including the schedule, if that is agreed to, we will deal with that issue first and I will recommit the Bill for substantive debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Issue and application of money.'

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I move the following suggested amendments:

Page 1—

Line 20—Leave out 'in the schedule' and insert 'in schedule A'.

Line 22—Leave out 'in the schedule' and insert 'in schedule A'.

The opinions which I have tabled and which have been made available to members indicate that this procedure on the Bill is available to the Legislative Council. I will not repeat everything in those opinions although, if need be, I will comment further on them, depending on the debate that we might have on this matter. Suffice to say that the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor are of the view that the Council does have the power to suggest to the House of Assembly these amendments to the Bill. Members who have perused the opinion will see that the matter has become somewhat complex, but the end result of the opinion of those two people is that the amendments can be suggested: it is within the power of the Legislative Council to suggest the amendments. Parliamentary Counsel believes that the Bill is in a form whereby there may be some doubt as to whether the suggestion can be made but, frankly, I think his opinion tends to ignore the plain wording of the Constitution. In any event, he concludes that it is up to the Parliament to decide how it wants to deal with Appropriation Bills.

As the opinions clearly point out, once an Appropriation Bill is passed by both Houses then that is the end of the matter and the issue is not justiciable in the courts. In the light of those opinions and in the light of the fact that the preferred approach by the Government to correct this basically technical problem in the House of Assembly was thwarted there, I move this motion and submit that it is in order for the Council to make the suggestion to amend the schedule in the manner I have outlined.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is a complex issue and I wonder whether you, Mr Chairman, would indicate from the Chair, as Chairman of Committees, what is your view on this question.

The CHAIRMAN: I am prepared to make a statement on it. I have considered the matter and I have decided that the suggested amendment in relation to the new schedule A may be submitted to the House of Assembly. In doing this I have considered advice from both Crown Law and the Clerk. I believe that the final decision as to what should happen is mine and mine alone as to whether this can be classed as a suggested amendment to the Appropriation Bill. My view is that there are no additional moneys included in the new schedule; it is merely a reallocation of those moneys in order to accord with the new ministries announced by Premier earlier this month.

I believe that certain actions that have taken place in relation to this Bill have been based on a mere technicality, which achieves nothing other than playing politics with the institution of Parliament. My firm belief is that the political process is being abused by the parties involved, bringing Parliament and its procedures into disrepute.

With the Appropriation Bill in its current form, the Legislative Council will, in almost all cases, be able to suggest an amendment because in almost all cases it will be possible to find a not previously authorised purpose in the budget papers. My opinion is that all parties will be the losers because it will open up the potential for unwarranted obstruction of the Government of the day when any Appropriation Bill is in future before this Parliament, and in particular the Legislative Council. That

is how I see it. So, I am prepared to let the amendment go through as a suggested amendment.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As we are in the Committee stage I think it is appropriate to make some observations, and, of course, we are not restricted in the number of contributions we can make on this particular issue. However, it is an important constitutional issue and because so little time has passed since the problem arose I do not feel I am able to do justice to it in the light of the history which has developed over the past 135 years on the relationship between the two Houses of Parliament. It is for that reason that I want to make a few observations and in a sense keep open options for the future.

Mr Chairman, I do not intend to move any disagreement with your ruling. I suppose members may be relieved that that is my position. I think to do that would have the effect of setting it in stone as a ruling of the Council for all time. Because it is such an important issue that we ought to be careful about taking that course at this stage. So, initially, I express some reservation about the ruling which you have made and want to reserve for the future any opportunity to debate it further in a more substantive way.

It may be, of course, that if the present Government decides to take up one of the suggestions of the Solicitor-General to repeal section 63 of the Constitution Act that is when the real hard debate will occur. Although, as the Solicitor-General suggests, it may be that the provisions of section 63 of the Constitution Act have not been complied with religiously, not just in the past 10 years but over a much longer period of time, there may still be a benefit in retaining section 63 as a means of resolving issues between a Government formed in the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, which may wish to disagree with a particular appropriation. So, there may be some good purpose served by retaining section 63 in the Constitution Act for the future.

However, that is not the point that I want the address now. I suppose my initial point ought to be that the issue could have been resolved at a very early stage by the House of Assembly. The Attorney-General has made some observations about later developments in the House of Assembly when the House of Assembly did not approve an amendment to the schedule by an absolute majority as was required by its Standing Orders. That was a later event. The earlier event was that this Bill was before the House of Assembly at the time when the Government undertook its restructuring under its new Premier. It is a failure on the part of the Government really to address that issue in terms of appropriation that has led us to problem in which we now find ourselves. The issue could have been corrected at that very early stage whilst it was still before the House of Assembly rather than now raising the issue of the power of Legislative Council.

The provisions in section 63 of the Constitution Act go back to 1913. In fact, they probably go back to 1857 where at the establishment of responsible Government in South Australia there was an initial dispute between the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly as to the power of Legislative Council to amend money Bills. At that time, after some discussion between the two Houses,

there was a compact reached. That compact was reviewed in 1877 and further reviewed in 1913 and in 1913 amendments were made to the Constitution Act which were believed at that stage to reflect the agreements which had been made between the two Houses.

The issue on each of those occasions was whether the Legislative Council had the power to amend a money Bill. There was a lot of discussion between the two Houses and in the two Houses at the time that suggested that, at least in the House of Assembly, the privileges of the Assembly were akin to those of the House of Commons and that those of the Legislative Council were akin to those of the House of Lords and at that stage there was an equating of the Legislative Council with the House of Lords. To some extent that continues for those who want to criticise the Legislative Council and who seek even to go so far as to abolish it.

However, the argument of the Legislative Council even back in 1857 was that there was a major difference between the two Houses. The House of Lords was purely hereditary. The Legislative Council in 1857 was an elected body, although, of course, it was a body which was elected by electors on a restricted franchise. That franchise has varied from 1857 through 1913 up to the early 1970s—1973 when it became a universal franchise and all those who were electors for the House Assembly were also electors for the Legislative Council. So, no argument can now be placed before the Parliament which suggests that in terms of those who are electors the Legislative Council is any different from the House of Assembly.

Both Houses are elected by the same electors, the franchise is the same and there is no distinction except in respect of the House of Assembly where there are single member constituencies, while the Legislative Council is elected on a proportional representation basis. I have mentioned on previous occasions, and will probably do so again in the future, that in many respects the elective base of the Legislative Council is more democratic than that of the House of Assembly, although one might now qualify that as a result of the changes that were made earlier in this Parliament to the basis for electoral redistributions.

One might also argue that, even with those changes that were made to the Constitution Act relating to a redistribution, it may still not be possible to achieve the ideal: that is, in the House of Assembly a Party or group of Parties should be able to govern if at an election it gains 50 per cent of the preferred vote plus one vote. It may be that systems such as the West German system, which have been canvassed in this House and in the House of Assembly on previous occasions, are more democratic. Certainly, in the common understanding of voting systems, one could argue that there is a closer achievement of electoral equity with the proportional representation system in the Legislative Council than there is with single member constituencies in the House of Assembly.

So, no longer can it be argued that the Legislative Council is any less a House of Parliament than the House of Assembly. That is the basis for suggesting that if the procedure being adopted in this Committee is followed in the future it will widen the powers of the Legislative Council. That might seem rather strange coming from the

Australian Labor Party, which I think still has as part of its platform the abolition of the Legislative Council. I hope that the Government by adopting this device has finally put to bed the campaign within that Party for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It depends what form the Appropriation Bill is in.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That may be so, but I think the argument the Attorney-General has presented, based upon the opinions he has tabled and your own ruling, Mr President, suggests a significant broadening of the powers of the Legislative Council in respect of money Bills. If the Solicitor-General's suggestion is taken up, it may be that section 63 could be repealed, and it would be interesting to see the House of Assembly's response to that, remembering that, as far back as 1857, the House of Assembly has objected to the powers of the Legislative Council with respect to the amendment of money Bills. It will be interesting, particularly in relation to this suggested amendment, to see what position the House of Assembly takes on that suggested amendment.

All the public comments indicate that the Government in the House of Assembly will accept that this procedure can be followed. I suggest that if that occurs it will provide a further instance which might be used in the future to argue strongly for the widening of the powers of the Legislative Council. Under the Constitution Act, the Legislative Council, except in respect of money Bills, has equal powers with the House of Assembly. So, that may come back at some time in the future as a substantive issue to be considered further. I do not know what other consequences there may be of acceding to the ruling you have made, Mr President. Certainly, I have one eye on that in respect of a Liberal Government as to whether it will have advantages or disadvantages and whether the Legislative Council in exercising wider powers may frustrate the interests of a Liberal Government.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It is the best interests of the State and the Parliament you should have been interested in.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As the Attorney-General quite rightly interjects, it is really a question of what is in the best interests of the Parliament and of the State and what really is the law. As I indicated last week in the debate on this Bill, that is the perspective from which I wish to direct my comments. I have read with interest the opinions of the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor. I recognise that the time within which they could provide opinions on this issue has been limited, something in the space of one week, so what I now have to say should not be taken as a criticism of the way in which they have approached their problem. Rather, it reflects the great difficulty one has in adequately researching so complex an issue over the past 135 years with a view to making a decision or a contribution of sufficient weight to do justice to it. However, I suggest a concern with their opinions in the sense that, for example, the Solicitor-General has relied on what he understands to be the position or on what he has been informed is the position. The Crown-Solicitor has done some further work, but similarly he presumes that there are, for example, new purposes authorised within the Appropriation Bill and the budget papers which he believes ought to be read in conjunction with the Bill. However, there is not contained

in any of the opinions any specific reference to or example of a new purpose. That is one area in which I believe the opinions are deficient.

I suppose that their presumption may be correct—it would probably be relatively easy to look at the spending programs of the various departments and say, 'This is a new purpose and that is not', but on my reading of the opinions I did not detect any review of particular examples that might assist us in understanding what is meant by 'purpose'. That is the point on which this issue turns: what is 'a purpose' as defined in the Constitution Act? The Constitution Act only gives power to the Legislative Council to suggest amendments where there is a purpose that is not previously authorised.

I think it is correct that the budget papers should be examined in conjunction with the Bill. I do not put this into the same category as statutory interpretation in the courts. I think we are considering the interpretation of the Constitution Act in relation to the practice and procedure of the Parliament and the two Houses. For that purpose we must have regard to papers which might be tabled or which might be part of any statute upon which a determination as to procedure must be made. In the courts, on the other hand, those sorts of papers, such as committee reports and parliamentary debates, may not be taken into consideration in interpreting the statutes, and I suggest that is how it should be, although I do not want to open up that debate on this occasion.

I am conceding that on the consideration of the procedural issue and the constitutional issue we can have regard to the budget papers. The Parliamentary Counsel takes a very expansive view of what is a previously authorised purpose, and goes so far as to say that the new schedule proposed as a suggested amendment does cover previously authorised purposes. That, I think, would tend to defeat the object of section 63, although I do concede there have been, over recent years, Bills where there have been both previously authorised purposes and not previously authorised purposes covered within the legislation. But what the Parliamentary Counsel does not address within this Bill is whether there is any new purpose. He may, in fact, by implication, take the view that all of the Bill is previously authorised purpose, but he does not specifically address the issue as to whether there is any new purpose authorised by the Bill; to that extent at least he leaves that open to further argument.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Nothing is a previously authorised purpose in the way that they draft the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I did not interpret his opinion as saying that all of what is in the Bill is previously authorised and nothing is new. I did not interpret it as that; I may have been wrong.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They would have to produce two Bills.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am prepared to concede that I may have misinterpreted Parliamentary Counsel's opinion, but it seemed to me that he left that issue open. Both the Crown Solicitor and the Solicitor-General do acknowledge that the issue is one which is not easy to resolve and that there is at least an argument the other way from that which they have finally advised.

It is on that basis, therefore, as I said at the beginning of my contribution, that we will reserve our final position

on this important constitutional issue. We will not oppose the procedure which you have ruled upon and which the Attorney-General is seeking to follow. We do not want that lack of opposition to be construed as a final acceptance of the proposition upon which you have ruled and the Attorney-General is seeking to implement. We believe that it is an important issue which could well be the subject of further research, and, as the Presiding Officer, I would hope that you might be inclined to pursue it further now, not with a view to doing anything more than putting it into a perspective in the event that the issue arises at some time again in the future and, in that event, that we do not have to deal with it as quickly as we do now.

That last observation is not meant as a criticism of the way in which this matter has been now dealt with. I merely want to say that I think it is such an important issue that we do need some time to put it into perspective—to look at the important issues of relationships between the two Houses of Parliament. It may well be construed as a precedent for the future. Certainly it will be a matter taken into consideration if at some time in the future the issue arises again, and not only the decision which is taken in the Legislative Council but also the acceptance of that procedure by the House of Assembly. It may be that at some time in the future one will need to look carefully at whether, in the light of the franchise which now elects Legislative Councillors, it is appropriate to maintain the restrictions on our power which are in the Constitution Act and which, to some extent, are varied by this procedure.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I think the Opposition's approach to this matter in this House is a reasonable one and has been ever since attention was drawn to this problem, and I thank them for that approach, leaving aside any comments about their colleagues in another place for another day or another forum.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get to that in a minute, The Hon. Mr Griffin said that the schedule could have been fixed in the House of Assembly earlier, and pointed out that my criticism of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly was directed to a later point in time when the House of Assembly attempted to recommit the schedule. His point was that the House of Assembly should have amended the schedule before it left that House because the House of Assembly and the Government were aware of the changes that had taken place in governmental arrangements before the Bill left the House of Assembly. That is effectively the point that was made by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw when this matter was previously before us. I responded on that occasion by saying that she had made a reasonable point. I further went on to say that the advice within Government has not been unanimous on this point, and in particular on the point as to whether the Public Finance and Audit Act could be used to make reallocations after the Bill was passed.

I said earlier today that perhaps we need not have bothered; perhaps we could have done it that way, and it is highly unlikely that had we done it that way anyone would have challenged it; or perhaps, as the Crown Solicitor suggests in one of his opinions, the Treasurer could have done it in any event independent of the Public

Finance and Audit Act. However, the Crown Solicitor did believe that the Public Finance and Audit Act was not an appropriate way to reallocate the moneys after the passage of the Bill, but he has queried and suggested that perhaps the Treasurer had authority to do it in any event. But, of course, the further you go down that track the less meaningful becomes the appropriation process of Parliament.

That is why the Government felt that it was important that the Parliament have a chance to put the schedule in a form which accorded with the new arrangements. It is a reasonable point to make that the Government should have done it in another place before it first left there. The fact that it did not occur there was because there were somewhat differing views, but when it got here and these views were made known to me I thought the best course of action—to maintain as much integrity as possible in the appropriation process—was that the schedule should reflect the changed arrangements. I remain disappointed that the Liberal Party in another place used such a device to frustrate what I would have thought was good parliamentary practice and good Government practice. However, I accept the point made by the honourable member and also made by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw earlier that the House of Assembly and the Government could have corrected the schedule before it had left that House on the first occasion. The fact that that did not occur does not justify the actions of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly subsequently.

The Hon. Mr Griffin then dealt with the constitutional issues and has reasonably said he and the Liberal Party are not going to disagree with your ruling but have sought to not have this matter treated as a precedent for the future. That is a reasonable point for them to take. No doubt if this issue does arise in the future, those who support the President's ruling will seek to use it as a precedent; those who do not will get some comfort from the Hon. Mr Griffin's comments, and I suppose it is conceivable that the roles could be reversed at some time in the future.

The Hon. Mr Griffin said that the opinions of the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor were based on understandings of the position rather than actual knowledge. That can be said largely of the Solicitor-General's opinion, although he had the opportunity of reading the Crown Solicitor's opinion at the same time as concluding his opinion. It is clear the Crown Solicitor's opinion is more specific on a number of matters that have happened historically, and his first opinion does contain at least one example of a non-previously authorised purpose. That is dealt with at paragraph 15 of his opinion, where he refers to the proposed expenditure of \$4.1 million for the Hindmarsh Island bridge, which is expenditure on a new capital work for which there is no previous statutory authorisation. So, there is one example, although I concede that there was no time and that in their view it was not necessary to research the matter further.

I note the honourable member's comments about Parliamentary Counsel's opinion, and I take it that he was not really agreeing with Mr Hackett-Jones' opinion because, if that opinion is accepted, all matters in the Appropriation Bill are for previously authorised purposes, and he is talking about appropriation in a very general

way. I think that in itself undermines the appropriation process, and I find that opinion difficult to accept. Nevertheless, it is arguable and he has sought to argue it, because the Government has presented the one Bill drafted by Parliamentary Counsel now for many years, going back to the time of the earlier Liberal Government. Even though that appears to conflict with section 63, Parliamentary Counsel's argument is that it does not, because all the purposes are previously authorised. Of course, basically that would make the appropriation process of the Parliament not very specific. If that view was accepted, it would also mean that the Legislative Council would not have the power to suggest amendments under any circumstances, and I think that is taking the argument too far. I think also implicit in that argument is that, once the Bill has passed, the Government can virtually do what it likes with it. So, I think—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Have you considered the position in respect of two Appropriation Bills?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get to that in a minute. I noted the Hon. Mr Griffin's comments on Parliamentary Counsel's opinion. The next point he made—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I was not necessarily agreeing with it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No; the Hon. Mr Griffin said he was not agreeing with it, and I do not agree with it, either. However, it is arguable, like a lot of things in this area. The other point I want to address specifically is the assertion made by the Hon. Mr Griffin that adopting this procedure has widened the powers of the Legislative Council. I think that is a moot point. I do not think it does necessarily widen the powers of the Legislative Council to suggest amendments to money Bills; I think the key to it is the manner in which Appropriation Bills are presented to the Legislative Council. If it could happen that they were clearly split between the ordinary services of Government or previously authorised purposes or old purposes—however one would like to describe them—and new purposes or not previously authorised purposes, I think the powers of the Council to suggest amendments would be restricted in accordance with section 62 of the Constitution Act.

I do not accept the bald assertion that the powers of the Legislative Council are enhanced by this procedure, although I would accept that if Appropriation Bills are presented in this form, that is, with a mixture of previously authorised purposes and non-previously authorised purposes, then, as these opinions state and this procedure supports, the Legislative Council does have the power to suggest amendments to the whole Bill and, as I said, that is the procedure that we are adopting. Having said that, however, that assertion that that increases the powers of the Legislative Council depends on the Bill's being presented in the form that is currently before us, that being the form that has been presented to the Council since at least 1980-81. However, the matter does depend specifically on whether or not the Bill is presented in this form or whether two or any number of Bills are presented which split the process between previously authorised and non-previously authorised purposes.

The Leader of the Opposition asked whether the Government intends to do that in the future. The Solicitor-General has suggested that we look at section 63, the potential importance of which was realised only when researching this issue, and it is obviously a matter to which the Government will have to give attention. It may decide to leave it as it is; I cannot answer the Leader of the Opposition's question, because the Government as such has not considered it. However, it has been raised in the context of this debate and obviously will need at least to be examined.

So, in summary, I think the opinions, particularly from the Solicitor-General and the Crown Solicitor, are that the Council can suggest these amendments, because the Appropriation Bill contains purposes that are not previously authorised and that, while section 63 provides that Bills should be divided between those that contain

appropriations for purposes previously authorised and appropriations for purposes not previously authorised, that has not happened in recent times in this Parliament. The fact that it has not happened has not stopped the Legislative Council dealing with Bills, it has not stopped the Bills becoming valid law, and it should not do so on this occasion either. However, perhaps it does mean that we need to examine the issues that have been raised during this debate.

Suggested amendments carried, clause as suggested to be amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I move the following suggested amendment:

Page 3—Leave out the Schedule and insert the following new Schedule A:

SCHEDULE A

Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 1993

Purpose of Appropriation	Estimated Payments
Estimates 1992-93	\$
Legislative Council	2 511 000
House of Assembly	4 864 000
Joint Parliamentary Service	6 761 000
State Governor's Establishment	1 276 000
Premier and Cabinet	10 880 000
Industry, Trade and Technology	23 959 000
Premier and Minister of Economic Development, Miscellaneous	76 699 000
Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs	1 707 000
Treasury	15 430 000
Deputy Premier and Treasurer, Miscellaneous	656 143 000
Mines and Energy	20 867 000
Attorney-General's	23 615 000
Court Services	31 017 000
Electoral	2 161 000
Attorney-General and Minister for Crime Prevention, Miscellaneous	15 988 000
Office of Public Sector Reform	1 150 000
Office of Planning and Urban Development	27 814 000
South Australian Housing Trust	39 948 000
Recreation and Sport	17 430 000
Road Transport	8 100 000
State Transport Authority	152 487 000
Marine and Harbors	8 435 000
Office of Transport Policy and Planning	5 321 000
Environment and Land Management	1 309 000
Auditor-General's	8 540 000
Minister of Environment and Land Management, Miscellaneous	1 081 000
Police	273 236 000
Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous	18 265 000
Office of Aboriginal Affairs	3 109 000
Education	916 107 000
Employment and Technical and Further Education	174 817 000
Children's Services Office	54 374 000
Minister of Education, Employment and Training, Miscellaneous	224 874 000
Engineering and Water Supply	1 260 000
Housing and Construction	36 052 000
Minister of Public Infrastructure, Miscellaneous	8 836 000
Labour	36 040 000
Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous	225 000
Correctional Services	81 724 000
Arts and Cultural Heritage	68 185 000
Public and Consumer Affairs	4 811 000
Minister of Consumer Affairs, Miscellaneous	20 000
Office of Business and Regional Development	1 085 000
Minister of Business and Regional Development, Miscellaneous	3 038 000
Tourism South Australia	16 725 000
Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous	7 355 000
State Services	7 639 000
Minister of State Services, Miscellaneous	1 500 000

Purpose of Appropriation	Estimated Payments
Estimates 1992-93	
	\$
South Australian Health Commission.....	789 100 000
Family and Community Services.....	165 734 000
Primary Industries.....	55 812 000
South Australian Research and Development Institute.....	2 500 000
Minister of Primary Industries and Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous.....	2 527 000
Premier and Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous.....	1 016 000
Treasurer, Miscellaneous.....	192 096 000
Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Miscellaneous.....	1 451 000
Agriculture.....	12 629 000
Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous.....	885 000
Fisheries.....	4 905 000
Minister of Education, Miscellaneous.....	46 578 000
Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Small Business, Miscellaneous.....	297 000
Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous.....	1 280 000
Environment and Planning.....	25 591 000
Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous.....	361 000
Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous.....	197 000
Lands.....	2 000 000
Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous.....	108 000
Minister of Labour and Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous.....	636 000
Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous.....	93 008 000
Total.....	4 503 481 000

Suggested amendment carried; Schedule as suggested to be amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill recommitted.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

New Schedule A—reconsidered.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: First, I want to make some brief comments in relation to the way in which the Liberal Party intends to handle this debate in Committee on the Appropriation Bill, for the benefit not only of the Ministers but also the officers who will need to come and go throughout the day. We want to give some rough indication of timetabling so that we do not unnecessarily keep officers here. As the Hon. Mr Griffin indicated earlier, obviously there are concerns that the Liberal Party has in relation to the process and certainly with elements of the changes in the schedules that we are talking about. Most of these major concerns relate to the portfolios of Ministers in another place. I indicate that it is not the intention of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council to pursue those in the broad today. We believe that that substantive debate will need to be taken up with the responsible Ministers and their officers in another place during debate tomorrow. We share some of the concerns that our colleagues in the other place have in relation to some of those schedule questions, but we will leave it to them to explore those issues.

I indicate that I had a general discussion with the Leader of the Government in this place yesterday and I propose to lead off in this substantive part of the Committee stage with some Treasury related questions to the Attorney in relation to the schedules. We then intend to move into the general area of public sector reform, which questions will be directed to the Attorney and his officers. I presume that we will be able to handle a number of these questions this morning before the lunch break. Next, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw will commence questions to the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage and the Minister for the Status of Women, as

well as questions relating to her other portfolios. We shall then move into one of the other substantive areas, with some questions to the Minister of Transport Development. Certainly, this will not occur until some time after 3.15, when Question Time concludes.

We will then have questions concerning the South Australian Timber Corporation and small business. Officers required in relation to these matters will not be required until some time after 4 o'clock. Then, if time permits, we will have some questions on consumer affairs—I will leave it to my colleague the Hon. Mr Griffin to determine how he proceeds. If time does not permit he may wish to read them into the record, for response later. I will leave that for discussion between the Hon. Mr Griffin and the Minister.

I have had a discussion with the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage concerning questions that I had placed on notice during the second reading debate in relation to education. The Minister was good enough to table some of those responses last week, and I have asked the Minister to take the first opportunity in Committee to seek leave to incorporate the replies into *Hansard*. I have also asked the Minister whether, in relation to the second lot of questions that I asked, she can chase those up with the Minister of Education Employment and Training to see whether there is likely to be any response to those before the conclusion of the Appropriation Bill debate in Committee today. If there is, I would like to see those responses incorporated as well.

My first question to the Attorney-General is in relation to the Appropriation Bill attachments 1 to 4, which were provided by Treasury officers to members of the Legislative Council. In particular, I refer to attachment 2, appropriation adjustments for 1992-93, under three headings of estimated payments—initial, adjusted and revised. Underneath the line references there to old portfolio areas, there are the initial appropriations, the amounts already expended up to a certain date, and then the balance or the revised amount that is left. Will the

Attorney-General indicate the cut-off date for making the judgment as to when expenditure was incurred and what the revised expenditure would be?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: 1 October.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: To clarify our understanding of this bottom of the line section: I refer to the Minister of Education, Miscellaneous line, for example, as it is one with which I am relatively familiar. The initial appropriation was \$74 million, approximately. Is it the case that up until 1 October \$28 million had been expended, leaving a balance or a revised appropriation of \$46 million?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am advised that it is the other way around: it is the \$46 million that has been spent up to 1 October.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is puzzling then as to how one reads the revised reference. Certainly on my reading of that, the initial appropriation was \$74 million. I take it that what the Treasury officers are saying is that the adjustment we are talking about is, in effect, the balance which has not been spent and which has been adjusted and sent to some new line somewhere—is that correct?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I now turn to attachment 3, where there is further reference to this education expenditure. In talking about July, August and September, the first three months of this financial year, for this particular line what is being suggested is that we have already spent \$46 million out of the \$74 million. The big expenditure item is the non-Government schools, where clearly the indication is that Treasury, in the first three months, has allocated \$41 million out of \$53 million. In my discussions with the non-Government schools, my understanding was that their big payment was generally made in December of this year, for next year, and certainly that non-Government schools did not have that particular offering.

Perhaps I could explain that again now that further Treasury officers have arrived. The way we are to read attachment 3, under the general heading 'Minister of Education, Miscellaneous', is that \$41 million under the line 'Non-Government schools' has been expended in the first three months of this financial year out of the total financial year allocation of \$53 million. My understanding from non-Government schools is that the big payment that they get during the financial year is actually made in December. My understanding may be wrong, and I do not wish to hold up the proceedings at this stage, but if there is no immediate response I am prepared to allow Treasury officers to take that on notice and to provide a response this afternoon.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not know whether the Education Department is trying to make a profit on the way. I am advised that the money has been expended, but we can check and I will reply by letter.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On the same page, under 'State Youth Affairs', there is an appropriation of \$619 000, yet there is no expenditure for a quarter of the year. I take it that the Treasury advice is that State Youth Affairs has not spent any money in the first three months, or is that a particular line under State Youth Affairs? I am presuming that State Youth Affairs officers are still having their salaries paid. Does that come from some other line that is not therefore thrown up in the schedule

and this is some sort of grant line that is not paid until the last nine months of the year? I do not want to delay the proceedings. If there is a need for further advice to be taken, I am relaxed about that further advice being taken and perhaps an answer provided later.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The problem is that I have the Treasury officers who are here for general policy, but these two schedules were obviously prepared in consultation with the agencies. Treasury would prefer to check with the agencies to see what the explanation is for specific questions which are within the province of other agencies. We may be able to answer some of them, but for agency specific questions we may have some problems at this general level.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: To expedite proceedings, perhaps I could indicate that there is a series of questions like this with which I do not intend to delay the Committee now. If the Attorney-General will undertake that Treasury officers in relation to those two areas could this afternoon get us some sort of response, that will at least clarify our thinking in relation to the others and it may be that many of the other questions would not need to be chased up. I will leave my specific questions on that matter and hopefully get a response through the Attorney-General later this afternoon.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No; they are all basically in relation to that. They are all basically the same type of question. Some areas do not have any expenditure, but I presume that officers are still being paid their salaries. Therefore, there may be other lines that are not being adjusted or something. That will clarify our understanding.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We will try to get that information.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In that context, under 'Premier and Cabinet', there is the new agency 'Office of Public Sector Reform'. That seems to take over the unspent balance of the GARG office of \$306 000. Then it takes over part of the office of Cabinet and Government Management, which is the unspent balance of \$844 000. It is not clear to what part that refers. Again, if the Attorney-General needs more time to consider it, I shall be happy to receive an answer at some stage in the future. Could the Attorney-General indicate what part of the office of Cabinet and Government Management is referred to in that schedule?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the honourable member indicates, the Office of Public Sector Reform has an appropriation of \$1.15 million. These funds have been transferred to the Office of Public Sector Reform from the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The position of Chief Executive Officer has been created from the former position of Chief Executive Officer, Government Agencies Review Group. The office will continue to service the Government Management Board and the following four existing positions will be transferred: Director, Government Management; Project Officer; Secretary; and Senior Consultant.

The Public Sector Reform team consists of the following: Director, Public Sector Reform; Senior Consultant, Financial Strategies; Senior Consultant, Economic Strategies; Senior Consultant, Operations Audit; Senior Consultant, Best Practice; Senior

Consultant, Customer Service; Consultant, Customer Service; Senior Consultant, Public Relations; Consultant, Unions; Secretary; and Clerical Officer. Other staff will be seconded from time to time to this team, but it is the intention to keep the team small. Some costs are being built in for administration, although an administrative support service is being negotiated from the Premier's Department to reduce overheads.

Staff presently funded on grants from the Government Management Board will be attached to the staff of the Office of Public Sector Reform until those moneys run out, at which time they will be returned to their department of origin. The total staff numbers of the Government Management Board and the Government Agencies Review Group were more than those anticipated for the new Office of Public Sector Reform. The new office is streamlined. The surplus staff are being placed back in other positions in the Public Service.

I should say that at this stage, apart from the Director of Public Service Reform, we are in the process of making appointments to these offices; thus, there are no people in those positions at present. That is the general structure of public sector reform. The sum of \$1.15 million is taken out of the Premier's lines and includes some of the GARG officers and enough moneys to support the Public Service reform team that I have just outlined. The general structure is that the Government Management Board will continue to be chaired by the new Director of Premier and Cabinet, Dr Crawford; however, Ms Sue Vardon will be the Chief Executive Officer of the Government Management Board.

GARG itself has been abolished and the GARG functions will continue to be carried out under the auspices of the Government Management Board. For the moment, Mr Barry Greer has been given responsibility for overseeing the continuing GARG process and any new processes under the general direction of Ms Vardon as the Chief Executive Officer. She will also head up the Public Service reform unit, which will be separate from the Government Management Board but, obviously, because she is Chief Executive Officer of both, there will be close cooperation and liaison between the two bodies, as they are both engaged in similar work. However, the Public Service reform unit will be involved in what I might call the macro issues of public sector reform—the big issues of principle. The initiatives started under GARG and similar initiatives will continue under the Government Management Board and, of course, the Commissioner for Public Employment and the Minister of Labour will still have responsibility for what I might call the nuts and bolts administration of the Government Management and Employment Act etc. once policies are determined. Basically, that is the structure which is envisaged and which is currently being put in place.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Attorney-General identified a number of positions that have not yet been filled. Have the job specifications for those positions been developed? If they have, can they be made available, not necessarily this afternoon but at some stage within the foreseeable future? If they have not been developed, when are they likely to be developed and can they be made available when they have been developed?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Ms Vardon has been working with a somewhat limited staff since she began,

but she has been working diligently. Whether she has actually had job specifications prepared for all those positions, I cannot say. However, I am certainly happy to provide that additional information to the honourable member by letter when I can.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Would it be possible to obtain information about the levels at which the various officers will be appointed?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Is it proposed that those people will be appointed on a contract basis, or will they be appointed under the normal Government Management Employment Act provisions?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I believe that the Chief Executive Officer will attempt to obtain these people from within the service in the first instance, as is the general policy of Government. It would be only after it appeared that it was not possible that any outside advertising would occur. If people are already in the Public Service, in all likelihood they would be permanent public servants. However, if it is necessary to advertise outside regarding positions such as this, I think consideration would be given to whether it is appropriate to bring some people in on contract.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I refer again to page 5 of attachment 3; I take it that that part of the Office of Cabinet and Government Management referred to is just the Government Management Board. If not, what other parts of the Office of Cabinet and Government Management are to be transferred?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the question is whether any function of the Office of Cabinet will go over to the public sector reform unit, the answer is 'No.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The document refers to the Office of Cabinet and Government Management, in part.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is because some officers within the Office of Cabinet and Government Management were responsible for supporting the Government Management Board. Some of the officers in the Office of Cabinet and Government Management will remain in that office.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Will they service Cabinet particularly?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, and other officers will come across to the public sector reform unit.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In an earlier response, the Attorney-General said that the Government Agency Review Group is being disbanded but that the functions it exercised will be undertaken by the Office of Public Sector Reform.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: By the Government Management Board.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Attorney also referred to the macro issues, the big issues of principle, which will be a primary focus of the office. Can he indicate at this stage whether those issues of principle have been identified or whether that is an issue for some time in the future?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They have been identified to some extent. In fact, I think that, in answering a question on this topic asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas, if I remember correctly, I outlined my attitude and approach to this issue. The impetus has arisen from the Ernst and Young consultancy to the A.D. Little report, in which

certain assertions were made about the efficiency of the South Australian Public Service in delivering its services. It was suggested that in South Australia we pay more for service delivered than do people in some other States, and more than the national average. The argument is put that the South Australian public sector, like the private sector, needs to be up with the best practice—that is the current phraseology used around Australia and, indeed, internationally. Basically, the challenge is to ensure that the public sector is up to that standard of best practice.

I have been brought up on the conventional wisdom—and the two might not necessarily be inconsistent—that South Australia had a lower level of taxation than most other States, which is true, and a higher level of public service, which is also true, certainly in a number of areas of Government expenditure, and by that I mean higher than the Grants Commission standard.

However, I think the A.D. Little report and the Ernst and Young consultancy have said that we have achieved that because of Grants Commission policy—a very long historical policy—of equalisation which has meant that in the allocation of Commonwealth funds to the States South Australia has got a reasonable share, because our capacity to generate income is less than that of New South Wales and Victoria. That, according at least to the Victorians and New South Welshmen, has flowed through to those States having higher levels of taxation than the smaller States and also to lower per capita levels of Commonwealth grants. They argue that that should not continue. That is one of the great debates that is going on in Commonwealth/State relations at the present time.

If the previous policies of the Grants Commission are overturned then in future South Australia will get proportionately less in allocation from the Commonwealth Government than it has in the past. That issue has not been resolved, but it is certainly on the agenda at the Premiers Conference. If that does occur, of course, whether now, in 18 months or 18 years time, when there might be a different Government, it will be a problem that the State will have to deal with. That emphasises the importance of ensuring that our public sector is up to best practice and to being the most efficient and effective in Australia.

Having said that, as I said in answer to an earlier question, I intend to have the Ernst and Young consultancy put under the microscope, because if we are going to talk about public sector reform I do not want to continue to have an argument about whether its conclusions are justified. I think it is important that the facts which lead one to a particular policy are at least agreed in so far as they can be agreed.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not sure; I think someone here is looking at it. Treasury is looking at it at the moment. I can assure the honourable member that it does not have a vested interest in defending anyone's position; it is always telling the Government that we should be cutting back and doing this and that. So, it will be done. It is being put under the microscope and Treasury is assisting in that process. Ms Vardon is responsible for it, and undoubtedly we will consult with the authors of the Ernst and Young consultancy.

So, what is public sector reform about? It is about taking up the Ernst and Young consultancy, the issues raised there, assessing their veracity and then working out what needs to be done to ensure that South Australia has a public service which is up to best practice. I do not want to outline the sorts of proposals that we have in mind. As I have already indicated, I intend to make a fuller statement on this topic, possibly in the Parliament if it is prepared by the time we get up or, alternatively, at some appropriate forum—perhaps even at a press conference. It may be a speech, but it will certainly be some time before Christmas.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Is a timetable set for the review?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Sure, when I make my statement, which I said will be before Christmas at the very latest, obviously we will want to comment on the Ernst and Young findings in that statement. We will then say, 'This is what we accept; this is what we do not accept,' or whatever. That will be in broad terms because we are here talking about general principles applicable to the public sector.

As I said, the Minister of Labour Relations and the Commissioner of Public Employment continue to deal with the nuts and bolts of appointments and policy under the GME Act, etc. The Government Management Board will continue deal with GARG initiatives and some of the things that it has in train, such as the review of SAFA, etc. The Public Sector Reform Unit will be dealing with broad issue of best practice to ensure that what we have here in South Australia is in fact as efficient a Public Service as we can get.

Of course, one of the problems, if we say that we are spending more on the delivery of services than some—not all—other States, might simply be the size of the population. It may be that one can deliver services more efficiently in Victoria, for instance, where there is a large population and a smaller State rather than a small population and a large State. That in itself may account for the fact that we spend more on some services than do other States. They are the sorts of things we have to look at. So, when members make speeches about it hopefully there will be some agreement on the facts.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Does the Attorney-General envisage that the Office of Public Sector Reform will also have an interest in the delivery of services or the undertaking of enterprise by statutory authorities? If so, does he also then envisage that one of the responsibilities of the office will be to give advice to Government on issues like privatisation, private sector provision of services, contracting out and all those sorts of issues?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In general terms, the office would cover the statutory authorities. It is not going to be a unit which is there supervising statutory authorities. I should not give members the wrong impression. However, the best practice principles that it outlines should, in the Government's view, also apply to statutory authorities. So, it is not a body or a unit that is confined in its operations to the Public Service in the purest sense of term. It does have a broad brief.

The questions of privatisation, of course, are very controversial and really come down to Government policy. The unit will have to implement whatever Government policy is determined.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I suppose if a proposal came up to privatise, the Public Sector Reform Unit may well be involved in it. That really has not been determined.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member should just hold on for a little while, because I intend to make a statement about these matters. Perhaps he can requestion me next year about the specifics of the statement that I have made. The first thing I did after taking over this position was say, 'Let us get the administrative arrangements sorted out.' That is in the process of happening. I said that I wanted a full report to table in the Parliament on GARG, what happened with it, what it achieved and what are the ongoing projects. That is in the process of happening as well. I said that I wanted prepared a broad policy document which would outline the principles of public sector reform that the Government could agree to and operate under for however long. That is in the process of happening. So, the issues that the honourable member raised will undoubtedly come up in that context.

I do not intend to go into the issue of privatisation or non-privatisation at this stage. Issues of privatisation, as the honourable member knows, are matters of broad Government policy, and whether they will be specifically addressed by public sector reform remains to be seen, just as does the general question of public sector numbers. It is not something that will be dealt with by the public sector reform group. Whether there ought to be a certain level of public sector numbers—more or less or the current numbers—is a matter that will be determined at the policy level of Government. Public sector reform will have to fit in with whatever that determination is, and that determination will have to be made in the context of the budget considerations and deliberations.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Does the overall responsibility for that lie with the Premier? The Office of Public Sector Reform does not get involved other than to advise?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Office of Public Sector Reform might have some views on public sector numbers, but the Office of Public Sector Reform is not there just to recommend number cuts as a razor gang exercise saying, 'This department in three months will have to have 30 per cent fewer employees.' That is not the name of the game for the public sector reform group; it has a broader brief—it is not just a razor gang, as I said before.

If decisions are made about public sector numbers, they will be made by Cabinet in the context of the Government's overall policy and the budget. Obviously, that will involve input from the Treasury, which tells us, 'We haven't got enough money to employ all these public servants'; labor, which will say, 'If you sack them, you will have industrial trouble'; public sector reform, which could have another view; and the Premier, who will have a view as well. The point is that that issue will be decided as part of the general economic policy of the Government; it is not a matter that is specifically the responsibility of the Office of Public Sector Reform, although it may have some comments to make about it. The Office of Public Sector Reform is involved in other issues, not just public sector numbers.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Will the Minister of Public Sector Reform confirm that an advisory group including people from the private sector has been established by Government in relation to public sector reform? If so, was that instituted by the Minister of Public Sector Reform, the Premier or the Treasurer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If that is so, they have not told me about it yet. I will obtain a response for the honourable member.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What are the remuneration packages of the new super six or super seven coordinators under this restructuring that has been instituted? Two or three weeks ago, I asked a question about one of those coordinators. In providing his response, could the Attorney-General indicate whether all the coordinators—that is, super six or super seven—are being paid similar packages, or are they being paid different packages depending on their respective responsibilities?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This matter is not properly directed to me in my role as Minister of Public Sector Reform. As I said, it is a matter of nuts and bolts.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Treasury officers might know the answer.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They might, and they might not; I do not know. The point is that those sorts of things are not my specific responsibility as Minister of Public Sector Reform. However, as I represent the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister of Labour Relations in this place, I will attempt to obtain a reply on those matters.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

QUESTIONS

ASER

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about the ASER Development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In 1988 Southern Cross Homes Incorporated purchased a one-third share of the ASER Development, which includes the Casino, the Convention Centre and the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In the Southern Cross Homes Incorporated most recent report to shareholders, it expresses concern at the fact that it still had not received any dividend on its investment. The Chairman, Mr Taylor, stated:

This lack of return is a matter of concern which we intend to address as best we can.

I have been advised by a senior Treasury source that Southern Cross Homes has, in the last two weeks, taken this issue up with the Government and the Treasurer in particular. Southern Cross Homes has told the Treasurer it is very unhappy with the non-existent return on its \$12 million investment. As its investment was fully financed by borrowings it has argued its investment cost is now valued at about \$22 million. It has discussed a number of options with the Government, including selling

its interest in ASER to SASFIT at a cost of \$22 million. Another option which has been discussed is a re-negotiation of the complex rental and financing deal involving the Government and the ASER Property Trust so that Southern Cross Homes does start to receive some return on its investment.

I am further advised that the Under Treasurer, Mr Peter Emery, has been given 14 days by the Treasurer to come back with some sort of solution to the problem. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Treasurer had discussions with Southern Cross Homes about the possibility of SASFIT purchasing the one-third share of the ASER Development owned by Southern Cross Homes, and has SASFIT been involved in any discussions on this matter?

2. What has been the outcome of discussions between the Treasurer and Southern Cross Homes on this issue, and what has been the advice of the Under Treasurer on the options available to the Government?

3. Has the Treasurer had any discussions with Southern Cross Homes about the question of whether Mr Ian Weiss, the current Chairman of SASFIT, would be reappointed on 1 July 1993 when his current appointment expires, and, if so, has the Treasurer given Southern Cross Homes any undertakings on this matter?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

AGE DISCRIMINATION

The Hon. K .T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about age discrimination.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K .T. GRIFFIN: I have been contacted on behalf of a constituent, who may in fact have been the same person who complained about the issue to Murray Nicholl yesterday afternoon on ABC radio. A constituent recently lost a casual employee and, after recently reading that if every business employed one junior that would help the youth unemployment problem, he decided to put on a full time junior, but he seems to have run into all sorts of problems in trying to do that. This constituent wanted to place an advertisement in the *Advertiser* for a 16-year-old receptionist. The *Advertiser* told him he could not do this as it was against the law and that the Equal Opportunity Commission would take him to court. He rang the Equal Opportunity Commission and it said, 'No', he could not do it. He rang the Attorney-General's Department and received the same advice. Later, the Attorney-General's Department rang and said that he could do this because an amending Bill had passed through the Parliament.

The constituent rang the Equal Opportunity Commission and told it this, and staff there said that they were unaware that the Bill had passed, because the Attorney-General's Department had not advised them. The person then asked the *Advertiser* to place the advertisement for a 16-year-old. Staff there said he could only specify that he wanted a junior and that he could not specify the age. The Equal Opportunity Commission has said the same thing, but it is getting a legal opinion on whether a person can advertise for a person of a specific

age, and it also says that the employer is leaving himself open to a legal challenge from, say, a 17-year-old who is better qualified for the position advertised than the 16-year-old, who is really what the employer wants. Yesterday afternoon the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity was on ABC radio. She admitted that she had not known that the Bill had passed the Parliament, and I think she expressed some surprise that that had occurred. My questions are:

1. Why was there a breakdown in communication between the Attorney-General and his office on the one hand and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity on the other?

2. Had the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity supported the Bill's being introduced in the first place?

3. When will a clear description of what is allowed by the amendment be available from the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity to interested persons, including employers and the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The age discrimination provisions of the Equal Opportunity Act were passed by this Parliament, with the support of all Parties, including the—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am just letting everyone know that. It passed with the support of all Parties. During the course of the administration of the Act it became clear that there was an anomaly in that junior rates of pay were provided for in some awards yet, under the Act, it was not possible for an employer to advertise for a junior employee, even though that employer had the intention of employing only a junior, pursuant to the award. As a result of that, the Government introduced legislation to correct that anomaly. That was publicly announced to everyone. Parliament is a public place, and ills that go through this Parliament are not put through in secret; they all happen in the glare of the public and the ever-present media, which are down here every day reporting our proceedings. So, the Bill was introduced, a press release was put out and it went through the normal process of being passed here and then passed in the House of Assembly. Then followed the further process, which is that it then goes to the Executive Council, where the Governor assents to the Bill.

In this case, I do not believe there was a proclamation clause in the Bill, so it came into effect on assent. Some of the proceedings of the Executive Council are made public through the *Government Gazette*, which is also a document made available to the public, the media and Government departments. Indeed, sometimes the media are most enthusiastic about getting hold of the *Government Gazette*, depending on what is in it. On this occasion, they were not, and apparently neither was the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, because she overlooked the fact that the Bill had been passed. I am not making any criticism of her for that, but the fact of the matter is that it was publicly announced and went through a process in Parliament; it would have been publicly indicated in the *Government Gazette* that the Bill had been assented to and had therefore become law.

I would expect that, when Government departments were aware that legislation that affected their administration was being passed by the Parliament, they would take some steps to monitor the progress of the Bill

and to ensure that when it was proclaimed or came into effect they had procedures in place to ensure that there were not the sort of problems which apparently occurred with the honourable member's constituent and which quite clearly should not have occurred. However, I merely make the point that it all happened publicly and that the officials concerned in the administration of this Act should have been aware that the Bill had passed. So, there was no breakdown in communication. I do not see it as the role of the Attorney-General's Office to send out notices of which Bills have been passed or proclaimed to all and sundry in the Government sector. That may be appropriate on some occasions, but they have a *Government Gazette* for that purpose, and one of the reasons that it is available is so that people in the Public Service and the public generally can be aware of what is happening, although I suspect the *Government Gazette* is read with more enthusiasm by Public Servants than it is by the general public.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It's not very exciting.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It's informative.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is informative but not exciting: that is quite right. There was some discussion about the Bill within Government before it was introduced. It is true to say that some sectors in the community opposed the Bill initially. In fact, when the Bill was before Parliament it was suggested that it would be opposed by some organisations. However, that was by no means the majority view. It seemed to me to be a matter of plain commonsense that the anomalies should be fixed up—that it is not acceptable for employers to be able to employ juniors and not advertise for them. So the Government proceeded with it.

I am not sure that I had a specific expression of view from the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity on the topic. I think when the Government made its decision she was happy to acquiesce in it. I do not believe she opposed it initially, but I can check that and bring back a reply for the honourable member. I will also check to find out whether there is any explanatory document prepared by the Commissioner for distribution to members of the public.

BOAT LEVY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development a question about a recreational boating levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Drafts of a new Harbors and Navigation Act prepared by the Department of Marine and Harbors over the past two months have included provision for a levy to be fixed by regulation on the registration or renewal of the registration of a power driven recreational vessel. The recreational boating industry in South Australia reluctantly agreed to this levy (this was before the Minister's time) when it was first proposed by the Department of Marine and Harbors as it saw no other way but to dig into its own pockets to generate the funds necessary to construct urgently needed boating facilities around South Australia.

Last year the Government granted no funds for this purpose, and again this year the Government has

allocated no funds. In fact, the Government has been steadily starving the Recreational Boating Fund of moneys since the former Tonkin Liberal Government established it over a decade ago with an annual grant of \$500 000. By contrast, the Queensland Government has provided grants of over \$8.5 million for the establishment of recreational boating facilities in that State over the past three years.

I have now been advised that the Minister, since she assumed this new responsibility, has decided to remove the levy option from the Harbors and Navigation Bill—a move that would have provided about \$350 000 for recreational boating facilities in South Australia on an annual basis. Recognising that there are more than 90 000 people involved in recreational boating in South Australia on a regular basis (and the Government's own documents on this matter identify that that is increasing by 7 000 annually) I ask the Minister:

1. Why has the Minister backed down on the former Minister's resolve to introduce a levy on boat owners to fund recreational boating facilities in South Australia?

2. What substitute source of funding is she now prepared to consider in order to provide the funds so urgently needed to build and improve recreational boating facilities for South Australian boat users and the tourism industry?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, discussions with the recreational boating and commercial fishing associations led to a decision being taken by my predecessor that provision would be made in this draft Bill for a levy to be charged to both those sectors of the boating community to enable such work to be undertaken around the State, and for the provision of facilities for the commercial fishing industry and also recreational boating purposes.

The understanding was that there was complete agreement on that matter. As I understand it, part of that agreement for some reason or other no longer exists, and I have been advised that there is now a division of opinion among these sectors about the question of a levy. So, in order that the Bill might proceed as quickly as possible, I gave instructions a couple of weeks ago that the clauses relating to the levies be removed until such time as there is full agreement on this matter.

Political agreement is also quite important in this instance: if there is to be provision in the legislation for such a levy to be charged to provide for facilities then, of course, it also must have the support of the Parliament. I presume that the honourable member, by raising this question, is indicating on behalf of her Party that, should such a levy provision be included in the Bill, her Party would support such a measure. I take that as a positive stance, because in principle I have no problem with the idea of such a levy being provided for, as long as there is general community agreement that such a measure is desirable and will meet the needs of the sector of the community upon whom the levy would be placed.

So, in summary, as have indicated, my understanding is that the agreement which previously existed in the industry groups for some reason or other no longer exists, and for that reason I decided at this stage not to proceed with the implementation of the levy proposal. But, of course, during the Committee stage of the Bill, anyone is free to move such an amendment or, if the industry

organisations over the next few weeks are able to reach agreement once more on this matter, it can be considered again.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As a supplementary question, will the Minister clarify the situation (and she can bring back a report if she cannot do so now)? My understanding is that the disagreement is not about the imposition of the levy but about the purpose for which the levy would be used, whether it involves the construction of new or the maintenance of existing facilities.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, there are two issues here. Certainly, some disquiet has been expressed to me by representatives of the recreational boating associations indicating that officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors have suggested that some of the money raised might be used for purposes other than that for which they felt such a fund was established. However, my understanding, having now questioned officers of the department on this matter since I met with those associations, is that formal negotiations have not taken place on the matter at this point. I do not see that as a significant issue, because I believe that, once there are complete negotiations on the matter of the purpose to which such a fund would be put, appropriate agreements can be reached between the Government and the industry associations. There is this other issue to which I referred in my main reply to this question that there is no longer an agreed position between the boating and fishing associations on the question of a levy and, until there is, I am not prepared to proceed with the levy proposals.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development a question about public transport at the multifunction polis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: A freedom of information request by my colleague the Hon. Mike Elliott produced copies of submissions to the State Government on the transport implications of the proposed MFP at Gillman. Much of the content of the submissions raised serious doubts about planning costs and infrastructure requirements for the project. The Department of Road Transport, the STA and the Office of Transport Policy have all questioned the MFP's transport concept. The Department of Road Transport's submission suggests adequate infrastructure needs have not been contemplated by the draft EIS, a situation which it predicts will lead to increased costs to the State.

The department claims that significant extra road traffic will be generated by the MFP, requiring major intersection upgrades in the vicinity of Gepps Cross/Grand Junction Road and South Road. The costs for the upgrades have not been taken into account by MFP planners. In addition, the STA points to further unquantified costs, stating in its submission:

...if the public transport corridor is to be utilised ... major infrastructure work would be required. This will require significant funding . . . under existing funding arrangements only a bus system could be expected...

That is a far cry from the claims of MFP proponents that the MFP would have a revolutionary transport system. The STA and the Office of Transport Policy and Planning claim:

...the transport aspects are very conservative and could hardly be viewed as a model for future urban developments ... It is also pointed out:

...adopting the arterial road layout shown in the design concept will have the effect of encouraging residents to travel by car ...

So much for the pretence to environmental considerations. The STA notes:

...of the 30 urban villages shown in the plan, the public transport corridor only passes through eight of them ...

Many of the villages are expected to be at least 600 metres across, often bisected by lakes, requiring far greater walking distances than the recommended 500 metres maximum to access public transport. Clearly, the MFP design is not transport friendly. It will encourage further reliance on cars and will have limited access and mobility for residents and workers. Therefore, my questions to the Minister are:

1. What are the principal modes of transport to be employed at the NIFP?
2. What will be the establishment costs for public transport options at the MFP?
3. Does the Minister agree that the provision of just a standard bus service for the MFP can hardly be viewed as a model for future transport development?
4. Does the Minister also agree that, with only eight villages of the 30 to have direct access to a bus service, there is minimal encouragement for residents of the MFP to use public transport?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am sure the honourable member understands as well as anyone that planning for the multifunction polis is at an early stage of development and that there still needs to be much work done in determining the nature of the urban and housing villages as well as some of the industrial and business aspects of the MFP. At the appropriate stages, I would expect that people from the Department of Road Transport, the Office of Transport Policy and Planning and the STA, and anyone else who has an interest in these matters, will take part in detailed planning of community transport needs. What is possible will be dependent on the nature of MFP developments and business activity that can be encouraged there, and one essential ingredient that will have to be taken into consideration is who is paying.

All those matters are yet to be determined finally and will take shape as the project itself takes shape. I hope that, through the various agencies that form part of the transport development portfolio, and working with people from other places (if that is appropriate), we will be in a position to provide modern, convenient and efficient forms of public transport for those people who may be attracted to live in the area of the MFP core site.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: As a supplementary question, do we take it from the Minister's answer that we actually disregard the current AUP plan for transport?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I think that all the planning for the MFP, to some extent, must be viewed as a guideline, because there is no doubt that alterations will be made to the nature of the development as it proceeds and takes shape.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Are you having discussions with them about it?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not having discussions with the people at the MFP about this matter. In fact, it is not something upon which I have initiated discussion at this stage, but at some stage I intend to be involved to the extent that it is appropriate with the ministerial committee that has oversight of the development of the MFP. Certainly, through the responsibilities that I have as Minister responsible for the development of the transport hub concept, I would expect some interface will be required with that ministerial subcommittee. Already I have had some discussions with the relevant people on the transport hub transport requirements as they interface with the MFP site, but at this stage I do not view the public transport needs of the MFP development itself as one of the major priorities for the first few weeks of my position as Minister of Transport Development. I would hope that, in the coming weeks, I will have the opportunity to have further discussion with the relevant people about the MFP and the input that agencies under my control will need to have in developing the MFP concept.

RAPE CRISIS CENTRE

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services a question about the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I understand there is a proposal to close the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre. The other terms one can use are 'relocation' or 'amalgamation' of the centre with the Sexual Abuse Clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre was established in 1976, 16 years ago, and now has a budget of approximately \$250 000, a staff of four full-time equivalents, and a client rate of 1 275 clients over a nine month period. The rate per month has increased from 41 in January to 386 in September. There is a concern that the medical model and physical surroundings of the Queen Elizabeth unit will be at variance to the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre. To emphasise this, I shall read part of a letter from a client of the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre. It states:

Since the time of my assault I have attempted various forms of counselling with doctors and psychologists but I have found that the most effective counselling that I have received has been at the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre. I believe that this is because they do not have the scientific medical background which tends to cloud fundamental issues with considerations about disease pathology and psychiatric theorems. The fact that the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre is not located on the grounds of a medical institution also removes the personal stigma of having to obtain help from a place where 'sick' people belong, because sexual assault survivors are not sick. They are merely trying to adjust their minds and souls to cope with what they experience in life.

My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Has consultation been originated by the Health Commission between the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre?

2. What other options are there if the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the centre have different approaches and issues and therefore are unable to work together?

3. Is there the option for the centre to remain as a unit with the original method of counselling? If not, why not?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development a question about STA services during Grand Prix week.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: In the lead-up to the Grand Prix, and particularly the week of the Grand Prix, traffic from the east, north-east and south-east of Adelaide becomes very congested. Two nights ago during peak hour it took me a quarter of an hour to get to Greenhill Road from here. Motorists commuting to and from the city have to take alternative routes due to disruption to local traffic caused by road closures in the vicinity of the Grand Prix track. Will the Minister advise whether extra bus, train and O-Bahn services are provided, especially in peak hours, to encourage motorists to use the now advertised friendly STA services during the lead-up to the Grand Prix and to help minimise traffic snarls that occur at this time of the year in the eastern suburbs? If extra services are not provided, is it the Government's intention to introduce such extra services in future and to advertise these extra services in advance and during the two week disruption? If not, why not.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is my understanding that during every Grand Prix festival additional services *are* provided by the STA for the convenience of the travelling public and to encourage members of the public to leave their motor vehicles at home and travel to the city area by public transport so that congestion around the Grand Prix area can be minimised. That has been the practice since the Grand Prix first began in Adelaide, and as far as I know the same thing is happening this year. If it had not been for the fact that for the past three days I was on recreation leave, from which I had to return for today's parliamentary sitting, I would be in a position to provide more up-to-date information about the flow of public transport during the past few days as I receive such information on a regular basis for my own information about the efficiency and timeliness of buses, trams and trains as they travel through Adelaide as part of their usual service.

I do not have that information with me today as I have not been involved in the office for the past few days. However, everyone understands that during Grand Prix week many more people come to the city of Adelaide from all over the world and many people resident in Adelaide also want to visit the city centre for Grand Prix activities. We can expect more congestion on our roads, but most people also recognise that that is a sacrifice for one week a year and is worthwhile because the Grand Prix is of such major benefit to our State in tourism and financial terms.

Most people are prepared to put up with the inconveniences that it causes; but it certainly has been the practice of the Government and of the STA to encourage people during Grand Prix week to take public transport and to leave their motor vehicles at home, in order to minimise delays and to minimise traffic congestion.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. I agree with a lot of the Minister's response, but nobody knows about it. Two or three people have contacted me and said that they would not know whether there were extra buses. My question was: in future will the Minister advertise the fact that there are extra buses on—if indeed there are? People believe that there are not, but if there are why is this fact not advertised in the *Advertiser* or at least put on television? If it is just a short period surely it would not cost that much.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Well, advertising always costs a lot. But I will certainly seek further information from the STA as to the practices that it has followed in the past concerning the advertising of services. I recall seeing in past years such advertising and reading and hearing news reports encouraging people to take public transport and to leave their car at home. So, I imagine that the same thing is happening in the course of this Grand Prix. However, I shall make some inquiries of the STA to ascertain exactly what has been the practice and what is being pursued during the course of this Grand Prix.

PUBLIC AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about some computer programs in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: At page 137 of his report the Auditor-General states:

During recent years Audit has reviewed the department's progress towards the introduction of new information technology. The reviews have revealed continual delays in the upgrade of the department's systems, in particular the: Occupational Licensing System; Liquor Licensing System; and Residential Tenancies System.

The delays have resulted in the introduction of an interim Commercial Licensing System and the continued use of the manually orientated Residential Tenancies System. Both these systems have inadequate internal controls thereby increasing the risk of errors or unauthorised transactions being processed and remaining undetected.

In May 1992, Audit again expressed concern at the apparent slow rate of progress being achieved in respect to the upgrade of systems, particularly given the lack of adequate internal controls in some systems. Recent advice from the department on the progress of the aforementioned systems is summarised as follows:

Occupational Licensing: Implementation of the computerised Occupational Licensing System has suffered considerable delays, some of which have been caused through inter-agency approval processes for the introduction of new computer systems. Meanwhile, an interim system for commercial licensing is operating in-house on a network of personal computers, until the proposed system is implemented early in 1993.

In regard to that system, I ask: is it expected that the proposed system will be implemented early in 1993 and, if so, when in 1993? The Auditor-General further states:

Liquor Licensing: The initial delay until October 1991 was caused by under-estimation of the complexities associated with the project. Since October 1991, higher priority has been given to activities concerning the gaming machine legislation. The department has indicated that the implementation of the Liquor Licensing System is still dependent on Cabinet approval being obtained for the funding requirement.

My questions on that point are: has Cabinet yet approved the funding requirement? If not, when is that likely? Has this problem adversely affected the collection of revenue? The Auditor-General further states:

The department has commissioned a feasibility study and advised the likelihood of an interim bond system being operational by late 1992, prior to the development of a system fully integrated into the occupational licensing system. The response by the department confirms the slow rate of progress in implementing information technology improvements. Audit will continue to monitor developments.

The last two sentences that I read have been printed in bold type. My questions on this issue are:

1. Has the feasibility study been completed and, if so, what does it indicate?
2. Is the interim system yet in operation?
3. When is full integration expected?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have not received any information as to the programs being delayed from what is expected, but I will make inquiries to see whether there is any updated information on when the systems are now expected to be operational. I can assure the honourable member that there is no effect whatsoever on revenue collection by the liquor licensing system's being computerised. It is being devised to accommodate gaming machine licensing as well as liquor licensing, so the Liquor Licensing Commissioner will have at his disposal an integrated system, as he has the dual functions. I am not aware of any delays on what had previously been expected with regard to the computerisation of the different licensing systems, but I will make further inquiries and bring back a report.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: As a supplementary question, has Cabinet approval yet been obtained?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sorry, it is rather hard, when five or six questions are thrown, to recall them all. I expect to take the proposal to Cabinet in the very near future. Obviously, it has not been obtained yet, but it is certainly in the pipeline.

PARKING

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, representing the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, a question about clearway and parking signs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Everyone would be aware of the altered traffic patterns due to the Grand Prix, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Dunn noted. It amazes me that, even with the known possibility of a build-up of traffic around the circuit area, some councils are not helping the situation by scheduling all their earthworks for this week. I believe each of us will run into that problem. In addition, I bring up more evidence of traffic and parking sign problems. On Friday 30 October this year the Department of Road Transport, with the changing of the

signs indicating 1 1/2 hour clearways on the southern half of North Terrace, Kent Town, replaced the Kensington and Norwood parking signs with signs complying with the Australian Standard AS1742/11, and on Saturday 31 October this year the signs on the northern half of North Terrace, Hackney, were similarly changed.

Subsequent examination of the area indicated a complete mess. Without knowing fully what the signs should have been, the only accurate statement of the sign arrangement is that, for 22 areas between consecutive signs, the signs at each end were not compatible. However, all signs for temporary areas—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: That is right. This is a typical example that comes up almost on a daily basis. However, all signs for temporary areas did not have 'temporary parking control' written on them. Contact was made with officers of the administration of St Peters council who were amazed at the incompetent installation of the signs. The council stated that it had approved the department's coloured plan showing standard signs and their location, a condition being that the existing and temporary areas should be marked with signs in accordance with AS 1742/11.

The council has given an assurance that the required instruments in writing were made under regulation 11 of the local government parking regulations in respect of the intended temporary areas, but nothing had been done in respect of the existing areas being replaced. Without examination of any of the documents, it appears that all northern areas were unlawfully and/or incorrectly marked and the signs have been completely rearranged. The position regarding the southern half is ridiculous.

Under regulation 12 of the local government parking regulations of 1991, the chief executive officer of a council must keep a register of parking controls. The St Peters registry subsequently conforms to the requirement of the resolution. The Kensington and Norwood council has as its register a collection of pieces of paper in folders which in no way conform to the requirements of regulation 12, with no detail of temporary areas at all.

It would appear that all parking controls in Kensington and Norwood are unenforceable. The Kensington and Norwood council has said that no temporary provisions had been made for any zone after one which was to apply on 18 July 1992. No provision has therefore been made for any temporary area on the southern half of North Terrace, Kent Town, except a bus zone area.

The council cannot prohibit the parking of vehicles without a declaration under parking regulation 5 or an instrument under regulation 11 of the Local Government Act. Therefore, except for two signs for the bus zone all other parking signs on the northern half of North Terrace, Kent Town, are clearly false traffic control devices indicating no legal authority. There is apparently no declaration for prohibition zones east of 96.7 metres west of Fullarton Road, between six and 18 metres east of Dequetteville Terrace and two marking the prohibited zone in Fullarton Road. The signs at these areas should be removed and not be replaced as temporary zones cannot be established where a permanent zone is to be established.

The Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has been aware of the

matters I raise today since the beginning of this week. Therefore, my questions are:

1. Has the Minister instructed his officers to inspect the areas I have mentioned where it is alleged that traffic and parking control signs are incorrect?

2. Has he taken any action to correct the situation? I am informed that to date it has not been corrected.

3. Will he take action after the Grand Prix to make sure that proper traffic and parking control signs are in place before the next Grand Prix?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I point out to the honourable member, as I have indicated previously, that the Local Government Association has agreed to ensure that all councils in this State are made aware of their responsibilities under the parking regulations. I know that the Local Government Association has contacted all councils in this State in this regard.

As a result, many councils contacted the Local Government Association and Government officials for assistance on how to maintain a parking register and other matters under the Act. So, it is not as though the LGA has not undertaken the responsibility which it promised me it would undertake to keep councils informed and to assist councils with their parking regulations. However, I will certainly refer those questions to my colleague and bring back a detailed reply.

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage a question about Dr Willmot's statements on art funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I was interested to read an interview with Dr Willmot, the new CEO for the department, in the *Advertiser* on 24 October, and his novel suggestions in relation to funding the non-commercial art sector in this State. He said in part:

The highly commercial and profitable art forms should contribute to the wellbeing of the others.

He suggests that entrepreneurs who come to Adelaide and make huge profits at the box office should be expected to give something back to the non-commercial arts community. I ask the Minister whether that was a personal statement by Dr Willmot or one that was made with her knowledge and support, and is it now a matter that is being investigated by the department and the Minister for implementation in South Australia?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Dr Willmot had certainly not discussed that matter with me prior to the article appearing in the *Advertiser*. It is certainly an interesting and novel suggestion which I am sure is worthy of further consideration and discussion. I can certainly assure the honourable member that that consideration and discussion has not, at this stage, taken place.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety, a question about WorkCover.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last week I asked a question about the former licensee of the Roosters Club, a David Douglas Fisher, and the penalties which had been imposed on him for a number of counts of fraudulent conversion. At the time I referred to the payment to Fisher by WorkCover of weekly amounts of about \$600 for about 12 months, on the basis of Fisher's claim that he had suffered stress while employed by the club. The weekly payments were stopped by WorkCover in October and there is now a review by a WorkCover review officer. The main issue is whether Fisher's gambling problem caused his stress problem, as asserted by the Roosters Club, or whether the stress caused the gambling problem, as asserted by Fisher.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: It depends whether he was winning or losing.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I think he was losing, actually. The first review hearing was on Tuesday of this week, but by sheer luck the Roosters Club only found out about it five days earlier. The Secretary/Manager of the club had telephoned WorkCover to complain to a senior officer that a clerk had not been responding to telephone calls on at least three earlier occasions, and at that time she was told about the hearing. The senior officer said that that was not good enough and promised to have the clerk telephone the club; that still has not happened a week later.

The Secretary/Manager of the club attended the review hearing on Tuesday of this week and says she was appalled by what occurred. Fisher was represented by a lawyer but WorkCover was represented by a clerk who appeared not to be prepared to fight the case hard. When asked why WorkCover was not represented by a lawyer competent to fight the review, the clerk said that it was not WorkCover's policy to do so. The Secretary/Manager was concerned that this was a disputed claim and that she had information which could have been used by WorkCover in the attempts to fight the review.

The Secretary/Manager is also concerned that WorkCover did not appear to want to discuss the claim or the person's alleged injury with the employer to gain enough information to fight that claim which, as I say, the employer disputes vigorously. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister have the case investigated and bring back a report as to the attitude of WorkCover?

2. Will the Government insist that WorkCover challenges all dubious claims and require that WorkCover consults with employers of injured workers to ensure that all background necessary to challenge alleged fraudulent claims is obtained by WorkCover?

3. Will the Minister insist that WorkCover inform employers of review hearings sought by employees so that those interested employers may attend if they so wish?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This is a follow-up to a question asked earlier by the honourable member. I will refer that to my colleague and bring back a reply.

CLUB KENO

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about getting answers to questions on abuse of Club Keno.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In February of this year I first asked a question in this Chamber about the abuse of Club Keno, and I indicated again in April and again in August in follow-up questions to the Attorney-General that in March of this year Mr Laurie Fioravanti provided answers to the former Premier about abuse of Club Keno in South Australia but that since March of this year, even though the question had been asked in February, the former Premier, then the Acting Premier, Dr Hopgood, and now the new Premier, Mr Arnold, have evidently all refused to provide the answer that has been provided by Mr Laurie Fioravanti on the abuse of Club Keno.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It is not the Premier's responsibility any more.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would like to know whose it is now, but I will ask the question of the Attorney-General. It is quite simple: will the Attorney-General give an undertaking, as he has on two previous occasions now, to track down whose responsibility it is under the new restructuring of Government and give an undertaking that the response that Mr Fioravanti has provided to the Government about the abuse of Club Keno in South Australia will at last be provided before the end of this session?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is the responsibility of the Treasurer. I can only say that I will attempt to get an answer to the question for the honourable member. Whether that will mean that any documents are forthcoming, I do not know; however, the honourable member is entitled to an answer of some kind and I understand that what he is saying is that he has not received an answer of any kind, even one telling him that he will not get one. So, I will track it down and attempt to get some form of answer for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PARKING

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Has the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage an answer to my question of 8 September about parking signs?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government relations has provided the following response. I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

1. There were thirty-six Infringement Notices issued by the Police prior to the Mitcham Council removing signs. Of those issued twenty-three were subsequently withdrawn.

2. Six notices were expiated, none were cancelled and no refunds were given.

3. The remaining seven notices were forwarded for prosecution, resulting in two convictions and five withdrawals.

4. Department of Road Transport records indicate that clearway conditions on Goodwood Road between Edward Street and Springbank Road commenced on 15 July 1991 and operated during the morning peak (7.30am - 9.00am) and afternoon peak (4.30pm - 6.00pm).

The Department wrote to Mitcham Council on 12 June 1991 to inform Council of the impending clearway and requesting Council to ensure that existing and future parking restrictions did not conflict with the clearway conditions. It was subsequently noted that Council did not alter its signs until after the clearway became operative. To overcome this problem in the short term, it is understood that Council removed some existing 1/2 hour parking at all times" signs. Any complaints concerning the panting signs should be directed to Mitcham Council.

It is standard Departmental practice to advise the Police of the implementation of new clearways or of changes to the operating hours of existing clearways on roads for which the Department is responsible, such as Goodwood Road. The policy of Police enforcement is left to that Department.

The Department currently has no changes planned to the existing clearway provisions on Goodwood Road. However, it should be noted that the clearway between Edward Street and Springbank Road was replaced with a bus lane on 17 February 1992 as part of a Government initiative to introduce the Transit Link Service.

The original times were 7.00am - 9.30am and 4.00pm - 6.30pm. These times were subsequently amended to 7.00am - 9.00am and 4.00pm - 6.30pm on 10 April 1992 and are the current operating times. The existing morning peak clearway time on the western side of Goodwood Road north of Edward Street was amended on 28 August 1992 to coincide with the bus lane time (7.00am - 9.00am) and is the current operating time.

BUS CONTRACT

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Does the Minister of Transport Development have an answer to my question of 15 October in relation to PMC bus contract?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to have the answer inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The receiver of IRA Ltd intends to continue to operate PMC Adelaide to build buses here, subject to the support of customers. The intention is to achieve the agreed delivery rate of one bus per week. The receiver will endeavour to reconstruct the company (JRA Ltd) and if successful it is expected that the majority at PMC Adelaide will be unaffected. Arrangements for covering the longer term warranty obligations have yet to be negotiated.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 652.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have a number of questions to ask the Minister about her new position of Minister for the Status of Women. I note that there is no budget line in schedule A (which is proposed for amendment by the Attorney) for this new position of status of women. Is it an oversight that no resources or staffing arrangements have been made or is it a deliberate decision that the Minister will have no staff or funds to fulfil this role?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There is a reply to a question on notice on its way with regard to this matter which indicates that the organisation for the portfolio has only very recently been formalised. The Women's Unit in the Department of Premier and Cabinet will remain located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet but will be reporting to me as Minister for the Status of Women on a day-to-day basis.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Why isn't it being transferred?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It will remain located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet (where it has been located) but will be reporting to me on a day-to-day basis. I have had many discussions already with the Acting Director of the unit and we are starting work appropriate for the portfolio. With regard to additional staff, it has been agreed recently that a Women's Liaison Officer will be appointed to my ministerial office but no extra resources will be required as it will be done by reallocation within existing portfolios. Such appointment has not yet been made, but I would hope that it will not be long before an appointment can be made to that position.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am a little confused about the situation. What previously was the Office of Women's Adviser to the Premier is now the Office of Women's Adviser to you, or is it still Premier and Cabinet but you have an Acting Director of that unit reporting to you? Are there two levels of people reporting to different Ministers?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is a very similar arrangement to that which applies to the local government relations unit, which is also located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet but which reports to the Minister of Local Government Relations. The unit will now be called the women's information and policy unit. The Director of that unit will have the title of Women's Adviser to Premier and Cabinet, but they will report to me in the same way as the State local government relations unit, located in the Department of Premier and Cabinet, used to report to me when I was Minister of Local Government Relations and now reports to the new Minister of Local Government Relations. It is an analogous situation. Its location is within Premier and Cabinet but it reports to me on a day-to-day basis.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In terms of accountability, if the Premier wants something or you want something, how are the lines defined?

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In response to that interjection, I have complete faith in the members of the unit that there will be no call for resignation on the part of anybody. As I say, it is the same as for the Minister of Local Government Relations and the local government relations unit which used to report to me but which now reports to the Minister of Local Government Relations. On specific policy issues, there can be access to the Premier with the Minister of Local Government Relations, and the same will apply for the women's information policy unit: it will report to me on a day-to-day basis but there will be access to the Premier through me as required. The two units located within Premier and Cabinet will have the same relationship with another Minister.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Who is the line manager; the head of the unit?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In administrative matters it is the head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, but in policy matters they report to me, as Minister for the Status of Women, in exactly the same way as the local government relations unit used to report to me on policy issues as Minister of Local Government Relations but on purely administrative matters was responsible to the CEO of the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It seems to me to be a very clumsy arrangement and it suggests that the Government did not necessarily have any wish to be seen in the public eye as diminishing the status of women by removing the Premier's name from the title, because otherwise, if you are establishing a Minister, you would have thought that that Minister would at least have the authority to be in charge of the administration of that unit. It just seems to be an extraordinary situation—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In response to the Hon. Ms Wiese, what if the Minister for the Status of Women wants something investigated in terms of policy issues but the adviser decides that she will go to the head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet saying she does not have the resources to do it? It is a very clumsy, messy arrangement, and I suspect that it is one that is almost a sop to keep the Premier's name there so it does not look as though the role of women has been politically diminished because really there is not a lot of substance to the Minister's portfolio.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I find this absolutely remarkable. Nobody had ever queried the method of functioning of the local government relations unit—its reporting relationship, its responsibility to me for policy or its ability to have access to the Premier through me. The relationship for the women's information and policy unit is exactly the same.

It reports to me on day-to-day and policy matters but it has access to the Premier through me when required. It is exactly the same situation. With regard to the basic administration of both units, it is through the CEO of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and I stress that the women's adviser's title has been altered and she is now the women's adviser to the Premier and Cabinet.

She has a responsibility for advice on any area relating to women to all members of the Cabinet through me, as Minister for the Status of Women, with access to other agencies, as required, in the same way as the local government relations unit, situated within the Department of Premier and Cabinet, was able to liaise right across Government on matters affecting local government through me as the then Minister of Local Government Relations and, presumably, as they still do through the current Minister of Local Government Relations.

The two situations are exactly analogous and it is strange that queries are being raised about the status of women portfolio when they were never raised with regard to the local government relations portfolio, which I held for over 18 months.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: There is good reason for questions to be raised, because there was not a position of adviser to the Premier on local government matters. It seems to me that the Premier did not have

confidence in the Minister to give her responsibility for this area. He gives her the policy but not the administration. Otherwise, I see no reason why that area could not have been transferred solely to the Minister so that she had responsibility as any other Minister would have for administration of the portfolio as well as for policy matters.

If the Minister does not have responsibility for administration of the women's adviser's unit but has policy associations with it, will there continue to be women's advisers in other departments so that other Ministers, whether they be in Labour or the like, can continue to work on policy matters within their departments and have their own unit dealing with women's perspectives on matters in respect of Labour, for example, but the Minister does not have input into those areas? How will it work if there are all these advisers?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: First, I deny categorically the allegations made by the honourable member about the relationship of the women's information and policy unit. The honourable member is still calling it the women's adviser's unit, but that is not its name. It is the Women's Information and Policy Unit and its relationship with me is an excellent one, as was the relationship involving the local government relations unit regarding which I had the portfolio. We are working amicably and I am sure we will achieve a great deal.

With regard to her subsequent question relating to women's advisers or women's officers elsewhere throughout Government, I point out that their situation is not changing in any way, shape or form.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In respect of the Minister's new authority for policy work in this women's area, has she been given a responsibility to pursue all Cabinet submissions that go through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet prior to consideration by Cabinet to assess their impact on women?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That is why the Women's Information and Policy Unit is located in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Despite her suggestions that they should have been moved out, I strongly opposed—well, I did not oppose any such suggestion because it was never made by anyone involved in the Public Service. They would realise that that was a ludicrous suggestion that could be made only by someone with very little knowledge of how the Public Service operates. The point of our having the Women's Information and Policy Unit within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is so that it does have an overview of the Public Service activities and Cabinet documents and is able to evaluate them in relation to their possible impact on women. Certainly, that is one of the aspects on which we are working together.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yesterday the Minister released a statement about arts grants amounting to \$9.284 million for the calendar year 1993. The Minister might not have that information at hand, but I would like to know the total value of the applications received for this year, how many people applied and, of that number, how many received grants? The press release gives only a small number of those that, I trust, have received funds from this source.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not have information as to the total amount applied for, although it has been calculated. I would suggest to the honourable member, if she would care to listen, that this is the round of general grants, and there is not a large number of organisations that apply for general grants and do not receive them. It is the project grant round where traditionally there is a very large number of applicants and where the total amount asked for is often five times the sum available. The grants announced yesterday are the general grants to the more major organisations that receive on-going funding. As to the total amount requested, I will supply that information as soon as possible.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I was interested to note in the Minister's press release that the largest increase in project grants relates to dance. When does the Minister envisage that the project grants will be announced, and what is the explanation for her statement that it is expected that the newly formed company Leigh Warren and Dancers might be supported from this fund?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The date for applications for project grants closed only last Friday, so obviously a period of time is required for evaluation of the applications, and the various committees will be meeting over the next few weeks to determine this. I would expect the project grants to be announced perhaps in early December. With regard to the comment in the press release regarding Leigh Warren and Dancers, it was specifically mentioned because of discussions that were held with the dance panel of the performing Arts Committee and with the Arts Finance Advisory Committee. Leigh Warren and Dancers is a new company that is being established to begin operations next year: they are obviously highly skilled and highly talented individuals. It is not normal for new companies to jump straight into general grants: the usual procedure is for new groups, new organisations or new companies to receive project grants initially. I would certainly expect the Leigh Warren and Dancers group to receive project money as a new organisation but one known to many people in South Australia as being a very skilled and talented one.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister confirm that Leigh Warren and Dancers applied under the general grants and was considered by the dance committee as acceptable for funding, but that the Minister suggested that it should be a project grant and not a general grant?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Certainly, I do not confirm that, because that is not what happened at all. It is not normal for new companies to suddenly jump into general grants. Leigh Warren and Dancers did put in an application, which will be considered in the round for project grants. I understand that the dance panel of the advisory committee system had discussions amongst themselves with the performing Arts Committee and with the Arts Finance Advisory Committee. That committee wished to have discussions with me, which I was glad to have. I would not want to suggest that the discussions were solely about the Leigh Warren and Dancers applications: far from it. We have wide-ranging discussions over a large number of areas.

Subsequently, I have had further discussions with the Arts Finance Advisory Committee and with members of

the dance panel, and they have had further discussions amongst themselves. There was certainly no question of a conflict between us: we had very amicable discussions, and the recommendation which finally came to me was unanimously upheld by all members of the dance panel, the performing Arts Advisory Committee and, indeed, the Arts Finance Advisory Committee itself.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister or the Government appeal to the Australia Council in respect of the funding for the ADT and for Red Shed, or support the appeals by those companies?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am not appealing to the Australia Council on behalf of anyone. I do not think it appropriate for a State Minister to intervene or to try such tactics with regard to the Australia Council, which is a Federal Government body. That does not mean to say that there are not discussions that take place between officers of my department and officers of the Australia Council. At the officer level such discussions have long occurred and I hope they will continue to occur on a whole range of issues. But I do not think it would be appropriate for me as Minister to write to the Chair of the Australia Council on this matter.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I recall the time I was working with a former Minister for the Arts when the Australia Council cut funds to a number of companies, including the Stage Company, and probably Troupe, and certainly the Government of that day did protest and support those companies in seeking to have their applications for funding reassessed, and we did not leave it to behind the scenes negotiations between staff. However, perhaps there was a different perspective to the arts then than there is today. I want to ask the Minister further questions about film. She notes in this press statement that the Government Film Fund is to be cut, that the reduction is from \$384 000 in 1992 to \$200 000 this year. She goes on to say that she believes that Government departments themselves could contribute to the funding of their films and match funds within the Government Film Fund. It is that statement that intrigues me. I want to know how realistic the Minister believes it is to suggest that other departments will in fact have the funds in their budgets for such initiatives, when those departments established their budgets about five months ago.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I cannot give any guarantees, of course, but we will certainly be encouraging any Government department or Government agency which requires a film to contribute to that on a dollar for dollar basis. I do not think that is an unrealistic assumption. There was a period of 15 or 18 months when there was no Government Film Fund, as the honourable member knows, and during that time Government films were made that were funded entirely by the relevant agencies that wished to have them.

Many Government agencies do have budget allocations for publicity and such general purposes. So they do have funds available and if they wish to expend such funds on the production of a documentary there will be a budget line within their departmental allocation that they can draw on. I do not think that that is an unrealistic assumption. There are precedents for agencies finding sums for the production of documentaries that are of use

to them. We will monitor the situation and hope that what we are expecting will come to pass.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Did the Minister or her officers canvass any departments that had made inquiries about applications in the current financial year in respect of the Government Film Fund, to assess whether they would have funds in their own lines to part-fund such an initiative? I am interested to know whether that exercise was undertaken before the Minister made this public statement that, she thought this joint funding process would be a way to have Government films funded this year.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Officers of the department conducted a survey of other Government agencies and determined that a number of them had funds allocated for general publicity and promotion-type work, which they would be prepared to put into film if they felt that that was the best way to undertake their promotional or publicity work. Certainly, we ascertained that there were agencies that would have the funds available for this if they wished it.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister confirm which departments gave positive encouragement in this respect and whether they have committed funding for this purpose of which joint funding would be available through the Government Film Fund?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not want to name any agencies: that is their business. Whether they choose to use promotional and publicity funds in this way is a matter for those agencies. It would not be legitimate for me to pre-empt in any way the decisions they may have already made or may be about to make.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister is saying that she or her officers have no idea whether or not there will be any funding through various Government departments—

The Hon. Anne Levy: I'm not saying that.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: But you really do not have any idea, because all you keep on saying is that you hope there will be some funds or there may be some funds. The independent film sector and, certainly, Actors Equity, will be unhappy with the statement made yesterday by the Minister because of the hope that there will be some new arrangement of part-funding and then, when they receive the answers to these questions today, there is no firm detail and it is just up in the air.

It is rather a crazy way to finance an industry that the Minister keeps on claiming is so important to this State. In respect of project grants, will the Minister indicate what the 9.4 per cent increase in the project grant pool equates to in dollar terms and how much of that increase is to be directed to dance?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: First, I refute completely the allegations that the honourable member is trying to put into my mouth. I am not saying what she is reporting me as saying.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I did not interject when the honourable member was speaking, and I would be grateful if she would pay me the same courtesy. I have indicated that we are aware of the fact that there are Government agencies with allocated funds that they can use for making documentary films if they wish. We are aware that these funds exist, but funds provided by the

Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage are not expended unless Government agencies make requests for documentary films that they want made for their own purposes.

So, it is not just vague pie in the sky: we are aware that there are Government agencies that want to have documentary films produced and that there are agencies that have the resources to contribute to them. It is not unreasonable to expect that they will do that, given that when there was no money at all in the Government Film Fund these various agencies found resources and had documentary films made from their own resources. If they could do this previously when they needed to put in the entire financing themselves, it is not unreasonable to imagine that they will do so again when they are being asked to provide only half the resources for the films. I think the honourable member is trying to put words into my mouth, which are what she would like me to be saying but which are certainly not what I am saying.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You have clarified the situation now.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The honourable member again interjects saying that I have now clarified the situation. I have said only what I have been saying for the past five minutes. Obviously, the honourable member does not like to listen to my answers. With regard to her questions—the first part was a statement and contained no question at all, and I presume that is permitted in the Committee stage of the Bill—the project grant money, as indicated, has increased by 7.4 per cent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It is 9.4 per cent.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, 7.4 per cent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You said 9.4 per cent before.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The honourable member may have said 9.4 per cent, but my press release said 7.4 per cent for projects. The project grant pool has increased by 7.4 per cent. I have a copy of the press release in front of me.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The release I have from you says 'project grant pool of 9.4 per cent'.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That must be a typing error. My copy has 7.4 per cent stated on it twice; once in the third line and again three quarters of the way down the second page—'project grant pool increase of 7.4 per cent'. As also indicated in the press release, the project grant pool has been increased in four areas: dance, visual arts and crafts, multicultural arts and Aboriginal arts. I do not have the exact figures here. It is certainly true that the pool of project money for the dance area has had the greatest increase, but the project grant pool has been increased over the four different art form areas that I have mentioned.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have a copy of a press release dated 4 November which was prepared by Diane Beer and which states on two occasions in the opening paragraph, 'There was an increase in the project grant pool of 9.4 per cent'. That is on page 1. On page 2 it states, 'The project grant pool has increased by 9.4 per cent.' Perhaps this press release went out first and then someone in the Minister's office reassessed the situation and changed the figure down. Certainly, I received this press release from media sources, so this is the one that went out to them. At some stage the Minister might like

to clarify what is going on in her office in respect of these funds, because there is quite a significant difference between 9.4 per cent and 7.2 per cent.

relation to the South Australian Film Corporation, in answer to questions I asked about FilmSouth on 19 August 1992, and particularly in relation to the film *The Battlers*, the Minister advised that the corporation would commence production of *The Battlers* in the next few months. Can the Minister indicate the current timetable for *The Battlers*?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I understand that *The Battlers* will begin filming very early in the new year. It was not possible to start filming prior to that time because of the unavailability of one of the star actors in the film. The film *Black Beauty* is filming at the Hendon studios at the moment, so that is a great hive of activity. There is another film, *Ebb Tide*, which will also be filmed there and which is for an independent producer in South Australia. I am not sure whether that is being slotted in before *The Battlers* or coming straight thereafter. The three films are using not just the same facilities but very much the same technical crew, and it is delightful that these films are being made and providing employment for so many people for such a lengthy period of time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As of yesterday I was told by people who work at the Film Corporation that *The Battlers* has been delayed until June/July next year.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have no information on that and nor have my officers.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Would the Minister look at that matter because if it is correct, and I have no reason to doubt my senior sources, it would mean that there is no production by the Film Corporation this year; and that would mean that the Chairman's gloomy prediction during the Estimates Committee of a \$192 000 deficit for the year, if there was no production, would be fulfilled. I do not think anybody in this Chamber at least would want that circumstance to arise as another bleak year in the recent history of bleak years with the Film Corporation. If the film is delayed until June/July of next year, what will happen in respect of that funding of \$130 000 provided by FilmSouth to *The Battlers*.

I am not sure whether there is a condition on funding through FilmSouth that that money be used in the financial year in which application was received and the project granted because, as the Minister would appreciate, that funding through FilmSouth was critical for the Film Corporation's receiving funding from other sources.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: First, I can allay any fears that the FilmSouth grants have to be spent within a particular year. On numerous occasions in the past they have rolled over to the next financial year.

With regard to the other comments made by the honourable member, I remind her that the film industry is constantly rife with rumours, some of which are reliable and some of which are not. However, I will certainly seek further information regarding the timing of the production of *The Battlers*.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: And at the same time could the Minister bring back information on what has been developed at the corporation over the past 18 months? She may not have this information at hand, but I would be interested to know what the role of Cheryl

Conway is at the South Australian Film Corporation. I understand that some time ago she was brought from Los Angeles to look at scripts, but I am not sure what she is doing, and at some stage the Minister may be able to clarify her role and salary.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I think the individual mentioned is currently undertaking work as a script development manager. I will have to seek further details from the Film Corporation, and I will certainly be happy to get a resume of the different developments that are occurring. I have seen a very extensive list of projects under development. I think it had about 20 items on it, but I am sorry that I cannot remember more detail. I will have to seek that information.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister also bring back information on why the Managing Director, Ms Hardy, saw a need to travel to Manchester last month with the Director of *The Battlers*, Mr Ogilvy, and Danielle Carter, who I think is the leading lady in that film? I understood that Mr Ogilvy and Danielle were required for screen testing with Philip Quast, but there have been questions why the Managing Director of the Film Corporation needed to go and, if anyone else was needed to go, why it was not the producer of that film.

I would also like to receive information on the names of the independent producers who are occupying space at the Film Corporation and what rent the corporation is receiving from each. It has been suggested to me that they are occupying space but not paying rent, or that the rent is being deferred, and I would like to know the accumulated amount of the deferred rent.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: With regard to the latter question, I understand that the policy of the Film Corporation now is to assist the independent sector by enabling it to occupy space which the Film Corporation does not currently need. The arrangement is that if these independent producers are working on developing a film they pay no rent until the filming occurs, in which case part of the cost of the film will be rent to the Film Corporation.

I think that it is a very generous gesture on behalf of the Film Corporation to assist the independent sector in this way, and I know it has been greatly appreciated by many members of the independent sector. I will seek a report from the Film Corporation with regard to the other questions. I am surprised that the honourable member has not done so herself.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister might suggest that I should seek this information as well, but I was just asked about it today at lunch and have not had time to seek the information. Was Simon Phillips paid by the State Theatre Company while he was absent in New York for five months undertaking a production on Broadway?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will have to check that. I understood that he had taken extended leave to undertake that production in the United States, but I will check that and let the honourable member know.

The other day I tabled in this place the replies to questions that were asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas in an earlier debate on the Appropriation Bill, but it has been suggested to me it would be more appropriate to incorporate them in *Hansard*, and I seek leave to do so.

Leave granted.

QUESTION REPLIES

QUESTION 1, SCHOOL HOURS

The Note (c) on page 85 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts 1992-93 refers to the Vacation and Out of School Hours Recreation for Students (Swimming and Aquatics Program) (that is, the Vacation Swimming and Aquatics Program cited in the Auditor-General's, Report, page 44). That program was operated by the Education Department and has now been transferred to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

The Note 4 on page 44 of the Auditor-General's Report, 1992 cited as the Vacation and After School Hours Recreation Program refers to what is now termed as the Children's Services Office Vacation Care Program transferred in 1991.

QUESTION 2, MIGRATION EDUCATION

The ESL Program (referred to as Migrant Education in budget briefings) has two elements:

- The General Support Program (for students resident in Australia over 12 months)
- The New Arrivals Program (for students resident under 12 months)

The General Support Program

Staffing levels

1991: 135.3 FTE

1992: 135.3 FTE

+ 5.5 FTE (area advisory salaries converted to school based positions)

Proposed 1993 allocations: 140.8 FTE

Staffing is allocated on the basis of data provided by schools through the Specific Population Census. General Support Program school based ESL salaries have been maintained and allocations adjusted according to need but staying within resources available.

The New Arrivals Program

Staffing levels

Term 1, 1991: 77.9 FTE

Term 2, 1991: 78.4 FTE

Term 3, 1991: 76.9 FTE

Term 4, 1991: 83.3 FTE

Term 1, 1992: 74.0 FTE

Term 2, 1992: 79.0 FTE

Term 3, 1992: 79.1 FTE

Term 4, 1992: 79.1 FTE

Proposed Term 1, 1993: 77.7 FTE

Staffing for the New Arrivals Program is formula based

- that is 1:15 Secondary students (with comparative educational backgrounds in country of origin)
- 1:10 Secondary students illiterate in their first language
- 1:13 Primary students (with combination classes of literate and illiterate in first language)

QUESTION 3, PURCHASE OF SCHOOL PROPERTIES

- 3a. No formal request has been made by the Anglican Schools Commission regarding school properties in the northern suburbs. Hence the Minister of Education, Employment and Training has not considered the matter.
- 3b. In the case of the West Lakes High School campus, a formal application registering interest in using this surplus facility was made to the Joint Planning Committee for Government and Non-Government Schools by the Principal of Trinity College, Gawler on 27 March 1992.

An earlier application by Trinity College to establish a similar secondary college in this area, made in 1988, was given a very low priority for Commonwealth general recurrent funding because of enrolment trends in that area. The applicant was subsequently advised by DEET that its application was unsuccessful.

The Anglican Schools Commission has been advised that the sale of the site to the Anglican Schools Commission must not be taken as tacit approval of nor support for the establishment of a school on the West Lakes Campus and that should the school now proposed be of similar type and have a similar catchment area to that proposed in 1988, then it would seem certain that

existing Government Schools would be adversely affected and planned education provisions for this area not be met.

QUESTION 4, TASS CENTRE SERVICES

Schools will not have to pay for specialist student services such as speech pathologists, guidance officers, equal opportunity advisers, social workers and health and safety officers that were previously provided at no cost to schools. Where appropriate a fee might be negotiated for staff training and similar programs that could be provided from the TASS Centre. No decisions have been made about this matter. When and if cross charging occurs this would be part of a devolution to schools of the resources currently managed in non-school locations including TASS Centres themselves.

QUESTION 5, RECOGNITION OF EXCELLENCE

Schemes such as the SSABSA annual merit award ceremony have been established in recent years to give public recognition to students who achieve excellent standards in their academic work.

In addition, South Australian schools are recognising the importance of acknowledging students' leadership skills.

In its policy 'Student Participation' (1990), the Education Department sets out the responsibilities of principals to acknowledge the development of student's leadership and decision-making skills.

Across the state, schools are showing their communities in a variety of ways that they value academic excellence, honesty, accountability, self-respect and respect for others.

I strongly support all schools in acknowledging their student's achievements in a wide range of activities and endeavours, and I also encourage individual school communities to determine the most appropriate method of doing this.

QUESTION 6A, DEVOLUTION PILOT PROGRAMS

In 1990 two cooperative projects, the Noarlunga Basin Cluster and the South West Corner Secondary School Cluster, were established before the current consultation on Local School Management began. The two clusters are not trials as such, although each one has piloted various innovative ways of organising and delivering education services. The outcomes are being used to inform the present debate about the nature and scope of Local School Management.

The Noarlunga Basin Cluster consists of the following schools:

Christies Beach Primary, Christie Downs Primary, Christie Downs Special, Morphett Vale Primary, Noarlunga Downs Primary, Port Noarlunga Primary, Hackham West Primary, Hackham West Junior Primary and Hackham South Primary.

Achievements and progress to date in this cluster include a new TRT management program, an assessment and report of Cluster resource requirements, the installation of Administration computers and related staff training, specialist teachers working across the curriculum, programs to improve the quality of teaching and learning, the on-going development of initiatives with SACON for maintenance of school buildings, the introduction of a computer program to manage assessment and recording based on attainment levels and learning outcomes and the establishment of links with the South West Corner Secondary Cluster.

The South West Corner Secondary School Cluster consists of the following schools:

Hamilton Secondary, Brighton High, Seaview High, Marion High, Plympton High, Mawson High and Daws Road High.

Achievements and progress to date in this cluster include a number of shared curriculum arrangements and innovations between schools, moves to develop guidelines in cooperation with the Union for converting teachers salary to cash, joint training and development days across the cluster for teachers, school assistance and senior staff, and the exploration by school staff and Education Department officers of cost-saving strategies for the management of financial resources at the local level.

The Peachey Road Project is a one year trial project that will begin in 1993. The schools involved in the project are Broadmeadows Primary, Elizabeth Fields Primary, Elizabeth Fields Junior Primary, Elizabeth North Primary, Elizabeth West Primary, Elizabeth West Junior Primary, Smithfield Plains Primary and Smithfield Plains Junior Primary. The aim of this project is to explore strategies for improving the educational

outcomes in the Peachy Road schools by trialling innovative and flexible ways of managing and staffing these schools.

QUESTION 6B, SCHOOL FUNDS

As part of the Principal Training and Development Program conducted by the Department a session titled 'Introduction to One-Line Budgets' addresses some of the issues involved in one line budgeting. In the context of the presentation a figure of \$171 million is quoted to demonstrate that collectively schools are already responsible for making decisions over a significant level of resources:

This figure is derived as follows:

	\$ million
Total School Bank Balances at 1 November 1990	49.2
Add: Funds received by schools in school financial year ending 31 October 1991	103.5
	152.7
Add: Canteen Sales in school financial year ending 31 October 1991	18.2
Total Funds controlled by schools	170.9

The receipts figure includes all amounts received by the school including grants from the Department, school fees, fund raising and canteen sales etc., whether those funds have been paid into the School Council, School Fund or affiliated bodies accounts.

QUESTION 7, TEACHER NUMBERS

The variation of 138 teachers is accounted for by a change in the accounting arrangements for recording employees in receipt of Workers Compensation payments.

Information regarding the breakdown of staff on Workers Compensation which have been recorded against 'Executive, Professional, Technical, Administrative and clerical Support' for 1991-92 has previously been provided to the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore in response to a Question on Notice (No. 13) from the Estimates Committee Hearings.

The number of teachers allocated to schools for classroom instruction for 1992 has not decreased.

QUESTION 8, OVERSTATED ENROLMENTS

The following are details of schools which have overstated their enrolment to 30 June 1992:

Name of School	Overstated Enrolment
Gladstone Primary School	7
Henley Beach Primary School	3
Mount Barker Primary School	3
Peterborough Primary School	6
Terowie Rural School	2
Basket Range Primary School	2
Parafield Gardens Primary School	7
Lincoln South Primary School	6
Marryatville Primary School	4
Gepps Cross Primary School	9
Murray Bridge High School	8
Willunga High School	13
Airdale Primary School	3
Modbury South Primary	3

Action Taken

The above 14 schools were reported to the appropriate Area Office, and the school support grant was reduced.

Elizabeth Downs Primary School	4
Lonsdale Heights Primary School	3

Action Taken

The above two schools were reported to Area Office, and a reply is still awaited.

Name of School	Overstated Enrolment
Alberton Junior Primary School	4

Action Taken

Reported to Area Office. Area Assistant Director sent letter to Principal stressing correct procedure must be followed, as this was the third overstatement in successive years at that school. Support grant also reduced.

Salisbury High School	40
-----------------------	----

Action Taken

Currently under investigation by the Education Department Investigations Unit.

Christie Downs Junior Primary	3
-------------------------------	---

Action Taken

Reported to Area Office. No further action taken by Southern Area following Principal's explanation.

QUESTION 9, COORDINATORS AND KEY TEACHERS

The following numbers of Coordinators and Key Teachers were appointed as at 3 July 1992:

Coordinator, Primary.....	208
Coordinator/Senior, Secondary.....	1 355
Senior reverted to Key Teacher.....	55
Key Teacher Primary.....	1 107
Key Teacher Secondary.....	170

Information regarding the numbers of people in such leadership positions in specific areas such as social justice, science and behaviour management is not readily retrievable, as these positions are determined at the school level in line with School Development Plan priorities.

QUESTION 10, FOCUS SCHOOLS

• Mathematics—R-7

Carlton Primary School
Cleve Area School
Naracoorte Primary School
Pooraka Primary School
Murray Bridge Junior Primary
Settlers Farm Junior Primary/Primary School
Braeview Junior Primary/Primary School
Prospect Primary School
Nairn Primary School
Victor Harbor Primary School

Mathematics—Junior Secondary

Christies Beach High School
Craigmore High School
Port Augusta High School
Mitcham Girls High School
Gepps Cross Girls High School
Port Adelaide Girls High School
Underdale High School
Allendale East Area School
Mount Gambier High School

• Technology and Science—R-7

Hendon Primary School
Elizabeth East Primary School
Direk Junior Primary/Primary School
The Pines Junior Primary/Primary School
Walkerville Primary School
Hackham West Junior Primary/Primary School
Coromandel Valley Primary School
Ardtornish Primary School
Jamestown Primary School/Caltowie Rural School
Pinnaroo Primary School

Technology and Science—Physics

Marion High School
Norwood High School
Unley High School

• Literacy

Smithfield Plains Primary School
Mount Gambier East Junior Primary/Primary School
Port Augusta High School
Port Germein Primary School
Elizabeth South Junior Primary/Primary School
Hackham South Primary School
Renmark Junior Primary/Primary School
Ridley Grove Junior Primary/Primary School
Gepps Cross Girls High School
Salisbury North-west Junior Primary School

- **Students with High Intellectual Potential R-7**
 Fisk Street Primary School
 Port Lincoln Primary School
 Clapham Primary School
 Magill Junior Primary/Linden Park Junior Primary Schools
 Madison Park Primary School
 Torrensville Primary School
- **Gymnastics**
 Ascot Park Primary School

Special Interest Schools

- **Music**
 Marryatville High School
 Brighton High School
 Woodville High School
 Fremont High School
- **Languages**
 Adelaide High School
- **Agriculture**
 Urrbrae High School
- **Engineering Pathways**
 Christies Beach High School
 Hamilton Secondary School
 Inbarendi College (Elizabeth City Campus)
 Le Fevre High School
 Millicent High School
 Thebarton Senior College
 Thorndon/Campbelltown High School
 Whyalla Secondary College (Edward John Eyre Campus)

QUESTION 11, SPORTS TROPHIES

The Education Department's policy on junior sport supports the notion that the focus of

junior sport, like all physical activity, should be (children's) participation, enjoyment, physical fitness and the building of (their) self esteem and confidence.

Underlying the Junior Sports Policy is the principle that children's competitions should differ in nature from those of adults. The policy therefore calls on our schools to:

- help children to develop skills as they progress from general physical activities to specific sports skills.
- encourage them to participate and thus to develop team skills as well as a sense of co-operation.
- give them opportunities to reach their full sporting potential.

The Education Department does not prescribe to South Australian schools whether or not they should present certificates, trophies or prizes for achievement in any area of the curriculum, including sport.

Within the spirit of the Junior Sports Policy, principals have the responsibility for determining, in consultation with their school communities, the most appropriate ways of recognising the skills and participation levels of their students.

QUESTION 12, SCHOOL SUPPORT GRANTS

The early payment of School Support Grants has been a long standing Government policy. The purpose is to provide schools with the opportunity to supplement their income through interest earned and to compensate for any shortfall between the annual increase in the grant and actual increases in the cost of goods and services in schools. It needs to be recognised that the Treasury inflation rate provided in the annual budget does not necessarily reflect the cost increases experienced in the operation of schools.

QUESTION 13, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

I confirm that the estimated costs of the school administrative computing system are \$16.4 million against estimated benefits of \$18.8 million over a five year period. At this stage I am not prepared to provide a copy of the detailed analysis as the recommendation of the tender evaluation team is still being assessed by the Education Department and is therefore commercially confidential.

At this stage the business case for the Education Department's component of the Human Resource Management System is still being developed. Final figures for this presentation are still being prepared.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:The Hon. Mr Lucas also asked a second series of questions. I have responses to those questions and I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.
Leave granted.

QUESTION REPLIES

QUESTION 1. The costs of upgrading the 5th and 9th floors are as follows:

	\$
9th Floor	94 716
5th Floor	
Stage 1 (actual).....	112 419
Stage 2 (estimated).....	150 000

SACON have been requested to provide a detailed breakdown of the work undertaken on each of those floors.

QUESTION 2a. In relation to rental for Elizabeth House in the former Northern Area, I advise that the rental figures are as follows:

	\$
1985-86.....	208 000
1986-87.....	221 000
1987-88.....	256 000
1988-89.....	256 000
1989-90.....	254 855
1990-91.....	259 002
1991-92.....	285 500
1992-93.....	259 000

QUESTION 2b. The annual rental savings at Murray Bridge, Noarlunga and at Elizabeth will be achieved when the GARG process has been completed.

The expected saving at Elizabeth House of \$172 000 relates to quitting part only of the space currently occupied.

QUESTION 3. The figures quoted by the Honourable member relate only to GME Act staff. The planned reduction of 300 positions comprised both GME and seconded/advisory staff. Actual savings to 30 June 1992 of both GME and seconded/advisory staff against the GARG plan totalled 276 positions.

A reduction of the remainder will occur by way of voluntary separation, redeployment and attrition.

QUESTION 4. According to information through the collation of the Languages Other Than English Mapping and Planning Project (LOTEMAPP), the number of schools introducing LOTE programs between 1993 and 1995 are as follows:

- 1993—approximately 90 schools
- 1994—approximately 120 schools
- 1995—approximately 50 schools

These programs may be filled through:

- the normal placement process
- redeployment of existing employees qualified in a LOTE but not presently teaching it.
- recruitment of new employees.

Past experience indicates that in the languages of Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, Indonesian, there are not enough existing employees for planned programs. It can therefore be assumed that for 1994-95 extra employees will need to be recruited. However, the numbers of these cannot be given with any degree of exactitude because the numbers will vary according to the ways in which vacancies are described—that is whether teachers are shared across schools via clustering arrangements, or whether schools offer LOTE through the Open Access College.

QUESTION 5. One officer is a permanent public servant who had been seconded. The officer was appointed in a temporary capacity for a short time by the previous Director-General of Education to carry out a range of specific tasks where the officer's expertise was required.

Another officer applied for one of five advertised positions in the approved GARG structure. The selection procedure was delayed because of changes in the Education Department. Pending the outcome of the selection process, the previous Director-General of Education appointed the officer to the

position in an acting capacity in order to meet the needs of the Department. Remuneration was at the classification level for the position, PSO4.

QUESTION 6. The Office of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training has the following complement of staff. Those marked* are vacant positions. One additional position

marked** is funded through the Minister's Consultative Committee line as mentioned during Estimates. This is in accordance with the level recommended by the Department of Labour and approved in Cabinet.

Details of staff currently in the Office of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training are as follows:

GME Act	Classification	Min.	Max.	Salary
Senior Administration Officer	ASO5	37 515	42 025	42 025
Manager Finance	ASO6	43 460	46 125	43 460
Administration Officer	ASO3	29 008	31 058	31 235
Administration Officer	ASO3	29 008	31 058	31 235
Administration Officer	ASO3	29 008	31 058	29 008
Administration Assistant	ASO2	24 908	26 958	16 919
Parliamentary Clerk	ASO2	24 908	26 958	24 938
Receptionist	ASO2	24 908	26 958	24 908
Clerical Support	ASO1	12 551	23 165	23 165
*Clerical Support	ASO1	12 551	23 165	
*Clerical Support	ASO1	12 551	23 165	
*Clerical Support	ASO1	12 551	23 165	
**Assistant Media Adviser (.5)	ASO4	33 313	34 850	16 656
	12.5 FTEs			

Ministerial Appointments	Class.	Salary
Executive Assistant	ZA2..	44 793+ 15% overtime allowance
Ministerial Assistant	ZA2..	44 793+ 15% overtime allowance
Ministerial Assistant	ZA2..	44 793+ 15% overtime allowance
Ministerial Assistant	ZA2..	44 793+ 15% overtime allowance
*Ministerial Assistant	ZA2..	44 793+ 15% overtime allowance
Media Adviser	ZA7..	44 699+ 15% overtime allowance
	6	
	18.5	

QUESTION 7. No, school councils do not have the power to prevent the publication of Education Review Unit reports or to delay their publication in South Australia if they are unhappy with some aspects of those reports.

There has been one case relating to the Anangu Schools where a special case was agreed, on the initiative of the Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Education Council (PYEC) which is not specifically a school council, that given the PYEC role in Anangu education, and as a courtesy, ERU reports would be released to schools through the PYEC. Public release would follow, after allowing time for a response from the PYEC. The reports were released to the PYEC in March 1992. PYEC then forwarded reports to each community and homelands council. Confirmation of public release has yet to be received.

This process is consistent with the government's view that alternative processes may need to apply in Anangu education.

b. No, school councils do not have any power to force amendments or changes to reports that have been conducted by the Education Review Unit into their particular schools.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I was interested to note that both the original and the revised schedules to this Bill record that the Office of Transport Policy and Planning will be the recipient of \$5.321 million. The Minister will recall that, soon after she was made Minister, the Premier abolished this office—a step which was described in this place as a retrograde step. The Minister was asking the Office of Public Employment to review the situation. Does the fact that the two schedules contain the same appropriation figure for the Office of Transport Policy and Planning suggest that the review of the office has been completed, that Cabinet has agreed that the office remain in the same form as it was for the Minister's predecessor, with the same number of staff and with the same duties?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: No, it does not indicate that. The review is still under way, although I expect to receive a report very shortly from the officer from DPIR. I expect to receive a report very soon from the officer who has been asked to review the functions of the Office of Transport Policy and Planning in the context of the broader role of the agencies that form the portfolio of Transport Development. When the Premier made his original announcements concerning the restructuring of the Public Service, he indicated not that the Office of Transport Policy and Planning would be abolished, as I recall it, but that the functions of that organisation would be subsumed within the Department of Road Transport.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: What's the distinction?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The distinction is that the idea would be not to abolish the positions and functions but that the people and functions would be relocated. The funding for the employment of staff, projects and other things that previously were provided for in the budget under that arrangement presumably would still be required but would be relocated within the lines of the Department of Road Transport.

As I indicated in response to a question asked by the honourable member a couple of weeks ago, after I had been appointed Minister of Transport Development and had a quick opportunity to review the operations of the various parts of the portfolio, I came to the view that there was an ongoing role for the Office of Transport Policy and Planning and I requested the Premier not to

make a final decision about the office until I had an opportunity to review it.

As I indicated, I asked the Commissioner for Public Employment to appoint an officer to assist me in that review. I asked that officer to approach the review in the context that the office would continue to operate but to examine the operations within the context of the broader portfolio responsibilities as now defined to provide me with an administrative and advisory structure that will assist me in the performance of my duties as they are now developed.

That review is almost complete and I expect to receive the report soon. Appropriate arrangements will then be in place for the administration of the transport development portfolio. I shall be surprised if any significant changes need to be made to the funding arrangements provided for in the Bill.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Am I to assume that there will be an Office of Transport Policy and Planning, because that is what we are to vote on here? Even though the Director-General of Transport has been moved out to public sector reform, has his salary gone with him or is there a salary up for grabs within the Office of Transport Policy and Planning that could be available for someone else in the revised structure?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Part of those arrangements will be the subject of the report that I expect to receive early next week. I expect that there will continue to be some sort of role for the current Director-General of Transport in the broad policy transport area. As to the source of payment for his salary, to use the earlier words of the Attorney-General in response to a similar question about remuneration of officers, I view that as a nuts and bolts issue; in any case, the matter as to where the Director-General's salary might come from is a small part of the overall financial arrangements. It may be that part of his salary will be paid from a budget of the public sector reform organisation and part by the Office of Transport Policy and Planning.

I am not sure at this point, because I have not yet received the report upon which we will act. However, it is a very small part of the overall budget that we are being asked to approve here, and would in anyone's terms be viewed as a minor variation, if there has to be a variation at all.

To answer the substantive question of the honourable member, it is my view that the Office of Transport Policy and Planning should continue to exist. I have asked the review to start from that point and to advise me as to how the Public Service individuals can be best utilised within the overall new structure of the transport development portfolio. Therefore, I would expect the line relating to the Office of Transport Policy and Planning to remain very much the same. There may be a minor variation to the extent that there is a minor variation in any budget during a 12 month period, but it would not be significant and would not affect the overall budget of the portfolio.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In her reply, the Minister said that there would be some sort of role for the Director-General of Transport. Is she confirming that there will still be a position, Director-General of Transport, as head of this Office of Transport Policy and Planning, and that that will still be held by the present

incumbent? I was confused when I thought that Dr Scafton was going to the Office of Public Sector Reform.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to answer that question fully at this stage until I have received the report of the review that I commissioned into the role of the Office of Transport Policy and Planning and until I have received full information from Dr Scafton and the Commissioner for Public Employment as to Dr Scafton's future. As I understand it, the arrangements for the Office of Public Policy Reform are in the process of being determined. As part of that process, decisions will be made as to how much of Dr Scafton's time will be devoted to those duties.

I believe also that he has recently received an invitation to join the work of a Federal body, and it may well be that part of his time will be taken up in working in the Federal arena. If there is some time left over, I would consider it appropriate, were he willing to be involved, for Dr Scafton also to be involved in providing advice on transport issues to some extent, because it is acknowledged that Dr Scafton is well informed and highly regarded in his field, both in Australia and overseas. It seems to me that it would be a shame if his advice, at least in some shape or form, were not available to the transport development portfolio. The extent to which that involvement can be maintained, in what form and how he will be titled, are issues yet to be resolved, but I expect them to be resolved in the very near future.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister indicate what additional salary and resources are to be provided to Mr Payze to coordinate the activities across the transport portfolio in addition to his responsibilities as CEO of Transport Development?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to provide an answer to that question. If there is to be a change in arrangements with respect to salary, it will be arranged by the Commissioner of Public Employment, and I am not aware of any changes that may be taking place.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister outline how she envisages the role of coordinator working, especially in a situation where there is a Director-General of Transport, a coordinator and an Office of Transport Policy and Planning?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That, too, is one of the subjects of the review currently under way, and I hope to receive advice in the very near future as to the finer points on how it might work. In general terms, I expect that Mr Payze will act as a coordinator across the departments and agencies that form part of the Transport Development portfolio and will be in a position to keep an overview of the broad policy issues of importance in those departments and agencies. More particularly, he will be concentrating his efforts on coordinating activity across the agencies where a need exists for cooperation and coordination. In particular, the transport hub project is a multi-disciplinary or across agency project and requires coordination. I would expect Mr Payze to play a key role in drawing together the agencies of Government to ensure that that project comes to fruition and to draw together the functions of Government in providing advice to me as the Minister responsible for that project.

It will also require Mr Payze and relevant agencies of Government to have closer ties with agencies outside the South Australian Government, for example, the National Rail Corporation, Australian National and the Federal Government, where appropriate. Part of the role of coordinator of this portfolio will be to keep a handle on what is happening right across all areas that will have an impact on transport development issues for South Australia, with particular reference to the transport hub.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the Minister described the role of the coordinator, Mr Payze, it reminded me of the role of a former Director-General of Transport in the Office of Transport Policy and Planning. The Minister does not see any conflict and I suppose it is subject to the review. It seems that what the Premier has imposed on her is a repetition of what has already been in existence.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not completely familiar with what has already been in existence, and I certainly was not the Minister under the previous arrangement, so I am unaware of exactly how the various Chief Executive Officers reported to or related to the Minister in charge at that time. There are fundamental differences; for example, the Department of Marine and Harbors is now part of the Transport Development portfolio and was previously a separate department with another Minister.

My understanding of the way these agencies have worked in the past is that they have pretty much acted as independent agencies, reporting directly to the Minister on major issues. The Office of Transport Policy and Planning has to some extent provided an alternative source of advice to the Minister. I believe it is possible for that role to continue, that is, the provision of alternative sources of advice should that be desirable. I think the resources exist within the Office of Transport Policy and Planning to provide research work as required by the Minister, on a whole range of matters. Nevertheless, it ought to be possible for that body to be part of a group whose activities are coordinated by an individual, in this case Mr Payze. Those arrangements can be worked through satisfactorily and I expect that the review that will be presented to me sometime in the near future will establish clear links for the benefit of the officers concerned so they know how these things can work. One of the things that I want to do in this new portfolio, in an administrative sense, is to have regular joint meetings myself with the CEOs of the agencies for which I am responsible, so that there will be much closer contact between the Chief Executive Officers of the agencies and so that on a regular basis I will have the benefit of their collective wisdom on matters that are of concern across agencies.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Is the Department of Marine and Harbors to continue to report to the Minister direct or through the coordinator? Further, is the STA, which is a statutory authority, now to report through Mr Payze or to the Minister direct?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I expect that there will be a combination of those things. It seems to me that there will be a number of issues for which these agencies are responsible that will have no particular cross-agency relevance and thus it would be a waste of the time of other Chief Executive Officers to sit through a reporting

arrangement with the Minister on those matters. I expect that there will be a combination of reporting arrangements. There will be some issues on which we will meet collectively, to talk about matters that are of significance across the portfolios, while there will be other occasions when I will meet individually with the Chief Executive Officers of the various departments and agencies to discuss matters of relevance to those agencies and in the interests of fulfilling the Government's policy in those areas.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In respect of the STA and public passenger transport, the former Minister of Transport was very keen on the idea of a community transport Act, which had been recommended in various reports, the latest I think by Dr Ian Radbone, looking at a response to the taxicab and hire vehicle industry. Will the Minister indicate whether she, too, supports the concept of a community transport Act, which, essentially, would get rid of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act and the STA Act?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am aware of the discussions that have taken place on this matter in the past. Although I have read some briefings concerning this matter I have not yet had an opportunity to be briefed fully on the question of a proposed community transport Bill. I understand that work is proceeding on it, and some time in the near future I hope to be fully briefed so that I have the complete background of how the idea emerged and what the benefits are.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: A Bill is being prepared or just the concept is being prepared?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I think that there might have already been some work on the preparation of a Bill but, certainly, considerable work has been done on the concept. As I say, I have not been fully briefed on that matter at this stage, but I hope in the very near future to be brought up to date with the progress that has been made so that I can determine for myself the advantages of proceeding with such a plan and then make a decision as to whether I support the proposition as supported by the previous Minister.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the Minister now has this additional responsibility for the transport hub, to which she referred earlier today, what additional resources are to be provided to her to develop that hub proposal? As I understand, those resources have all been within the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. Are they to remain within that department or to be transferred to this new department?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That, too, is a topic that is part of the review currently under way. As the honourable member indicates, some of the officers who have been working on the transport hub concept have been previously located in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, and I would expect that some of those people could or should be transferred to this Transport Development portfolio to continue the work with which they have been involved. I understand that some officers within the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology have been spending part of their time on transport hub matters and part on other projects, so there will probably need to be what we might call some horse trading done on whether those officers should be transferred or should stay and take up other duties.

Certainly, I am aware that resources are residing in other parts of the public sector, and part of the review that I commissioned was to look at who those people are and where they could best be located to serve the interests of the Government and to further the transport hub idea.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It would be the same for the Air Access group, Barrie Spencer and changes to the airport?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, that would include the people associated with Air Access and the Barrie Spencer group. As the honourable member would be aware, there is also an officer within Tourism South Australia who has been spending part of his time working on Air Access matters, and I hope that he will continue to be involved in some way or other in furthering South Australia's interests with respect to Air Access matters. How best that can be achieved is part of this review.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Now that she has responsibility for the transport hub concept, will the Minister find out how much has been paid to Mr Ian Lovell to develop the concept to date and generally how much has been spent on this whole project? What is the budget for this year for the transport hub proposal?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have that information with me, but I will be happy to provide as much detail of expenditure as possible.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Will the Minister indicate why the Department of Marine and Harbors and, indeed, the Department of Road Transport were not included under the portfolio of public infrastructure? I have been asked that question by quite a number of people. They seem so much related to public infrastructure, so why has the distinction been made?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That question should be directed to the Premier as the decision about the grouping of agencies was his. I can only assume that the Premier would have taken into account the fact that the Department of Road Transport and the Department of Marine and Harbors are, at once, providing a public infrastructure service and a transport development service. Ultimately, he chose to group those agencies within a transport development portfolio, bearing in mind that when it is necessary for coordination between public infrastructure agencies there is an avenue through which that coordination can occur at ministerial level through Cabinet subcommittee work. As I understand it, it is envisaged that I, as Minister of Transport Development, will be a member of the same Cabinet subcommittee as the Minister of Public Infrastructure. So, there will be on-going contact between those two Ministers as there will be between officers of the relevant departments. Hopefully, the extent to which there needs to be coordination in the public infrastructure field will be provided by those arrangements.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: What amount has the Government agreed to pay to P&O to resume the lease for Conaust as the operator of the Outer Harbor container terminal?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Earlier this week, agreement was reached between the Department of Marine and Harbors and Conaust about the resumption of the lease for the container terminal. However, at this stage I am not at liberty to indicate what the

arrangements are. The formal agreement between the department and the company is likely to be finalised and signed off some time during the next week. Before that time, it has been agreed that there will be no public statements about the nature or terms of the agreement that has been reached, and I must honour that. However, at an appropriate time down the track I understand that it has been agreed that such information can be provided publicly. When that time arrives I will certainly make those details available.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: This information should be provided publicly, as taxpayers' money is being used to buy out a legally binding lease—an extraordinary exercise in itself that has cost the State a great deal not only in repossession charges but also in legal costs. When the Government announces what compensation has been agreed with respect to P&O, could the Minister also provide this place with the legal costs to date including officer time on this project?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: If that information is available when I am able to announce details of the agreement between the Government and Conaust I will certainly provide it. It has been the long held view of the Department of Marine and Harbors and also the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry that, although in some ways this is a rather unusual situation that we find ourselves in with the Government negotiating to resume a lease, it is a matter worth pursuing. We believe the long-term interests of the State and the Department of Marine and Harbors will be served by this move in that we expect it to generate increased business through the Port of Adelaide. If that occurs, as everyone expects it will, the investment that the Government is making in this way will be of considerable long-term benefit to South Australia and will be an investment worth making.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Is the compensation to be paid from the budget of the Department of Marine and Harbors or from Treasury at this stage and then later charged as a cost against the department's budget?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Additional special funding will be made available through Treasury for this arrangement. In principle Cabinet approval has already been given for such a payment.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On 13 October in this place the Minister said that a number of companies had registered an interest in operating the container terminal, yet during the Estimates Committees the former Minister said that only one company had been approached by the department to operate the port after it got rid of Conaust. Can the Minister clarify the situation? Have additional companies expressed an interest in operating the terminal in the three weeks between the time the former Minister spoke on the subject and the present Minister did so on 13 October?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I cannot speak for the previous Minister. I am not sure whether he made reference to companies expressing an interest in this matter, or whether he made his remarks with respect to registrations of interest relating to the operation of the *Island Seaway*. I am not absolutely certain about the number but I understand that four companies or consortia expressed an interest in operating the container terminal

at Port Adelaide. That is the most up-to-date information that I have available.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will find the reference I am looking for in *Hansard* in a few moments. Of those four companies, I understand that the Government has now nominated one such company; is that Sealand, the American based company operating out of Singapore?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to indicate which company or consortium might be the successful one at this stage. Continuing negotiations are taking place, and the success and the detail of those negotiations will determine the decision that the Government will ultimately make about this matter. Until those negotiations are concluded, I am not in a position to indicate who or which company or consortium is the favoured operator for the terminal. However, my understanding is that the negotiations are at an advanced stage, and it is hoped that there will be full agreement within the next few weeks, at which time it will be possible to make public announcements about this matter.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In the other place during the Estimates Committees, the Hon. Peter Arnold asked questions about the container terminal. He mentioned the new operator and the transport hub vision in general, and asked the Minister specifically whether the department had sought an expression of interest from other companies or just one, in reply to which the Minister said 'One' and did not explain further.

So, I would like some clarification of this matter, because there are completely contradictory stories from the two Ministers between the department seeking expressions of interest from one company, when I know that ANI, and Conaust sought to be involved in the operation of the port. Perhaps they are amongst those that the Minister is suggesting are the four, but it is clear from Mr Gregory's answer at least that the Government is interested in only one of those companies.

Then, I have a number of questions about the business in terms of the negotiations with that one company. I am very keen to know, in seeking expressions of interest from this one company (which I assume is Sealand; at least it has not been denied), what business plans have been provided to the Government that identify growth projections for container throughput of the port and returns to the Government that would be greater than any growth projections or returns to the Government from the operator, Conaust, or perhaps the Government did not seek such growth projection returns from Conaust.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not think we should labour the point about when or at what point there were one, three or four or whatever is the number. The fact is that I am advised that more than one company or consortium has expressed an interest in operating the terminal at port Adelaide. I know of at least two consortia personally, other than the organisation which is favoured by the Department of Marine and Harbors and with which detailed negotiations are taking place.

I am also advised that over a period of time since the various expressions of interest have been received by the department quite considerable discussions have occurred with each of the organisations expressing an interest, so that all those consortia understood the objectives of the department in relation to the development of the port of

Adelaide. I understand that all organisations that have expressed an interest were asked to provide information about the question of growth and future projections as part of any interest that they wanted to express in the operation of the port.

Those matters are fundamental to the whole issue. The questions of what is reasonable growth and what we should be able to expect as reasonable growth for the future are at the very heart of the reason for wanting to change the arrangements for the operations of the container terminal. Naturally, on that question there has been considerable discussion with any organisation that has expressed an interest in operating the port, and the department will be concluding an arrangement with the organisation that it feels overall will provide the very best service at port Adelaide and the greatest opportunity for growth for the port and the State.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: At this stage the Minister is not able to tell me the growth projections of the company with which the department is negotiating, but what are the department's growth projections for the port for the next five or 10 years that is the benchmark to which these companies are lodging their expressions of interest and working out their business plans?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have that specific information with me. The safest thing for me to do, because a couple of figures have been discussed here, is take that question on notice and bring back a reply about the longer-term projections for the growth that the department believes is possible for the port of Adelaide, including roughly over what time period that growth is expected to take place.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Can the Minister confirm whether those departmental growth projections were submitted to the operator Conaust to see whether it was able to meet those projections before the move to out it from the port?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have the specific officers who have been working on this project with me here today to provide advice on the detail of the negotiations on this matter, so I will have to take that question on notice. I have been advised that quite detailed discussions have taken place with Conaust officials about future growth at the port. I believe that Conaust, as were other organisations interested in operating the port, was invited to provide its own projections of future growth for port Adelaide as part of the general negotiations that were taking place. So, I should expect that Conaust has had an opportunity of making its own judgments about the growth potential of the port from its perspective, if it continues to be the operator of the port. No doubt, information would have been provided to it about the aspirations of the department and of local industry. But, as to the detail of that, I am not in a position to provide that information now. If anything further can be said about that, I will provide a written response later.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In negotiations with this un-named company at this stage, if it has indicated some growth projections and likely returns to the Government, is it proposed that penalties will be imposed on that company if those projections are not met?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to discuss the details of negotiations that are taking place on the matter of who might operate the port. So, even if I

knew the answer to that question, I would not be able to provide that information. The agreement that will be reached between the department and any future operator will be a reasonably detailed agreement. Certainly, issues relating to future projections of business, and so on, will be the amongst the key issues being discussed. Currently, I am not in a position to say the extent to which that sort of information will be embodied in an agreement.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Is the Government providing the operator any financial incentives or in kind inducements to become the operator of the port? If the Minister does not have that advice, I would be prepared to receive it later. If the company was not able to put through the port the number of containers that the department thinks is a realistic assessment of the potential for the port of Adelaide, will the Government guarantee the income of the operator?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Once again, that is an issue that may or may not be part of negotiations that are currently taking place with respect to this matter. I am not in a position to provide any information about that.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I remain quite baffled about what the Government wants to achieve in theory and what is achievable in the real world. I appreciate the Government's seeking to have two services a week to Singapore. I understand that ANROW is one such service and that Nedlloyd is proposing a service on alternative weeks from Singapore to Adelaide. I understand that the Nedlloyd service is to go from Singapore to Fremantle and then around the top of Australia to Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart and Adelaide. No-one can tell me that cargo coming from the transport hub in Singapore and being shipped to Adelaide is going to be shipped and landed quickly in Adelaide if the ship sails from Fremantle round the top of Australia to Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart and Adelaide.

I cannot see why a company would not choose, as more and more are, to offload in Fremantle and land bridge across to Adelaide or even Sydney or Melbourne. I can see why there would be advantages if the Nedlloyd ship loads in Adelaide and then goes via Fremantle to Singapore. It is convenient for exporters to use this service, but I just cannot understand about the inward journey, the land bridging and what advantage the Government believes will be achieved for a transport hub or a land bridge from Adelaide when it seems that the second service operated by Nedlloyd provides all, or much more favourable, opportunities for land bridging from transport hubs in Sydney, Melbourne or Perth. Perhaps the Minister has information and can resolve some of my doubts and concerns.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, part of the work already undertaken in developing the transport hub concept includes some detailed work on estimating the time taken from the beginning to the end of a journey from Singapore for delivery of goods to Australia and, with the provision of a fast rail service and/or road transport facility for the land freight component, it is envisaged that considerable time can be cut from the total time for delivery of goods to locations in, say, Sydney and Melbourne if companies used Adelaide as the point of entry in Australia, as compared with Fremantle or Sydney.

This can be achieved because of the now efficient services provided at our port in transfer times and the like, but it would be dependent on the development of the land transport component being as efficient as it possibly can be. It was on the basis of that work done on estimating travel times (I do not have the information with me) that there could be a saving in journeys of one to three days in delivery of goods.

It was on the basis of the development of that research work that submissions were made to the Federal Government with respect to the provision of funding to assist with the upgrading of the rail loop proposal, about which there has been considerable discussion and for which funding was provided in the Federal budget. That is a component of that overall package. As I understand it, the work that has been done on the provision of that rail facility now would suggest that direct links into the container terminal, rather than a loop arrangement, is probably a more likely configuration for the appropriate rail link, but nevertheless as part of that general concept of improving the land links for the purposes of rapid freight movement this project has been set in train.

With these various components coming together in the way I describe, it is estimated that we could reduce the delivery time so, when we are looking at particular types of freight—time sensitive freight, for example—Adelaide could well be a very attractive port for people bringing goods into Australia. That is the sort of idea that we are working on with great energy.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I know that the Minister and the Government are working on this matter with energy and, as I said earlier, the theory sounds fantastic. It has been described to me on several occasions. If we bring a ship from Singapore to Adelaide via Fremantle, it is certainly much quicker than going to Sydney and land bridging across. What I am saying to the Minister is that the second service that comes to Adelaide, on the alternate week, in fact goes from Fremantle across the top of Australia to Sydney, Melbourne, Hobart and then to Adelaide. So, I cannot see why anyone would want to put their cargo on the alternate ship and bring it to Adelaide, and then land bridge it out to Sydney, Fremantle or Melbourne, when that same ship has in fact been to all those ports first.

I would like some reassurance that the Government is in control of this whole area of the transport hub and the operation of the port, because it would seem to me, from the developments that I know are taking place in Fremantle, Sydney and Melbourne in establishing their transport hubs, that what we are so enthusiastic about in theory may have been a great idea four or five years ago but the other ports have outpaced us in that time.

It is something that should be looked at very carefully before many more dollars are invested in this concept. We have spent already perhaps multi-millions of dollars on buying out or repossessing the lease from Conaust, and I would be very interested if the Minister could tell me how much this whole transport hub is to cost, including the warehousing and the railway line. What is the whole of the transport hub costed at, including the repossession of the port or excluding that project? Finally, why did the Government need a new operator for the two lines, considering the fact that, possibly from next year, we will have two shipping lines coming in

from Singapore? Do the figures and projections of the department in determining a new operator for the port anticipate a continuation of all the direct services from Europe and other Asian countries, as well as that same 20 equivalent units of containers?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will take on notice the question of projected costs for the transport hub. I am not sure to what extent there has been an accurate costing of that project. I believe that aspects of the concept still have to be worked through before such projections can be made, but if there has been what might be termed a rough and ready costing on the total project I will provide such information if I can.

As to the question relating to continuation of services into Adelaide should there be a change in operator, as I understand it we expect that there will be a continuation of existing shipping into Adelaide. As recently as last week one of the chief executives of the P&O Shipping Line from London was here in Adelaide and assured departmental officers that it would be continuing the service it currently provides from Europe to Adelaide, so we have no reason to believe that there will be any major changes in current arrangements. It is the intention of the department in the very near future to communicate directly with all of our current overseas customers to ensure that they are fully aware of what is happening at Port Adelaide and what the changes are all about, to assure them that we wish to maintain their business and to express the hope that the changes that are about to occur will benefit them so that they can continue to receive very high standards of service through the port. It will generally give them an opportunity to seek information and clarify any concerns they might have about the changeover.

Finally, coming back to the original point made about bringing goods in and out of Adelaide, I acknowledge the Hon. Miss Laidlaw's concern about goods coming in on that second weekly shipping service to which she referred and which will also call at other ports. First, it is an additional shipping service currently not in operation and, even with the constraints placed upon it on inward coming goods, the situation being that the ships will also be calling at other ports, it nevertheless provides a new avenue for South Australian exporters wanting to ship goods out of the State and may very well enable us to encourage companies currently shipping their goods through the Port of Melbourne to alter that arrangement and use our own port, which is in the interests of our State and our port.

Whilst we may not get the full benefit from this additional service as regards goods coming in, we certainly should achieve some additional benefit and might also have the opportunity of improving business through the port, particularly with goods going out. Overall it must be viewed as a plus for the Port of Adelaide. Even with the constraints involved, it has been worth working for.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Earlier during this Committee debate the Leader of the Opposition asked some questions about what appeared to be some problems with the new schedule. There were two issues: one was on the timing of payments for State Youth Affairs and also for non-government schools. Prior to 1992-93, State Youth Affairs was previously included under the

Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education—Program 8—Youth Services. It consisted of policy and program areas. In developing the budget for 1992-93, the Minister decided to shift the policy area of State Youth Affairs to the Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous. So the policy area was shifted from the department to the Minister. The programs area remained with the department. As an interim measure, until the budget is passed, costs associated with this purpose are being carried by the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education. Following the passing of the budget, all costs incurred will then be debited against State Youth Affairs, which is why at the present time there are no payments made under this line which are shown in the papers.

With respect to non-government schools, the pattern of payments is:

1. A payment representing 35 per cent of the total paid out in the previous year was made in July 1992.
2. A second payment was processed in September 1992, representing payment of the balance owing to the school for the calendar year 1992. This payment is equivalent to about 45 per cent of the total budget provision for non-government schools.
3. A final payment will be made in December 1992 by way of an advance for the 1993 calendar year. This is usually 15 to 20 per cent of the total grant.

This pattern of payments to non-government schools has been in operation for a number of years.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: As the relevant officers are not here, I would like to put two questions on notice. The first relates to the Intellectually Disabled Services Council. The IDSC has been under the South Australian Health Commission but recently they were told that they would be relocated to FACS. However, in the last week they were retold that they are back under the Health Commission. I would like a reply from the Minister as to which department the IDSC is under?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member indicates, I do not have health or FACS officers here with me at the moment to provide advice on this matter. However, I undertake to refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague in another place and ensure that replies are given as soon as possible.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I understand that Woods and Forests is to be abolished and to go into Primary Industries, and that Woods and Forests is to be amalgamated with SATCO. Does that mean that Woods and Forests and SATCO both go into Primary Industries, and which parts of which go into the South Australian Research and Development Institute?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, since the new Primary Industries portfolio was created, the Minister has been and is currently considering which parts of the various agencies that form part of that portfolio should become part of the Department of Primary Industries and which parts would form part of SATCO. The short answer is that the matter is currently being reviewed, and organisational arrangements should be in place in the very near future, at which time details will be available. I will need to provide that information at a later date.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I would also like details of which parts go into the South Australian Research and Development Institute: is it just Woods and Forests or is it Woods and Forests and SATCO.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, it is likely that parts of Woods and Forests will become part of the Research and Development Institute but highly unlikely that parts of SATCO will. That, too, is part of the review, and information can be provided as soon as those decisions are finally taken.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Reference has already been made to the merging of Woods and Forests and the South Australian Timber Corporation. What is the timetable for the proposed merger, what are the cost savings expected to flow from that merger and what reductions in labour force are expected to result?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Regarding the honourable member's first question, as I understand it, the timetable for the merger will be subject to negotiations that have only just commenced between representatives of the work force and the union. So, it is not possible at this time to be specific about implementation. As to the second and third questions relating to cost and labour savings, I do not have that information with me, but I will provide it later.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Can I confirm that all that is subject to negotiation is the timetable for the merger, that the Government has made the decision that there will be a merger and that that decision is not subject to negotiation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That is correct.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have been informed that over the past 18 months a task force has completed an examination of the Woods and Forests Department preparatory to the merger with SATCO. On notice, will the Minister provide the names of members of the task force and their respective expertise? Secondly, is the Minister able to give an undertaking that the findings of the task force will be made public; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The answer to the first question is 'Yes'. I will refer the second question to the Minister, as I do not know his intentions with respect to the report and whether or not he would consider it appropriate to make it a public document.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The new Minister has been a fearless advocate of open government and the release of information, so I am sure it will be released. The 1989 report of the Select Committee on the South Australian Timber Corporation referred to the duplication of resources at Nangwarry where SATCO and Woods and Forests have adjacent sites and operations with duplicated administration, payroll, wood yard, mill and other areas. What will be the situation at Nangwarry specifically as a result of the merger of the South Australian Timber Corporation and the Woods and Forests Department?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member indicates, those matters to which he refers form part of the objectives that the Minister, or the Government, is trying to achieve through this merger process. I am not in a position to divulge the detail that might emerge from it, because all those matters to which the honourable member referred will be subject to the consultative process which I outlined in my response to the previous question and will form part of the

discussions that must take place. So, the detailed outcome will not be known until that consultation has taken place. I am sure the Minister will be able and willing to provide information about those matters as soon as they have become clearer through this consultative process.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Whilst I am always one for consultation, surely the Government must concede that, if there is to be any cost saving from the merger, the Nangwarry arrangement is one of the more obvious areas where cost savings can be made. So, whilst I accept that the Minister says the specifics of Nangwarry are subject to negotiation, is the Minister or her adviser in a position to at least concede that the arrangements at Nangwarry are unsatisfactory and are therefore ripe for rationalisation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It has been recognised that there is a duplication of capital assets and services. These are matters which will be part of the discussion that must take place concerning the future of Nangwarry and the other areas the honourable member referred to. As part of this consultative process, one of the objectives would be that these duplications be removed or reduced to the extent that it is possible to do so. I cannot be more specific at this time except to say that they are the issues that will certainly be on the agenda for discussion and negotiation, and the Minister certainly hopes that progress will be made.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The infamous Wood Room, I understand, is to be finally commissioned in the current financial year. There are strongly conflicting views as to the current financial viability of the Wood Room, given other things that have occurred within SATCO, particularly in relation to the Scrimber project. Can the Minister say what the final cost of the Wood Room project will be; and what is the end product of the Wood Room going to be used for?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, the Wood Room is actually part of Woods and Forests rather than SATCO, and we do not have the information about costings that the honourable member requests. I will have to take that question on notice.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Along with the Hon. Terry, Roberts and others I was a member of the original select committee. One of the prime purposes for building the Mount Gambier Wood Room was to provide young, debarked pine to the adjacent Scrimber plant. In fact, it was estimated that 40 to 50 per cent of the product from the Wood Room would be required by the Scrimber plant. Now that the Scrimber plant is no longer operational, what will be the impact on the profitability of the Wood Room? In relation to the 40 to 50 per cent of product from the Wood Room being required for the Scrimber plant, what will be done with that product now?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have that information with me today, and my adviser does not have detailed knowledge of that area either, so I will take that question on notice and provide the information at a later date.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister may have to do the same with one or two of these other questions, because they relate to the Woods and Forests Department, but I will put them on notice. I refer to page 365 of the Program Estimates, and ask whether the Minister will indicate, either now or on notice, how the Woods and

Forests Department lost money on the forestry side of its operations, and what is the department's outlook for the current financial year?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will take that question on notice and provide a reply at a later date.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister may have to do the same with this question, too. I refer to page 364 of the Program Estimates. I am informed that the Woods and Forests Department still uses a 45-year rotation program, whereas all other State forest services have a 35-year rotation; CSR Softwoods has a 35-year rotation and SEAS SAPFOR has a 30-year rotation for its softwood plantations. So, in relation to the continuing emphasis on improving the yield from the forestry source, which is referred to on page 364 of the Program Estimates, how does the department justify being so out of line in its rotation cycle when compared with other State forests and private sector practice? Is it that the department wants mature wood for the Nangwarry operation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I may have to take at least part of that question on notice, but by way of background I can indicate that, as I understand it, the inventory process that is undertaken by the Woods and Forests Department with respect to the forests within its care is one of the most precise in the world. It is necessarily precise, as the plantations are managed very intensively with the objective of setting the level of cut to the maximum level that the forest can sustain. As I understand it, as part of the assessment process that is used by the woods and forests people, they have established a complex computer model that in some way makes projections about the growth time for trees. It is reviewed from time to time, as measured against the actual growth of trees, so that, to the extent that it is possible, they are attempting to make accurate projections about the time when plantations will be harvestable and therefore productive in creating wealth through woods and forests.

I think a fairly sophisticated approach is being taken by Woods and Forests on this matter. As to whether the time period that the honourable member cites is still that which is adopted by Woods and Forests, I am not sure. I have a feeling that, as part of a recent review, the period of time may have been revised at some stage. To get a detailed response on that matter, I will refer it to the Minister and bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: First, what is the current status of the legal dispute between the former senior executive officer of Scrimber, Mr Graham Coxon, and the South Australian Timber Corporation? Secondly, does the Government still hold to the view that the failure of Scrimber was directly attributable to the management of the day rather than to the fact that the \$60 million Scrimber plant was proceeded with before satisfactory commercial product had been produced in a pilot plant and, as I am advised is alleged, a fitter and turner had been in charge of the development of the Scrimber operation in the first two years after the Government decided to proceed with the project in 1986?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, Mr Coxon brought action for wrongful dismissal against SATCO and SGIC, and that took place on 13 September last year. I understand that the matter is currently before

the Supreme Court and is therefore *sub judice*. I believe there is nothing more I can say about it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I ask the Minister to respond to the question whether the Government still holds to the view that the failure of the Scrimber plant was directly attributable to the management of the day rather than to those other commercial problems that I outlined.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In view of the court proceedings currently in progress, I think it would be inappropriate for me to attempt to respond to that question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In November 1991 the Government announced that it had received at least five expressions of interest for the closed Scrimber operation. Legal disputes between CSIRO, Scrimber International and other parties were resolved in late January this year but nothing further has been heard about the Scrimber project. Have each of the five expressions of interest been examined, and are any of these expressions of interest still alive? Is there any prospect of the Scrimber plant at Mount Gambier reopening its gates this current financial year?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, the five proposals that were under consideration some months ago are still alive, and discussions are continuing with the proponents of those five proposals. They have not reached a stage yet that would enable the Minister to predict a timetable as to when or if the Scrimber plant might reopen. The nature of the discussions has not yet reached the point where such a prediction can be made.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Is it likely to be this financial year, though?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not able to say whether it is likely to occur this financial year. As I understand it, the nature of the discussions is such that it is difficult to make an accurate prediction about that matter.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Estimates Committee in another place indicated that the Woods and Forests Department supplied sawn timber products, engineered timber products and round preservation-treated products to the market. We also know that SATCO distributes Woods and Forests products in Victoria, as well as manufacturing and marketing plywood, LVL and furniture components. However, many of SATCO and Woods and Forests private sector competitors are now importing softwood to satisfy local demand, because there has been significant substitution of structural softwood for hardwood in the marketplace. Does the fact that private sector competitors are doing this disadvantage SATCO and the Woods and Forests in any way and, if not, why not? Does this fact highlight the inherent difficulty and limitation of Government agencies competing in the commercial arena?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Unfortunately, I do not have a marketing officer with me this afternoon to provide market advice. I thought this was a discussion about appropriation and, therefore, the adviser I have with me is a financial adviser. He does not have marketing expertise and is not aware of the activities in the marketplace with respect to the matters that the honourable member has raised. Therefore, I will have to take that question on notice and refer it to the appropriate people and bring back a reply.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: How does the Government continue to justify the cost of running SATCO's distribution of its own products and Woods and Forests products in Victoria and Woods and Forests distribution of products in South Australia? Has SATCO, or a consultant on its behalf, in the past two years examined the comparative advantage of having a private sector agency distributing products on its behalf?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The premise upon which this question is based relates to assertions made in the preceding question. I was not in a position to answer that question and I am not able to comment on whether the premise on which it was based is an accurate one. As to the operations of SATCO in Victoria, it is worth the Committee's noting that prior to 1984 sales of Woods and Forests products in Victoria were handled by a commission agency. A review of these arrangements disclosed potential for improved sales performance in product mix and the opportunity to service the market at lower overall cost provided it could be established and run on a sound commercial basis.

Pursuant to this review a decision was taken to establish a SATCO operated Melbourne distribution warehouse and sales team. In 1990, SATCO Victoria also assumed responsibility for the distribution of IPL products in that State and Tasmania, integrating these products into its sawmill product range. This has been a successful venture for the South Australian Government. Since its establishment in 1984, SATCO Victoria has contributed more than \$2.2 million to the State revenue from earnings that otherwise would have been paid to external agents. That sums up the value that the current arrangement has provided for South Australia and, as I understand it at this stage, the Government does not have any intention of changing that distribution arrangement. If further information can be provided in response to the specific questions asked by the honourable member, I will ensure that the Minister reviews the position and provides the appropriate information if it is relevant.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In this severe economic downturn the private sector timber industry has responded in some instances by improving productivity dramatically. Will the Minister take on notice a question about what productivity measures are available both to the Department of Woods and Forests and SATCO? Is the Minister willing to provide that information to Parliament at a later date?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will certainly do so.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: At present the CEOs of both SATCO and Woods and Forests report directly to the Minister. As a result of the new administrative arrangements another public servant has been sandwiched between the two CEOs and the Minister, a public servant who may not necessarily have a background in this important area of the South Australian Timber Corporation's operations. How does the Minister and the Minister's adviser see this new arrangement affecting the commercial operations of the South Australian Timber Corporation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, there are some issues upon which there will be direct reports to the Minister from these organisations, although I believe that all information that goes to the Minister is likely first to go through the new coordinator of the

primary industries portfolio. In that context it is interesting to note that the new coordinator, Mr Ray Dundon, is a trained forester, so I would expect that he is in a very satisfactory position to assess the information that is likely to cross his desk with respect to these agencies that form part of this portfolio.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Legislation will come before this Council to provide for the licensing of personal care givers in hostels and rest homes, or rather the licensing of the institution. That legislation is largely agreed and certainly will not be opposed by the Liberal Party, but there is concern about the nature of its funding. Which budget line in which portfolio—and I realise that the Minister will have to refer these questions—contains the funding of the expenses that will be generated by the passage of the supported residential care legislation? As regards the central bureaucracy which is to be created, the statutory authority of the board, will the funding for the salaries of assessors and their secretarial infrastructure be borne by the State Government or will it be charged out against local government, seeing that local government is to be the licensing authority?

With respect to the costs generated by local government in its areas, such as the costs of inspecting, it may be that some local government areas where there are many hostels and boarding houses will have to take on extra staff or in some other way incur costs, and other local government areas may not. Does the Government plan to fund local government to carry out its part of the task of inspection and enforcement, or will local government have to find the extra money itself? Given the inequities between different regions, some of which may have many institutions within their boundaries and others may have few or none, will grants to local government, if any, be pro rata, as it were, so that the inequalities are evened out by subsidy?

In short, will the Minister give details of those sorts of questions about funding and a detailed explanation of the funding of those costs both centrally and at local government level? I ask that now in the hope that it may save time in having to report progress in order to get the answers when the Bill comes on next week.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will be happy to refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. Is the honourable member suggesting that the replies be brought back before next week?

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Hopefully we will be passing the Bill next week and, in the normal course of events, I would like answers to the questions that I would have asked then. This will enable the Bill to pass more quickly when it comes on if we have the answers and they do not have to be asked in Committee, with progress being reported.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand the point being made by the honourable member. A Bill relating to this matter is currently before the Council and will be debated next week. If it is possible to provide those responses to assist the debate on that Bill, I will certainly take a keen personal interest in ensuring that that is so, since I am the Minister handling the Bill. I will put that request to the relevant Minister and, if at all possible, bring back replies within that time frame.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government promised that a business licensing information system would be introduced in the current financial year. How complete will be the system? Will it enable an intending small business proprietor to be advised what Federal legislation he has to comply with, as is the case with a similar system operating in New South Wales? Will the system in South Australia be as complete and comprehensive as the current New South Wales system?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is the intention that when the business licensing information system is introduced in South Australia it will simultaneously introduce information relating to State Government issues as well as to Commonwealth Government issues. We would hope that that information system will be in place by the middle of next year.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Will the Minister indicate how much it is estimated the business licensing information system will cost to establish?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In the first financial year there will be an allocation of \$430 000 to establish the system and it would be expected that there would then be a recurrent cost of around \$120 000 per year.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In other States increasing emphasis is being placed on regional development. For example, in Queensland and New South Wales a larger share of small business corporation spending is being directed to small business in regional areas in those two States. Although the recently released annual report of the Small Business Corporation in South Australia discusses the assistance it has given to self-help enterprise development groups in rural areas, we are clearly not doing as much in our regional areas as some other States, particularly in the face of the severe economic downturn. Has the Government examined the regional programs of other States and is there any chance that some of the better initiatives from the other States will be implemented in the regional areas of South Australia?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The South Australian Small Business Corporation has in many ways led Australia with some of the regional programs that have been initiated in this State. The honourable member may be aware of the 20 or more enterprise development organisations that have been established around rural South Australia by the Small Business Corporation, and working in conjunction with the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology. I understand that recently the Small Business Corporation has been successful in attracting Federal funding for the employment of four regional advisers, two of whom have already started work, with two to follow in the near future, to work with some of the enterprise development organisations that exist in South Australia. The role of the Small Business Corporation with respect to these people will be to assist the EDOs to choose appropriate people to fulfil the function and also to provide appropriate training for those people.

One of the things that sets the Small Business Corporation in South Australia apart from small business corporations in some other parts of Australia is that over the years there has been a very strong move by our Small Business Corporation to develop strong links with people in the private sector, to provide appropriate advice and support for small businesses around the State. While we

find that in some other States offices have been established in suburban and rural locations to provide assistance, in this State the emphasis has been on building networks with appropriate people in the private sector, such as accountants, people working in banks, solicitors, and other people who are in the front line of dealing on a day-to-day basis with people in the small business sector.

In this way better advice is provided to small business people as a matter of course in their daily dealings with various professionals, so that over time we have both a better informed small business community and also a better informed group of professional advisers working around the State. This networking that has been undertaken by the Small Business Corporation and these various professionals in the field has been pioneering work and it is work that has been copied in other parts of Australia because of the success that has been evident here in this State.

So, in summary, considerable work has been done in developing self-help organisations around the State amongst networks of small business people: additional assistance is being provided by way of grants from the Federal Government; occasional visits are made by officers of the Small Business Corporation to rural areas to provide appropriate assistance to local organisations; and there has been this network of professionals with whom the Small Business Corporation has developed very good relations and who in many cases, as a first line of call, will refer inquiries received from small business operators to these people in the field who are known to be well informed and able to provide advice of a high quality to small business operators.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What steps has the Small Business Corporation or the Government taken to review the Government Loan Guarantee Scheme, which provides small business with the ability to receive a loan of up to \$75 000? I am informed that in 1991-92 there were no successful applicants under this scheme and that in preceding years the scheme appears to have met with as little success. Has the Small Business Corporation reviewed the operation of this scheme and has it examined schemes operating in other States?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: During the past financial year a number of projects have been examined for eligibility under this scheme, but none of the projects brought forward actually met the criteria and the applicants under this scheme, who were found not to meet the criteria, were referred to other more appropriate sources of funding. Generally, the board of the Small Business Corporation has felt in recent years that the scheme has not met the original intentions it had for it, and it was felt that other sources of funding which are more appropriate are available through other agencies and other avenues.

In most cases, over the past two or three years people have been referred to those other sources of funding. From memory, there was a review of the criteria for this scheme undertaken about two years ago, just to bring it up to date and to tighten up the funding arrangements. That is the current status of this scheme. It still exists but its use is not as frequent as it was in the first few years of operation. I am not aware of any plans to review the

scheme but, if there are such plans, I am sure that information can be provided later.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In Queensland, in the current year, 1 000 small businesses are being provided with \$1 000 each to assist in the preparation of a business plan. What is the average expected level of assistance for consultancies for the development of business plans for small business in South Australia in 1992-93?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, the Queensland program was part of an election promise by the Goss Government prior to the last State election to provide 1000 consultancies at \$1000 each for the development of business plans. It is not clear whether this is to be an ongoing project or whether it is a one-off scheme. As far as South Australia is concerned, the budget for consultancies of this sort, or whatever sort that is required by individual small business operators, is about \$140 000 to \$145 000 a year. On last year's figures, about 240 people were assisted with that amount of money being devoted to consultancies. So, I suggest that, relatively speaking, South Australia is probably achieving more per dollar spent than the Queensland Small Business Corporation is likely to achieve with the allocation under that scheme.

As I indicated, it is not clear whether the scheme is to be ongoing or whether it is to be a one-off. What we can say is that the amount of money allocated in South Australia for consultancies is an ongoing scheme. The consultancy service is provided every year and considerable assistance is provided to small businesses around the State as a result of that ongoing scheme.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Mr Chairman, at this point I would like to make a correction to *Hansard*. Earlier this afternoon, in discussions with the Hon. Ms Laidlaw, there was a query regarding the percentage increase in the project grant funds. I am delighted to say that the Hon. Ms Laidlaw was correct and I was incorrect. The figure should be 9.4 per cent. I had been handed a sheet of paper which was an earlier draft with the incorrect figure on it. The correction was made because the initial calculations had not taken a proper account of the grant program administered by the South Australian Youth Arts Board. I am delighted on this occasion that the figure quoted by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw is the correct one and it is a 9.4 per cent increase.

New Schedule A passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver the Appropriation Bill and message to the House of Assembly when the Council is not sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Friday 6 November at 2.15 p.m.