

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 2 November 1993

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

ASSENTS

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

Appropriation,
 Classification of Films for Public Exhibition (Arrangements with Commonwealth) Amendment,
 Classification of Publications (Arrangements with Commonwealth) Amendment,
 Environment Protection,
 Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) (Consistency with Commonwealth Act) Amendment,
 Land Tax (Rates) Amendment,
 Motor Vehicles (Driving Whilst Disqualified—Penalties) Amendment,
 Petroleum (Pipeline Licences) Amendment,
 Prince Alfred Shipwrecked Mariners Fund (Transfer and Revocation of Trusts),
 Residential Tenancies (Housing Trust) Amendment,

Road Traffic (Breath Analysis) Amendment,
 South Australian Film Corporation (Administration) Amendment,
 Statutes Amendment (Abolition of Compulsory Retirement),
 Statutes Amendment (Landlord and Tenant),
 Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Places of Public Entertainment).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answers to the following questions on notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 15 to 22, 24 to 28 and 73.

GOVERNMENT STAFFING

15. The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Premier, Minister of Economic Development and Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which offices were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: All officers working in the offices of the Premier, Minister of Economic Development and Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs as of 1 August 1992:

Name	Status	Class	Salary	+ Allowance
Alexandrides N.	Min	ZA-2	44793	25% in lieu of overtime
Anderson G.	Min	EL-2	71750	Nil
Appleby J.	Min	ASO-4	34850	Nil
	GME	ASO-2	24908	Nil
Chenoweth K.	Min	ASO-2	25933	Nil
Deed B.	Min	ZA-1	49610	15% In lieu of overtime
Garrand R.	Min	ZA-2	42025	20% In lieu of overtime
	GME	ASO-1	23165	Nil
	GME	ASO-1	23165	Nil
Lange E.	Min	ASO-3	29008	Nil
Turner J.	Min	ZA7PR	48077	30% In lieu of overtime
Varga V.	Min	ASO-2	26958	Nil
Vaughan J.	Min	ASO-2	27182	Nil
Willoughby P.	Min	ZA7PR	48077	30% In lieu of overtime
Wright M.	Min	ZA2	41000	15% In lieu of overtime
Goodrich A.	Min	ASO-3	29008	Nil

N.B. MIN = Ministerial Contract
 GME = GME Act Employee

All officers working in the offices of the Premier, Minister of Economic Development and Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs as of 1 August 1993.

Name	Status	Class	Salary	Allowance
	GME	ASO-2	24908	Nil
Foley K.	MIN	ZA-1	49610	30% In lieu of overtime
Appleby J.	MIN	ASO-4	34850	Nil
	GME	ASO-2	25933	Nil
Chenoweth K.	MIN	ASO-2	26958	Nil
Kouts J.	MIN	ZA7PR	48077	35% In lieu of overtime
Garrand R.	MIN	ZA-2	44793	20% In lieu of overtime
	GME	ASO-1	25933	All. to ASO-2

Name	Status	Class	Salary	Allowance
	GME	ASO-1	18943	Nil
Lange E.	MIN	ASO-3	29008	Nil
Turner J.	MIN	ZA7PR	48007	30% In lieu of overtime
Greenhalgh G.	MIN	ASO-4	33313	10% In lieu of overtime
Vaughan J.	MIN	ASO-2	27182	Nil
Willoughby P.	MIN	ZA7PR	48077	30% In lieu of overtime
Wright M.	MIN	ZA-2	44793	15% In lieu of overtime
Goodrich A.	MIN	ASO-3	30033	Nil
Cox D.	MIN	EL-2	71750	Nil
Reardon G.	MIN	ZA-2	44793	15% In lieu of overtime
Campbell F.	MIN	ZA-2	44793	15% In lieu of overtime

N.B. MIN = Ministerial Contract
GME = GME Act Employee

16. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and Minister for the Aged as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which offices were 'ministerial' assistants and which offices had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: For the Minister of Health, Family & Community Services & Minister for the Aged:
Officers Appointed Under G.M.E. and
S.A.H.C Acts

ACT	Title	Salary 1.8.92 \$	Salary 1.8.93 \$
GME	Chief Administrative Officer	46 125	46 125
GME	Senior Administrative Officer	42 025	42 025
GME	Administrative Officer	33 313	34 081
SAHC	Personal Secretary	31 058	31 058
SAHC	Clerical Officer	25 933	26 958
SAHC	Clerical Officer	25 933	26 958
SAHC	Clerical Officer	21 127	21 742
SAHC	Clerical Officer	18 624	20 244
GME	Clerical Officer	25 933	26 958

Ministerial Officers

Name	Salary 1.8.92 \$	Salary 1.8.93 \$
Purman V *	55 874	55 874
Gilchrist S#	51 512	—
Boyd S#	—	51 512
Bennink J#	—	51 512
Roman A#	51 512	—

* Salary includes allowance of 25 per cent in lieu of overtime.

Salary includes allowance of 15 per cent in lieu of overtime.

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

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

17. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Business and Regional Development, Tourism and State Services as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which offices were 'ministerial' assistants and which offices had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:

1, 2 & 3. The Ministerial Office of Business and Regional Development, Tourism, State Services was not in existence on the 1st August 1992.

As of 1ST August
1993

	Name	Salary \$
GME Act ASO-6	-	46 125
GME Act ASO-6	-	43 322
GME Act ASO-4	-	33 313
GME Act ASO-3	-	31 058
GME Act ASO-2	-	25 933
GME Act ASO-2	-	26 958
GME Act ASO-1	-	21 986 + 319
GME Act ASO-1	-	20 808 + 319
Ministerial	Andrea Martin	44 793 + 6304
Ministerial	Helen Thew	44 699 + 6705

18. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Attorney-General, Minister for Crime Prevention and Minister of Public Sector Reform as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which offices had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

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

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

Positions	Status	Salary p.a
Secretary	GME Act	\$46 125.00
Administrative Officer	GME Act	\$34 850.00
Appointment Secretary	GME Act	\$31 058.00
Parliamentary Clerk	GME Act	*\$30 033.00
Clerk	GME Act (Part time)	\$13 479.00
Correspondence Clerk	GME Act	\$22 869.00
Press Secretary		
J Bottrall	Ministerial Assistant	\$44 699.00
		O/T Allowance \$ 6 705.00

* Receiving salary allowance.

19. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The office of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training did not exist prior to October 1992. As a result of the creation of the combined Ministry of Education, Employment and Training a saving of 14 FTEs was achieved.

The staff working within the office of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training as at 1 August 1993 is as follows:

Name	Level August 1992	Level August 1993	Type of Appointment	Salary Current as at 4th August 1993
Geoff Loveday	ZA2	ZA2	Ministerial	44 793 +15% overtime
Rosa Colanero	ZA2	ZA2	Ministerial	44 793 +15% overtime
Marie Sellstrom	ZA2	ZA2	Ministerial	44 793 +15% overtime
Belinda Wood	ZA2	ZA2	Ministerial	44 793 +15% overtime
Helen Till	ZA2	ZA2	Ministerial	44 793 +15% overtime
Toni Jupe	ZA7	ZA7	Media Advisor	44 699 + 15% overtime
* Senior Administrative Officer	ASO5	ASO6	GME	43 460
* Finance Manager	ASO6	Position Transferred	GME	43 460
* Appointment Secretary	ASO3	ASO3	GME	30 033
* Administrative Officer	ASO3	ASO3	GME	31 058
* Administrative Officer	ASO3	ASO3	GME	31 058
* Administrative Officer	ASO3	ASO3	GME	30 033
* Administrative Officer	ASO3	ASO3	GME	29 008
* Parliamentary Clerk	ASO2	ASO2	GME	24 908
* Administrative Support	ASO1	Position Transferred	GME	20 244
* Clerical Support	ASO1	ASO1	GME	20 244
* Clerical Support	ASO1	Position Transferred	GME	20 244
* Administrative Support	ASO2	ASO2	GME	24 908
* Receptionist/Information	ASO2	ASO2	GME	24 908

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

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

20. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and the Minister of Recreation and Sport as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were 'ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

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

In addition to contract staff, ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from departments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of

Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

1 August 1992—There was no office of the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and Minister of Recreation and Sport as of 1 August 1992.

Position		Salary \$
Executive Assistant	GME	46 125
Senior Administrative Officer	GME	37 515
Appointment Secretary	GME	31 058
Senior Clerk	GME	29 008
Ministerial Secretary	GME	26 958
Clerk	GME	24 908
Parliamentary Clerk	GME	24 908
Clerical Officer	GME	23 165
Clerical Officer	GME	23 484
Liaison Officer (Local Government)	GME	40 488
Senior Policy Analyst (Housing)	SAHT Act	48 461*
Cathie King	Ministerial	44 793
	O/T Allowance	6 719
Margaret Ralston	Ministerial	44 699
	O/T Allowance	6 705

It should be noted that the salary for the officer marked with an asterisk is funded from the respective department.

21. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Primary Industries and Minister assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management

and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: (It should be noted that as at the 1 August 1992 the current office of the Minister of Primary Industries was then the Office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Ethnic Affairs.)

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

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

2-3. Office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

Staffing as at 1 August 1992

	Classification	Salary
	Ministerial/ GME Act	
Chief Administrative Officer	ASO6 GME	\$44 793
Administrative Officer	ASO4 GME	\$34 850
Appointment Secretary	ASO3 GME	\$27 182
Senior Clerk	ASO2 GME	\$25 933
Ministerial Secretary	ASO2 GME	Resigned 1/7/92
Correspondence Clerk	ASO1 GME	\$24 908
Parliamentary Clerk	ASO1 GME	Act ASO2 \$23 165
*Receptionist	ASO1 GME	\$14 576
**Ministerial Liaison Officer	PSO3 GME	\$46 125
***Research Assistant	ASO4 GME	\$37 322
Executive Assistant (Mr Kevin Foley)	MO Gr.2 Ministerial	\$44 793 +15%
Media Adviser (Mr. Jim Kouts)	P/Sec Gr.1 Ministerial	\$44 699 +25%
*Aboriginal Youth Employment Training Program Participant—salary costs were reimbursed by the Department of Labour.		
**Ministerial Liaison Officer—Department of Agriculture.		
***Research Assistant—Department of Agriculture.		

3. Office of the Minister of Primary Industries and Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs.
Staffing as at 1st August 1993

	Classification	Salary
	Ministerial/GME Act	
Chief Administrative Officer	ASO6 GME	\$46 125
Administrative Officer	ASO4 GME	\$34 850
Appointment Secretary	ASO3 GME	\$29 008
A/Senior Clerk	ASO2 GME	\$25 933
*Ministerial Secretary	ASO2 GME	—
Correspondence Clerk	ASO1 GME	\$22 305
**Parliamentary Clerk	ASO1 GME	\$24 908
Receptionist	ASO1 GME	\$22 550
***Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO5 GME	\$40 488
Ministerial Adviser (Ms Grace Portolesi)	MO Gr.2 Ministerial	\$44 793 +15%
Media Adviser (Ms Michele Nardelli)	P/Sec Gr.1 Ministerial	\$44 699 +15%
*Ministerial Secretary—Vacant		
**Parliamentary Clerk—Additional Duties Allowance.		
***Ministerial Liaison Officer—Department of Primary Industries.		

22. The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, Consumer and Affairs and Status of Women as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:

1 August 1992 \$		
L Boswell	Ministerial	44793 + 15% loading
H Thew	Ministerial	44699 + 15% loading
	GME Act	42025
	GME Act	34081
	GME Act	34081
	GME Act (0.4 FTE)	10373
	GME Act (0.6 FTE)	12338
	GME Act	23484
	GME Act	21986
1 August 1993 \$		
L Boswell	Ministerial	44793 + 15% loading
R Morris	Ministerial	44699 + 15% loading
	GME Act	43460
	GME Act	42025
	GME Act	34081
	GME Act	34081
	GME Act (0.4 FTE)	10373
	GME Act	21127
	GME Act	23484
	GME Act	22957

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

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

24. The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Environment and Land Management and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: As at 1 August 1992, the Minister of Environment and Planning, the Minister of Emergency Services and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs were all different Ministers. As a result, attached there are three tables indicating their staffing details as at that date. I have provided a combined table with the required information as at 1 August 1993, as these were then the responsibilities of one Minister.

Employee details For the Office of Minister of Environment and Planning Minister of Lands Minister of Water Resources as at 1 August 1992			
Name	Classi- fication	GME ACT/ Ministerial	Salary (\$pa)
	ASO5	GME ACT	42 025
	ASO3	GME ACT	31 058
	ASO3	GME ACT	31 058
	ASO3	GME ACT	31 058
	ASO3	GME ACT	31 058
	ASO2	GME ACT	25 933
	ASO2	GME ACT	26 958
	ASO1	GME ACT	23 165
	ASO1	GME ACT	21 423
	ASO1	GME ACT	23 165
	ASO1	GME ACT	16 600
	ASO1	GME ACT	23 165
	ASO1	GME ACT	23 165
	ASO1	GME ACT	21 423
	ASO1	GME ACT	20 808

R Clark	Press Secretary	Ministerial	44 699+ 6 705(allow)	Parliamentary Clerk	ASO2	GME ACT
G Loveday		Ministerial	44 793+ 6 719(allow)	Index Clerk	ASO1	GME ACT
D Robertson		Ministerial	44 793+ 6 719(allow)	Receptionist	ASO1	GME ACT

The following tables are of individual portfolios as at 1 August 1992.

Name	Minister of Emergency Services	Classification	Appointment Criteria	Name	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs	Employment Criteria	Salary (\$pa)
Mr David Abfalder, Principal Adviser		ZA-2	Ministerial Contract	Andrea Martin		Ministerial	51 097 (Including Overtime Allow)
Mr Peter Charles Press Secretary		G-1	Ministerial Contract	Dianne Beer		Ministerial	51 403 (Including Overtime Allow)
Chief Administrative Officer		ASO6	GME ACT			GME ACT	31 058
Administrative Officer-ES		ASO4	GME ACT			GME ACT	40 322
Administrative Officer-M&E		A-ASO3	GME ACT			GME ACT	21 127 (including Academic Allow)
Personal Assistant		ASO3	GME ACT			GME ACT	25 933
						GME ACT	21 741
						GME ACT	34 081
						GME ACT	27 182
						GME ACT	20 533 (including Academic Allow)

Employee details for the office of
Minister of Emergency Services
Minister of Environment and Land Management
Minister of Aboriginal Affairs
as at 1 August 1993

NAME	CLASSIFICATION	GME ACT/ MINISTERIAL	TITLE	SALARY (\$ PA)
	ASO5	GME ACT	Chief Admin Officer	42 025
*	ASO4 (Acting)	GME ACT	Admin Officer	26 958+6 355 (Allow to ASO4)
	ASO3	GME ACT	Appointment Secretary	29 008
	ASO2	GME ACT	Parliamentary Clerk	24 908
*	ASO1 (Acting)	GME ACT	Receptionist	23 135
	ASO1	GME ACT	Clerical Officer	20 808 + 319 (Academic Allow)
Simon Bryant	ZA-2	Ministerial	Ministerial Assistant	44 793 + 6 719 (Overtime Allow)
	PSO2	GME ACT	Liaison Officer	42 025 + 4 100 (Allow to PSO3)
Sarah Trainer	ZA-3	Ministerial	Liaison Officer	33 313 + 4 997 (Overtime Allow)
Karen Ashford	ZA-7	Ministerial	Press Secretary	44 699 + 6 705 (Overtime Allow)
	JBS-1	Job Skill	Trainee	280 per week (for 20 weeks)
	JBS-1	Job Skill	Trainee	280 per week (for 20 weeks)
	ASO1	GME ACT	Correspondence Clerk	20 244 + 319 (Academic Allow)
	ASO1	GME ACT	Correspondence Clerk	20 244 + 319 (Academic Allow)

Positions marked * are vacant positions

25. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety and Minister of Correctional Services as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

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

Ministerial/GME as at 1/8/92	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	G Williamson	51 512
Ministerial	AC West	51 404
GME—ASO6	-	43 460
GME—ASO3	-	30 033
GME—ASO3	-	29 008
GME—ASO1	-	20 563
GME—ASO1	-	18 943
Ministerial/GME as at 1/8/93	Name	Salary \$
Ministerial	G Williamson	51 512
Ministerial	S Clayer	51 404

Ministerial (Part Time)	L Sudano	30 907
GME—ASO6	-	44 793
GME—ASO3	-	31 058
GME—ASO3	-	30 033
GME—ASO1	-	21 127
GME—ASO1	-	20 563

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

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

26. **The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:**

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister of Mineral Resources as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers

had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

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

As of August 1992	Name	Salary
GME Act ASO-6		44 793
GME Act ASO-4		34 081
(Re-assigned to MOT Office Oct 1992)		
GME Act ASO-3		30 033
(Maternity Leave from Nov 1992-Resigned)		
GME Act ASO-2		25 933
(Re-assigned to MOT Office Oct 1992)		
GME Act ASO-3		29 008
(Re-assigned to Deputy Premier's Office from Oct 1992)		
GME Act ASO-2		24 908
GME Act ASO-1		22 149
GME Act ASO-1		21 742
(Re-assigned to Housing Trust March 1993)		
GME Act ASO-1		20 244
(Re-assigned to Deputy Premiers Office March 1993)		
GME Act ASO-5-		42 025
(Seconded position, returned to SAFA Oct 1992)		
GME Act ASO-5		38 950
(Seconded to Deputy Premiers Office from SAFA October 1992)		
Ministerial	Kaye Mathewson	55 874
Ministerial	Grace Portolesi	51 512
(Appointed to Minister of Primary Industries Office October 1992)		
Ministerial	Alvan Roman	51 512
(Appointed to Deputy Premiers Office October 1992)		
Ministerial	David Cox	71 750
(Appointed to Deputy Premiers Office Dec 1992)		
(Transferred to Premiers Office June 1993)		
As of 1st August 1993		
GME Act ASO-6		44 793
GME Act ASO-3		29 008
GME Act ASO-2		24 908
GME Act ASO-1		22 149
GME Act ASO-1		20 244
GME Act ASO-5		38 950
(Seconded from SAFA)		
Ministerial	Kaye Mathewson	55 874
Ministerial	Alvan Roman	51 512

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

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

27. The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Transport Development as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were 'Ministerial' assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

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

In addition to contract staff, ministerial offices are also serviced by officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act. These officers are often seconded from depart-

ments under the Minister's control and are periodically rotated or otherwise moved into and from positions within the mainstream of Public Service. It is therefore not considered appropriate to identify officers who happen to be located in a ministerial office at a particular point in time.

The following table indicates the names, positions, classifications, appointment criteria and remuneration of the staff of the office of the Minister of Transport as at 1 August 1992:

Name	Classification	Appointment Criteria	Salary
W Chapman, Ministerial Officer	Ministerial Officer, Gr. 2	Ministerial Contract	\$51 512
K Mathewson, Press Sec.	Press Secretary	Ministerial Contract	\$51 404
Senior Administrative Officer	ASO-6	GME Act	\$43 460
Administrative Officer	ASO4	GME Act	\$34 081
Appointment Secretary	ASO-3	GME Act	\$29 008
Parliamentary Clerk	ASO-2	GME Act	\$25 933
Correspondence Clerk	ASO-1	GME Act	\$21 127
Correspondence Clerk	ASO-1	GME Act	\$18 943
Receptionist	ASO-1	GME Act	\$21 127

The following table indicates the names, positions, classifications, appointment criteria and remuneration of the staff of the office of the Minister of Transport Development as at 1 August 1993:

Name	Classification	Appointment Criteria	Salary
I Newbery, Ministerial Officer	Ministerial Officer, Gr.2	Ministerial Contract	\$51 512
M Smith, Press Sec.	Press Secretary	Ministerial Contract	\$51 404
M Carmichael, Appointment Sec./Personal Assistant	Ministerial Officer Gr.3	Ministerial Contract	\$35 562
Senior Administrative Officer	A/ASO6	GME Act	\$43 460
Senior Clerk/Parliamentary Clerk	ASO-3	GME Act	\$29 008
Correspondence Clerk	A/ASO-2	GME Act	\$25 933
Ministerial Secretary	ASO-2	GME Act	\$26 958
Information Clerk,	ASO-2	GME Act	\$25 933
Receptionist Clerk/Typist	ASO-1	GME Act	\$20 244
Clerk/Typist	ASO-1	GME Act	\$20 244

28. The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. What were the names of all officers working in the offices of the Minister of Public Infrastructure as of 1 August 1992 and 1 August 1993?

2. Which officers were ministerial assistants and which officers had tenure and were appointed under the Government Management and Employment Act?

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

Name	Classification	Appointment criteria
Mr David Abfalter, Principal Adviser	ZA-2	Ministerial Contract
Mr Peter Charles, Press Secretary	G-1	Ministerial Contract
Chief Administrative Officer	ASO-6	GME Act
Administrative Officer-ES	ASO-4	GME Act

Administrative
Officer-M&E A/ASO-3 GME Act
Personal Assistant ASO-3 GME Act
Parliamentary Clerk ASO-2 GME Act
Index Clerk ASO-1 GME Act
Receptionist ASO-1 GME Act

The following table indicates the names, positions, classifications, appointment criteria and remuneration of the staff of the office of the Minister of Public Infrastructure as at 1 August 1993:

Name	Classification	Appointment Criteria	Salary
Mr David Abfalter, Principal Adviser	ZA-2	Ministerial Contract	\$51 512
Mr Peter Charles, Press Secretary	G-1	Ministerial Contract	\$51 404
Chief Administrative Officer	ASO-6	GME Act	\$44 793
Administrative Officer	ASO-4	GME Act	\$34 850
Personal Assistant	ASO-3	GME Act	\$30 033
Parliamentary Clerk	ASO-2	GME Act	\$26 958
Appointments Clerk	ASO-2	GME Act	\$24 908
Index Clerk	ASO-1	GME Act	\$22 305
Receptionist	ASO-1	GME Act	\$20 563

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

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

As there was no Minister of Public Infrastructure as at 1 August 1992 it is assumed that the honourable member is referring to the then office of the Minister of Emergency Services, Mines and Energy and Forests. That being the case the following table indicates the names, positions, classifications, and appointment criteria as at 1 August 1992 for that office.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

73. **The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Will the Treasurer provide a schedule of all equity shares, convertible unsecured notes, preference shares or investments in unlisted companies, business undertakings or partnerships (including the number of units or percentage interest) held by the State Government Insurance Commission or its subsidiaries as at—

1. 30 June 1992;
2. 30 June 1993?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Attached is a schedule detailing the information requested by the honourable member.

	Number of Units	Number of Units
	30-6-92	30-6-93
Aberfoyle Ltd	130 000	500 000
Adelaide Brighton	11 714 963	3 596 963
Advance Bank	600 000	-
AMCOR	350 000	850 000
Ampolex Conv Pref ANI	-	219 000
ANI	-	493 000
ANI Notes	400 000	-
ANZ Banking Group	1 000 000	937 700
ANZ New	-	160 700
ARGO Investments	592 100	10 550 000
Arnotts Ltd	200 000	96 200
Australian Chemical	-	100 000
Australian Cons. Press	-	196 000
Bennett & Fisher	2 339 618	-
BHP	1 020 000	1 710 500
Boral	700 000	669 400
Bounty Investments	3 429 205	2 079 205
Brambles Industries	200 000	-
Brash Holdings Ltd	300 000	295 000
Brash Convertible Notes	-	250 000

Brickworks	50 000	90 000
Brierly Investments Ltd	1 000 000	615 000
BRL Hardy	-	2 000 000
BTR Nylex	-	2 755 300
BTR Nylex Notes	543 000	-
Burns Philip	-	396 000
Burns Philip Notes	453 900	-
C MIMQB Jul93 2.50	-	100 000
C MIMTB Oct93 2.25	-	200 000
C STOQG Aug93 3.50	-	455 000
C WPLQA Sep 93 3.25	-	100 000
C WPLQE Sep 93 3.00	-	100 000
Caltex	350 000	-
CC Amatil Ltd	300 000	144 400
Clyde Industries Ltd	100 000	500 000
Coles Myer Ltd	500 000	1 014 700
Comalco Ltd	363 800	344 000
Commonwealth Bank	300 000	295 100
Co-Op Building Society	2 543 668	100 000
CRA Stock	460 000	444 500
CSR Ltd	650 000	684 400
Email Ltd	300 000	295 000
Energy Equity Corp	-	1 500 000
John Fairfax	-	631 000
F H Faulding & Co	4 646 634	2 646 634
Fletcher Challenge	500 000	895 000
Fosters Brewing Group	1 500 000	2 786 900
General Property Trust	400 000	395 000
GIO Australia	-	600 000
Goodman Fielder	1 400 000	1 090 000
Hills Industries	987 574	987 574
ICI Australia	200 000	235 000
Independent Holdings	2 403 968	-
Independent Holdings Options	163 088	-
James Hardie Industries	300 000	254 000
Leighton Holdings	-	250 000
Lend Lease Corp Ltd	200 000	211 200
Macmahon Holdings	2 413 272	-
Mayne Nickless	218 100	260 000
Metal Manufactures	200 000	300 000
Metal Manufactures Prefs	-	100 000
MIM Holdings	800 000	1 482 000
National Australia Bank	1 300 000	1 240 501
Newcrest Mining	800 000	250 000
News Corporation	260 000	1 914 000
Nine Network	-	330 000
Nine Network Preference	400 000	13 200
Normandy Poseidon	300 000	-
North Broken Hill	397 000	678 000
Orbital Engine Corp	300 000	283 934
Pacific BBA	-	150 000
Pacific Dunlop	644 875	770 000
Pasminco Ltd	500 000	757 000
Petaluma Ltd	-	100 000
Placer Pacific	420 000	716 500
Pioneer International	520 000	697 600
Poseidon Gold Option	-	400 000
QBE Insurance	200 000	100 000
QCT Resources C/Notes	800 000	-
QUF Industries Ltd	400 000	-
Renison Gold	200 000	192 400
SA Brewing Co	20 315 251	7 120 400
Santos	2 715 848	521 344
SEAS 'A' Preference	1 782 891	-
SEAS 'B' Preference	1 382 891	-
John Shearer	697 100	-
Howard Smith Ltd	500 000	143 900
Stockland Property Trust	250 000	220 000
Sydney Aquarium Ltd	-	200 000
Sydney Aquarium Notes	-	200 000
TNT Ltd	600 000	-
Tubemakers	400 000	-
Vision Systems	361 267	186 267
Wakefield	2 918 367	1 753 367
Westpac Banking Corp	800 000	2 027 600
Wesfarmers Ltd	100 000	185 200
Westfield Trust	400 000	579 000
George Weston Foods	200 000	-
WMC Holdings	600 000	929 900

Woodside Petroleum	400 000	526 000
UNLISTED EQUITIES		
	Number of	Number of
	Units	Units
	30-6-92	30-6-93
Advent Tourism	400 000	400 000
Amdel Ltd	1 485 000	1 485 000
Angasi Pty Ltd (Orlando)	6 000 000	6 000 000
Argo Notes	9 000 000	-
Austereo Notes	8 333 333	8 333 333
Austereo Ltd	43 672 184	43 672 184
Berrivale Orchards	160 000	-
Berrivale Notes	640 000	640 000
Brileen Industries	66 600	66 600
Brileen Industries Notes	49 950	-
Commercial Motors	556 868	556 868
Country Comfort Motels	11 742 416	11 742 416
IHL Co Options	610 000	-
Macquarie Bank	4 192 431	1 642 875
Macquarie Bank Trust	10 000 000	10 000 000
MBO Capital Investment Trust	10 000 000	10 000 000
Sabco Ltd	2 517 437	2 517 437
Sabco Ltd Notes	889 700	-
Satisfac Property Trust	2 000 000	2 000 000
SBC Mezzanine	-	40 000
Tubocell Ltd	100 000	100 000
CONTROLLED ENTITIES—Unchanged from 1991-92		
SGIC		
SGIC Pty Ltd		
which holds:-		
Austrust Ltd		
which holds:-		
Executor Trustee Australia Ltd	100%	
Bouvet Pty Ltd	100%	
SA Projects Pty Ltd	100%	
SGIC Financial Services Pty Ltd	100%	
SGIC Hospitals	100%	
which holds:-		
Darwin Private Hospital Pty Ltd	100%	
SGIC Health Pty Ltd	100%	
SGIC Nominees Pty Ltd	100%	
The Durham Trust Fund	80%	
Torrens Property Management		
Funds Pty Ltd	100%	
BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS/PARTNERSHIPS		
—unchanged from 1991-92		
SA Projects Pty Ltd holds:-		
Boran and Tuli Cattle Breeders	49%	
Australian Breeding Services	49%	
Scrimber	50%	

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table—

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—
Reports—1992-93—

- Attorney-General's Department.
Ordered to be printed. (Paper No. 151)
- Casino Supervisory Authority.
- Gaming Machines Act 1992.
- Children's Court Advisory Committee.
Ordered to be printed. (Paper No. 27)
- Commissioner for Public Employment.
- Director of Public Prosecutions.
Ordered to be printed.
- Group Asset Management Authority.
- Police Superannuation Board.
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
- SACON.
- South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs
Commissioner and Office of Multicultural and
Ethnic Affairs.
- Friendly Societies Act 1919—General Laws of the Mutual
Community Friendly Society of S.A. and the Friendly
Societies Medical Association Inc.
- Rules of Court—
Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court Act 1991—
Civil—Various.

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—

- Recovery of Costs—Personal Injury.
- Criminal—Arraignment Day.
- Admission Rules.
- Pleadings during Christmas Vacation.

Regulations under the following Acts—

- Environment, Resources and Development Court Act
1993—Fees.
- Lottery and Gaming Act 1936—
Lottery Licences.
- Various.
- Stamp Duties Act 1923—Exempted Business.

By the Minister of Public Sector Reform (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—

- Office of Public Sector Reform and Government
Management Board—Report 1992-93.
Ordered to be printed.

By the Minister of Transport Development (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—

- Reports, 1992-93—
Foundation S.A.
- Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.
- National Road Transport Commission.
- Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing.
- Metropolitan Milk Board.
- Primary Industries South Australia.
- South Australian Psychological Board.
- Soil Conservation Boards.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
Apiaries Act 1931—Registration Fee.
- Food Act 1985—Unwrapped or Unpacked Food.
- Harbors Act 1936—Commercial Pricing Policy
Review.
- Medical Practitioners Act 1983—
Fee for Company Registration.
- Qualifications for Specialists.
- Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Historic Vehicles—
Registration.
- South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—
Surgically Implanted Prostheses Fees.
- Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985—Registration—Fees.

By the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy)—

- Reports, 1992-93—
Bookmakers Licensing Board.
- Botanic Gardens of Adelaide and State Herbarium.
- South Australian Co-operative Housing Authority.
- Electricity Trust of South Australia.
- Department of Environment and Land Management.
- South Australian Film Corporation.
Ordered to be printed. (Paper No. 80)
- Greyhound Racing Board.
- Harness Racing Board.
- Libraries Board of South Australia.
Ordered to be printed. (Paper No. 54)
- Racecourses Development Board.
- Totalisator Agency Board.
- West Beach Trust.
- Department of State Aboriginal Affairs.
- University of Adelaide—Statutes.
- Racing Act 1976—Rules of Harness Racing—
Offences—Use of Whip.
- Artificial Insemination—Semen Extenders.
- Artificial Insemination—Transportation of Semen.
- Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report on
relocation of two single classrooms and siting of an
additional classroom, Victor Harbor Primary School.
- Regulations under the following Acts—
Beverage Container Act 1975—Plastic Milk
Containers.
- Development Act 1993—Various.
- Education Act ;1972—Dress Codes.
- Electrical Products Act 1988—Safety Criteria.
- Heritage Act 1993—Fees.
- Native Vegetation Act 1991—Clearance Exemptions.

- Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985—
Adoption—Model Codes of Practice.
Real Property Act 1886—Definitions.
Strata Titles Act 1988—Revocation of Schedules.
Waste Management Act 1987—Contribution by Licensees.
District Council By-laws—
Angaston—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders.
No. 3—Bees.
No. 4—Animals and Birds.
No. 5—Garbage Removal.
No. 6—Dogs.
No. 7—Repeal of By-laws.
Light—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders.
No. 3—Bees.
No. 4—Animals and Birds.
No. 5—Garbage Removal.
No. 6—Dogs.
No. 7—Repeal of By-laws.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) laid on the table the annual report of the Attorney-General's Department. Ordered that report be printed.

CHILDREN'S COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) laid on the table the annual report of the Children's Court Advisory Committee. Ordered that report be printed.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) laid on the table the annual report of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Ordered that report be printed.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) laid on the table the annual report of the Office of Public Sector Reform—Government Management Board 1992-93. Ordered that report be printed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage) laid on the table the annual report of the South Australian Film Corporation. Ordered that report be printed.

LIBRARIES BOARD

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage) laid on the table the annual report of the Libraries Board of South Australia. Ordered that report be printed.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Transport Development) laid on the table her response to the committee's report on the inquiry into the Hindmarsh Island bridge project.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA brought up the second report 1993-94 of the committee. Report adopted.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS brought up the report of the committee on environmental resources, planning, land use and development aspects of the MFP Development Corporation for 1992-93.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS brought up the report of the committee concerning the Port MacDonnell breakwater and boat harbour.

QUESTION TIME

SEPARATION PACKAGES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Education, Employment and Training a question about teacher separation packages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My office and other Liberal members' offices have been contacted by numerous teachers in the past week who were angry about the Labor Government's latest round of targeted separation packages (TSPs). For example, last Wednesday my office was contacted by a north-eastern suburbs secondary school teacher who advised that six out of 38 of his colleagues had received offers of TSPs—the youngest aged only 27 years, with three others being in their early thirties. Today I have been contacted by several teachers who say that they have been advised that the TSPs are now being offered to all teachers who are taking 'involuntary transfers'.

Education Department sources have indicated that at least 300 teachers have been offered packages. The South Australian Institute of Teachers has confirmed that 15 principals and 90 deputy principals have also been offered targeted separation packages. The Minister continues to claim that these offers are being targeted to surplus teachers.

Today my office received further information from a teacher which starkly illustrates the untargeted way in which these targeted separation packages are being distributed. This teacher, who has been offered a TSP, has just spent three years on a part-time release scholarship to learn a European language. The language is one in which there is an acute shortage in Education Department schools. The department has paid the equivalent of about \$40 000 for this teacher to study the language at Flinders University during the past three years and will pay a further \$4 000 for this teacher to visit Europe during the Christmas school break to hone up on the language he has studied. So, the department, which will have invested at least \$44 000 in this teacher by the end of the year, has just offered him a targeted separation package to quit the department.

I should add that, as part of the scholarship contract or agreement, the teacher was told that, on completion of the chosen subject, he was contracted to teach that language for the equivalent of at least three years at .4 full-time equivalents. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why has the department offered a TSP to a languages teacher, after investing \$44 000 in training during the past three years, and to a teacher who believes he has an agreement to work for the department for the coming three years?

2. Does the Minister still claim that these packages are being offered only to targeted teachers in 'surplus areas'?

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

TENDERING POLICY

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in this Council, a question about the Government's policy regarding tenders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last year I raised a series of questions about both the propriety of a tender process and the competence with which it had been pursued in relation to a \$300 000 tender call by State Supply and the Metropolitan Fire Service for over trousers for firefighters. At that time, I drew attention to the inadequacies of the tender specifications and their incompleteness, as well as the bias towards a British product and against Australian suppliers. Australian suppliers were significantly disadvantaged, even though their products were superior for Australian conditions and had been acquired by other fire services in Australia and overseas.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That is your opinion.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Well, that's the assessment. These include New South Wales, Queensland, Northern Territory, the Department of Defence for the RAAF, Civil Aviation fire fighting units, Singapore, Malaysia, United Arab Emirates and New Zealand. After 12 months, one would have thought that State Supply and the Metropolitan Fire Service would have learnt some lessons about tendering. Now tenders have been called for a tunic to go over the over trousers, but the defects in the specifications highlighted last year have not been addressed.

Potential tenderers were invited by letter of 11 October to a meeting on 28 October to discuss the specifications. It is interesting to note that, in the invitation to attend, there was a request to let the officers have questions in writing, and there would only be a very limited opportunity for so-called impromptu questioning.

One of those who attended that meeting on 28 October was the union representative, Mr Mick Smith, who was also the prime mover behind last year's tender process. He did most of the talking and managed to contradict himself, the draft specifications, the State Supply officer and the senior fire service officer. At the meeting it was announced that there was a crashing hurry to purchase the tunics. It is proposed to prepare tender documents within two weeks of 28 October and to close tenders in a further two weeks, with the result that all local tenderers will be prevented from tendering. I am told that Australian manufacturers require at least 10 weeks (excluding the Christmas/New Year period) because most fire testing is carried out overseas and the new draft specification has upgraded requirements for protection so that previous testing is mostly redundant. In any event, 12 months ago, Australian manufacturers raised questions about the specifications but State Supply has refused to reply.

One of the companies involved in this process is a company by the name of CrossFire. Its Managing Director, Mr Peter Marshall, has written as follows:

The complete unwillingness of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service to communicate with industry is in contrast to the ACT Fire Service, the Queensland Fire Service and Army/Air Force fire services. We have worked with each of these organisations to develop an Australian style specification (in many ways more stringent than the European one) which defines clothing for hot weather operations. With over 1 000 units now in service I've yet to hear anything but praise for our products, unlike the complaints I often hear about the Bristol overtrousers purchased by South Australia last year!

They were purchased, as members might remember, from the United Kingdom. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is it Government policy to prefer overseas rather than local products even if the quality of local products is at least equal to or better than overseas products and comparable in price?

2. Why is State Supply and the MFS proceeding with a great deal of haste to call tenders? Is it because they fear that after the election a Liberal Government will endeavour to treat Australian manufacturers fairly and get the best product for our firefighters at a competitive price?

3. In the light of the convention relating to a Government which is in caretaker mode, will the Attorney-General ensure that the contract is not let prior to the election?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answer to the first question is clearly 'No'—any suggestion from the honourable member that that is the case is ridiculous. He has made a whole lot of assertions, which may or may not be correct. I suggest they are more likely to be incorrect than correct, but I cannot ascertain that without having the Minister examine the matter.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the Hon Ms Levy interjects, because obviously she thinks I am incapable of answering the question, the State Supply Board is—

The Hon. Anne Levy: I was telling him.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I will tell him too and put it in *Hansard*. The State Supply Board is independent of government, and I assume that it is proceeding with this matter in accordance with its normal procedures.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is a view that the honourable member can take. I do not know whether he has been given correct information or whether the information he has provided to the Council is or is not correct. As I said, it is more likely than not to be incorrect, because I cannot imagine that State Supply would behave in the way the honourable member has outlined if the local product is clearly superior to the overseas product, as he has portrayed to the Council. I do not know how much money is involved in this contract and am, therefore, not in a position to say whether it would be picked up by the caretaker conventions, but if it is a substantial amount of money I would expect the contract not to be signed until after the election.

STATE THEATRE COMPANY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage a question about the State Theatre Company.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Barry Egginton launched a scathing attack on the State Theatre Company when addressing a meeting of members of the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance (formerly Actors Equity) in Adelaide

on 22 October to launch a new actors agency. He said, in part—

An honourable member: Who?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Barry Egginton, a South Australian actor who has lived and performed in London for possibly the past two decades and who returned to South Australia in 1990. He said:

Recently auditions were conducted by our State Theatre Company. These auditions were by invitation only; invitation only, he questions. How elitist can you get? For a theatre company to grow creatively and survive it must know what talent is out there in the marketplace and then set about utilising that talent. Without an open audition system, a company becomes inter-bred and offensively incestuous. The State Theatre Company is funded by us, the taxpayer. Every equity member has a right to showcase their talent before such a prospective employer and indeed should be accorded that courtesy.

He goes on to say:

We the equity members believe that our State Theatre Company has lost its identity. We believe that it is no longer in touch or represents where we are coming from, artistically or culturally, as a State. It has lost its direction, its inspiration, its purpose and consequently its membership and its audience. It employs predominantly interstate talent and directors and in 1994 will be virtually an entrepreneurial body, a mini-neo J.C. Williamson.

He goes on to argue for a South Australian actors theatre. I have spoken with a number of people who attended this meeting and I have been advised also by Mr Egginton that his accusations that the State Theatre Company has lost the plot were endorsed by all present at this meeting.

I ask the Minister, first, whether she is aware of the practice by the State Theatre Company to conduct auditions by invitation only and does she believe that such a practice is compatible with the company's objectives which, as outlined in the Act, include the following, 'to promote the training of all persons concerned in the production, presentation and performance of theatrical presentations'?

Secondly, did the Minister agree with the decision by the board not to appoint an artistic director following the conclusion of Simon Phillips' contract? If so, why, as I note that section 21 (1) and (2) of the State Theatre Company Act specifically state that the board shall appoint a suitably qualified person to be artistic director of the company and that the terms and conditions of employment of the artistic director shall be determined by the board and approved by the Minister.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am certainly aware of the comments made by Barry Egginton. I am not aware of who was in the audience at the time he made them, but it does seem to me that to suggest State Theatre does not use local actors can only be made by someone who has not been to see *Under Milkwood*, which is currently showing at State Theatre to enormous acclaim by everyone who was present in the first night audience and where a huge cast is almost overwhelmingly South Australian. I think there might be two interstate people who are members of the cast of *Under Milkwood*, and there must be at least 16, if not 18 or 20, South Australians in the cast.

To suggest that State Theatre is not using South Australian actors is absolutely absurd. If one looks at the record of State Theatre in the past year or so, one will see that a very large number of South Australian actors are being used.

I would also very much dispute the comment made that State Theatre is becoming a mini J.C.W. If one looks at the program for next year there are many productions—I do not have the exact details with me—which are being produced in South Australia and which will then tour to other States.

There are also productions from other States which will be coming to South Australia. I think it is very much to the advantage of South Australian actors, if they are engaged in a season in Adelaide, that they then have the exposure in other States of those plays touring interstate. Equally, if our plays are to tour to other States we will need to accept plays from other States coming here. In that respect, of course, those in the cast of the plays which come here will predominantly be people from other States who will then get an exposure here that they would not otherwise have. Likewise, the plays originating in South Australia, when they tour to other States, as they will to Perth and to Melbourne at least next year, will give South Australian actors a chance to be seen elsewhere in the country, which I am sure will be to their professional advantage.

With regard to the question concerning the artistic director, I am sure the honourable member is well aware that earlier this year—I am sorry, I cannot remember which month—the State Theatre Company appointed Justin McDonnell from Sydney to undertake a review of State Theatre: where it should be going and how it should organise itself to confidently face the future. The recommendation from that review, from someone who is very experienced in all the performing arts, was that a full-time artistic director should not be appointed but rather an executive producer, and that there should be an artistic committee consisting of a number of individuals to provide artistic advice when required.

The State Theatre Company accepted this report and certainly, on reading the report, I felt it was a very considered view and I was very happy for the board of State Theatre to accept the recommendations, and I may say that the example which has been set by the State Theatre Company in this matter is currently being examined very closely with every indication that the example will be followed by companies in other States including the Government of Western Australia which is considering this model as a very desirable way of setting up a State Theatre Company. The Western Australian Liberal Government abolished the Western Australian State Theatre Company within a few weeks of its election, but it is now moving towards re-establishing a State Theatre Company using as a model that which has been adopted by our State Theatre Company and which has certainly met with a great deal of acclaim. As I say, it is being watched with great interest and probably with the intention of copying it in many parts of Australia.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Mr President, I wish to ask a supplementary question. After eight minutes the Minister has still not answered either of my questions, and I would like her to indicate at some stage whether she does agree with the practice of invitation only for auditions.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That's not a supplementary question.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is. Secondly, will she say whether the decision by the board not to appoint an artistic director complies with the Act?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not see that that is a supplementary question at all. I think that was part of the original question, which I have answered very fully in relation to the State Theatre Company.

[Sitting suspended from 2.45 to 3 p.m.]

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labor Relations, a question about extended shop trading hours.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Last week the Arnold Government announced that it would permit supermarkets to extend trading hours on week nights to 9 p.m. by way of certificate exempting them from the current trading hours laws. This sudden decision has been greeted with anger and dismay by small retailers, who predict that it will lead to substantial job losses and business closures.

I have here a letter from the President of the Small Retailers Association (Mr David Giersch), which states:

It was with anger and disgust that we received notice last week that shop trading hours would be extended. . . Anger that it was done at all because of background information that we had been providing to the Government over the past 12 months either directly or through the retail forum. . . Anger that the Government did not at any stage seek to consult us as an affected industry association. . . Disgust that even though Mr Gregory gave us an undertaking in writing that the shop trading hours legislation would not be altered in the life of this Parliament, he then did it by exemption. . . Technically okay; ethically disgraceful.

The social cost to the small retailer is difficult at first to measure, suffice to say that some will open longer, perhaps 5 a.m. to midnight, to try to maintain a perceived advantage. Some will walk away, some will battle on trying now to exist on two-thirds of what they were breaking even on previously. . . All of this to see generated profits heading back to the Eastern States, further diminishing our own ability to expand this State.

Our association has provided figures to show that for every job created 2.4 jobs will be lost [as a result of the extended hours], yet Mr Arnold says jobs will be created, perhaps at the dole office.

The guarantee from the Minister referred to came in a letter to the association, of which I have a copy. This refers to 'guarantees I have given to the effect that no legislative changes to trading hours will be introduced in this Parliament and, furthermore, that any change will be implemented following discussions with all affected parties'.

Only today, the association has received a letter from Minister Gregory, which restates that the Government has no intention of changing the Shop Trading Hours Act during this term. It goes on to talk of a wide-ranging inquiry after the election to 'see what the future needs of South Australians are in relation to shop trading hours'. Quite clearly, his action last week has unilaterally pre-empted the outcome of any such inquiry.

Information made available to the Minister by the Small Retailers Association included a survey which showed, among other things, that deregulation of shop trading hours would lead to a decline in turnover of more than 20 per cent. It also pointed out that 2.5 jobs would be lost in small retailing for every job created by a major retailer. These alarming figures come on top of statistics also included in the survey, which showed that 70 per cent of businesses reported a decline in turnover during the past year and only 14 per cent of those responding said that their turnover had risen in the past 12 months.

Concern about shop trading hours is not confined to the metropolitan area. I have been contacted by the Loxton District Chamber of Commerce condemning what it calls 'this blatant attempt to drive small business out of business'. It too speaks of closures and job losses and the myth that extended shop trading hours will lead to more spending.

The Minister, Mr Gregory, was devious and misleading in the wording of his letter to the Small Retailers Association guaranteeing that there would be no legislative changes to trading hours during this Parliament. The Minister has breached a guarantee given to the association by not consulting with it over changes to hours. By his action, the Minister has pre-empted the outcome of his proposed inquiry into the future needs of South Australians in relation to shop trading hours. Small retailers do not want longer hours. Family business will have to open from 5 a.m. to midnight to try to stay competitive. Increased profits from the interstate based multi-nationals will be siphoned away from South Australia.

It is ironic and, I think, significant that the Premier, Mr Arnold, made the announcement regarding this extension of hours in the carpark of a Coles/Myer supermarket. This is clearly a lose/lose situation. The Labor Party has turned its back on the little people it pretends to protect, so where was the pay off? Why was there no consultation? I ask the Minister: how much did Coles/Myer contribute to the Australian Labor Party's South Australian election campaign in exchange for this handout?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I cannot answer that question. I doubt whether there was any, as far as I know. However, I will refer the question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

TRADE REPRESENTATIONS

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Economic Development a question about trade representations to Asian countries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I recently asked a question about the Economic Development Authority and the Minister's reply stated that the EDA's objective was, among others things, trade promotion. Further, the reply states that the EDA 'utilises'—the EDA's word—the marketing expertise of South Australian representatives in various overseas locations.

We were informed in the *Advertiser* yesterday that the Hong Kong representative had not been to South Australia and, further, that she is unable to persuade the lessor of the office space that signs advertising South Australia's role and presence are of great importance. So, as the *Advertiser* reports, the office on the forty-second floor of the Bank of China building in Hong Kong is unmarked and has no signs posted. The South Australian community does not see much marketing expertise present there.

Further, I understand there has been a recent appointment of a South Australian representative to Indonesia. It has been reported that this particular representative, although from South Australia, does not have marketing expertise and there is concern as to the payment for accommodation, as well as salary, to this person.

Again, we have the South Australian representative to Singapore, whom I met recently during a trade delegation to Singapore. The business community in Singapore speaks about our representative's low profile and poor marketing skills. The important factors necessary to promote South Australia are surely a knowledge of South Australia, knowledge of the overseas business community, marketing expertise and possible savings on accommodation by using overseas residents as our representatives. Numerous Asian business people have lived and/or studied here in South

Australia and have returned to settle in their place of birth. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What are the EDA's criteria for appointment of the South Australian representative to the different East Asian countries?

2. Has the EDA or Government appointed any other trade representatives to other East Asian countries; if so, what are the other countries?

3. What are the salaries of these trade representatives and is accommodation included in their remuneration package?

4. Do all the three representatives to Hong Kong, Indonesia and Singapore have the qualities and marketing skills necessary to achieve the EDA's objectives of trade promotion, investment attraction and strategic partnering; 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 CLOTHING CORPORATION

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development, representing the Minister of State Services, a question about the State Clothing Corporation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Recently the Minister tabled a 1992-93 annual report for the State Clothing Corporation showing a loss of \$84 842. With the exception of one year since 1985, the State Clothing Corporation has continued to record substantial losses which have accumulated to \$1.5 million. In addition, over this period the Labor Government has provided the State Clothing Corporation with large amounts of grants totalling \$1.253 million, and has forced SAFA to write off part of its loan amounting to \$660 000 and take up equity shares to the value of \$600 000 in order to write off the balance of the loan owing by the State Clothing Corporation.

This means that since 1985 the South Australian taxpayers have contributed \$3.9 million towards the operation of a failed Government-managed business, which is continuing to make clothing at a loss. In view of this disgraceful waste of public money, my questions are:

1. What action has the Minister taken to stop future losses occurring?

2. Has the Minister considered the possibility of selling the assets of the State Clothing Corporation to a private enterprise?

3. Will the Minister advise whether the clothing supplied by the State Clothing Corporation to other State departments could be supplied at a much more competitive price by private companies?

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

ROAD FUNDING

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Transport Development a question about road funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Last week the RAA highlighted the fact that \$9 million of Federal funds allocated to this State for road funding had been diverted to general revenue. Councils in rural South Australia would like to know why

they did not get a share of that money. In fact, one council informed me that, like a lot of rural properties in its area, operating plant was now run down and a lot of time and money was being spent keeping it running. Modern plant would help, it said. Another council said that the cost of maintaining a car on unsealed roads was becoming extremely high and in fact unbearable for some families. Country councils and ratepayers would like to know from the Minister:

1. Why the \$9 million was not used for road funding?

2. Where was the \$9 million spent?

3. Did the Minister agree that part of her budget be used by another Minister?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I found the RAA's comments last week rather difficult to follow, and in fact I would disagree with what it had to say about this matter. I understand that the \$9 million to which the RAA referred in its public statement last week related to an amount of money which was provided by the Federal Government for road funding for unincorporated areas, but I should point out (as the RAA itself acknowledged) that \$9 million in the budget was 'untied' money. So, there was no obligation on the part of the State Government to devote that money to roads if it so chose. As it happens, the Government did commit \$9 million to the funding of roads in unincorporated areas. The confusion that has arisen with respect to the RAA's figuring on this matter relates to the fact that that \$9 million is distributed in different places throughout the State Government budget, but when all of those things are tied together it can be seen that approximately \$9 million was allocated to roads in unincorporated areas throughout the State. So, my first point is that the RAA has got it wrong. The State Government, although it was not obliged to devote this money to roads, has in fact done so, and there is simply not an issue here.

STURT CREEK

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, representing the Minister of Public Infrastructure, a question about Sturt Creek pollution.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I have been contacted by residents along the Sturt Creek concerned about the effects of chlorinated effluent which flows into the Sturt Creek from the Heathfield waste water treatment plant. This nutrient-rich sewage effluent flows from a tributary of the Sturt Creek into the creek and ends up polluting the Patawalonga and, eventually, the sea. Although the chlorine itself dissipates, the nutrients remain to cause algal problems in the Patawalonga and the sea. This discharge is one of many which has helped the Patawalonga gain the reputation of being Australia's most polluted waterway.

Under the Water Resources Act 1990, a blanket authorisation was put in place until June this year, allowing discharge from sewage treatment works and common effluent schemes, such as Heathfield, which are outside water protection areas. The Heathfield plant now is in the process of applying for a licence to continue pumping the treated sewage into our waterways. Residents have called for the effluent to be further purified to reduce the amount of nutrients discharged. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has received public submissions on the licence request, which it will be granting to itself. When the legislation was debated it was

noted that the E&WS was licensing itself as a polluter. When the Environment Protection Authority legislation was before this House it was recognised that the E&WS's power to grant itself a licence to pollute was a conflict of interest. These comments should be taken into account when a licence is provided to ensure effective protection of the environment. It creates an ideal opportunity to improve the clean-up of our waterways by ensuring more stringent environmental standards.

Will the Minister give an assurance that, on the provision of a licence for the Heathfield sewage treatment plant being granted, a deadline will be set after which time no nutrients will be allowed to enter the Sturt Creek?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place for him to provide a reply.

COUNTRY DOCTORS

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to ask the Minister representing the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services a question about rural doctors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Is the Minister aware that, in spite of protracted negotiations over a three-month period, no country doctor in this State, as from 1 October 1993, has had a contract for fee for service with the South Australian Health Commission? Why has there been this delay, and what is the current fee for service position for these doctors?

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

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about appointments and contracts in the caretaker period of government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Advertisements have appeared calling for applications for two executive positions in the Department of Justice: one is for an Executive Director, Operations, at a salary of \$71 750 and the other is for the Chief Commissioner for Gaming and Licensing, at a salary of \$82 000. Applications for this latter position close on 12 November. Whilst I do not have the exact closing date of the applications for the other job, I presume that applications for that one will close at about the same time, at least before the election.

Also in the Attorney-General's area are potential contracts relating to the provision of programs as alternatives to imprisonment. Those contracts result from the passing of legislation to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act to provide additional alternatives to imprisonment and other forms of penalty. There is concern in relation to those alternative programs that several contracts may be let to different consultants rather than to one when, as I understand it, it was proposed initially that there be—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Declare your interests.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I haven't got any interests.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You have been lobbied.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I haven't got an interest.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: But you've been lobbied.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have been informed about it, yes.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Lobbied!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That's not an interest: to declare that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Griffin.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There is a suggestion that this will not produce the best coordinated pilot projects and a good basis for evaluation. The 1993 Cabinet handbook says:

By convention a caretaker Government should avoid, wherever possible, making appointments of significance in the caretaker period.

It also says, in relation to contracts:

The broad rule is that Governments should avoid implementing new policies, or entering into major contracts or undertakings during the caretaker period. This includes commitments which could bind an incoming Government.

My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Will he give a commitment that the appointments to which I have referred and other appointments of significance will not be made before the election?

2. Will he also give a commitment that the contracts to which I have referred will not be entered into before the election?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Government has been mindful of the caretaker conventions which were included in the Cabinet handbook. The Cabinet handbook states that the caretaker period begins from the issue of the writs. With respect to the appointments that the honourable member has referred to, the question really is whether they are appointments of significance. Obviously, Government cannot come to a halt when an election is called and, in any event, appointments under the GME Act are appointments that are supposed to be made on merit.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, that's right. But I assume that both those appointments would probably not be made prior to the election. The Chief Commissioner of Gaming is an appointment that probably would await the election result—although it is not an appointment at the highest level within Government by any means, and neither is the appointment of Executive Director of Operations. Nevertheless, that is an appointment—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: They are senior appointments!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They are appointments that are not at the top level of government, but the Chief Commissioner of Gaming and Licensing is obviously an important appointment, given the scope of the activities which he or she would have. But I do not imagine that appointments to those positions will be made before the election; prudence probably requires that they are not—although, whether they technically come within the caretaker conventions is something that could be open to question.

As to the contracts, again, not all contracts have to be stopped during an election period. Clearly, with contracts involving or introducing new policy, or if a contract is significant in monetary terms, care needs to be exercised with respect to it. But the contracts relating to the alternatives to imprisonment are not contracts relating to new policies: they are relating to policies which have been announced by the Government some considerable time ago and which were endorsed by the Parliament in the last session.

The honourable member has obviously been lobbied by the same group which has lobbied me and which is concerned whether or not they will get the contract, given that tenders

have gone out. I received representations from that same firm from which the honourable member has received representations.

Again, I would have to examine the matter and see whether or not these are the sorts of contracts that could be entered into during the caretaker period. I would need to check how much money was involved and what new policy issues might be involved, etc. In the nature of these things, my guess is that it is probable that those contracts would not be let before the election in any event.

EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Mr Ian Schapel has held the position of Acting Senior Administrative Officer in the Minister's office since the Minister became Minister of Transport Development about a year ago, and I understand that he earlier held the similar appointment when the Minister was Minister of Tourism. So, he has served with the Minister for quite a number of years. I note that a few weeks ago this position of Senior Administrative Officer within the Minister's office was called, and I have also been advised that Mr Schapel and nine other people have also applied for this position. Mr Schapel's substantive position is ASO4. The position of Senior Administrative Officer is classified as ASO6. So, if he were to win this position, it would be a substantial rise in salary and status on a permanent basis. However, I am told that the position is likely to be keenly contested. But whether or not it is keenly contested, a permanent position within the Minister's office at this time during an election campaign period would seem to be unwise and most inappropriate, if one were to look at the polls, although I would not make my final judgment on the opinion polls. Nevertheless, it is a sensitive position, and it is a personal appointment.

As we are now in an election period, I ask the Minister whether she will undertake to ensure that this position is not filled prior to the election and that the position of Group Manager of Freight Transport, which has been advertised within the Office of Transport Policy and Planning, also be withdrawn and not filled at least until after the election. This is a substantial position for a term of three years with negotiated conditions. I will not go into the conventions for appointments in respect of a caretaker Government as they have just been referred to by my colleague the Hon. Mr Griffin, but I ask that the Minister ensure that neither of these positions are filled before the election.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There are a couple of inaccuracies in the honourable member's statement which I would like to correct before I address her substantive question. First, Mr Ian Schapel is a public servant under the GME Act. He has occupied the position of Administrative Officer in the office of the Minister of Transport Development in an acting capacity for the 12 months during which I have been Minister of Transport Development. He did not work in my office when I was Minister of Tourism; my first contact with him was when I became Minister of Transport Development. Mr Schapel had previously worked in the office of the former Minister of Transport in an administrative position under the GME Act. He is a public servant, and his position in the former Minister of Transport's office was

as 2IC of the administrative staff. I wanted to clarify that point because I think it is important.

Secondly, the honourable member indicates that the appointment of Mr Schapel is a personal appointment. It is not a personal appointment. As I indicated, this officer is a public servant appointed under the GME Act. He is an officer of the Office of Transport Policy and Planning as are a number of the administrative officers within my office. His appointment is not a personal one, and there are a number of people within that category in my office as there are in other Ministers' offices. The responsibility for the calling for and the appointment of that position rests with the CEO of the Office of Transport Policy and Planning, and I believe that the same is so of the second position to which the honourable member refers, the Manager of Freight Transport.

I will take up the issues that the honourable member has raised to determine whether it is appropriate for those positions to be filled. I do not even know the arrangements for filling these positions as to whether applications have closed or interviews are about to be commenced. It is not a process in which I have any involvement, but I will certainly undertake to clarify those matters and determine whether these appointments ought to be set aside until after the election.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Will you advise me by letter?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member asks whether I can advise her by letter of these matters. I will certainly endeavour to do so.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

In reply to **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (12 August).

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In addition to the answer given on 12 August the Treasurer has provided the following comments:

1. The Government, as it always does when matters are raised in the Parliament, has them investigated, and provides detailed responses for the information of members. This has been the case on no less than three occasions during this year in relation to the Terrace Hotel.

In addition, the Ombudsman has twice investigated the actions of SGIC and Bouvet Pty Ltd and found no evidence of any relevant act of maladministration or administrative impropriety.

2. The answers provided to the honourable member in relation to the Terrace Hotel have been based on the information which the Treasurer obtained from SGIC and the Terrace Hotel. It is indeed regrettable that on one occasion this information was inaccurate; however SGIC had no reason to doubt the validity of the information with which it was provided.

3. Given the lengthy investigations already undertaken, the Government can see no worthwhile purpose in further investigating matters that have been found to have no substance by the Ombudsman.

In reply to **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (24 August).

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. Mr Jones is in receipt of the home loan referred to by the honourable member. This arrangement is part of his remuneration package, and is not an additional benefit.

2. The Government has not set down any guidelines for the upper limit of home loans provided as fringe benefits to senior executives. Within Government, such loans are not common outside SGIC and the State Bank.

3. Both SGIC and the State Bank have detailed guidelines on home loans to employees.

4. It would be preferable if these guidelines were not published, as to do so would place the organisations at a commercial disadvantage relative to their competitors. Insofar as housing loans are a component of executive remuneration packages they were recently investigated by the Economic and Finance Committee.

In reply to **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (25 August).

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. The Government is aware of media reports that the Australian Taxation Office will be conducting an inquiry into such remuneration packages but has no other knowledge of the matter.

2. The Government considers it appropriate that executive remuneration in statutory authorities be reported in salary bands as is required in the private sector.

3 & 4. A great deal of relevant information was made available in the recent report of the Economic and Finance Committee and the honourable member may care to refer to that document.

CRIME PREVENTION

In reply to **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (20 October).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In 1989, an amount of \$1 million (or 10 per cent of the total amount available for the Crime Prevention Strategy) was set aside for the Review of the Strategy.

Preliminary work was undertaken by the Crime Prevention Unit on the most effective way to evaluate the Crime Prevention Strategy, given its multi-program nature. The Crime Prevention Unit devised a framework of key questions which would guide the evaluation of programs and subprograms, in order that a common set of issues at all program levels within the strategy were addressed. By undertaking the evaluation in this way, economies of scale were achieved, as well as opening the review to the possibilities of identifying and illuminating some of the key issues in community-based crime prevention programs.

Expressions of interest were sought through the national press to undertake the review. Five organisations responded, and from these five expressions of interest, two were selected to provide a detailed tender. A selection panel was established and, following its recommendation the National Centre for Socio-Legal Studies from LaTrobe University, were awarded the contract to undertake the Review of the Crime Prevention Strategy. The review commenced on 2 August 1993, and the final report is due on 30 June 1994. The base fee for the contract is \$318 576.

There is scope within the contract to negotiate with the National Centre for Socio-Legal Studies for a number of special projects on crime prevention related topics. Each special project would be conducted by an agreed academic researcher, for an amount of \$1 500, with an upper limit of 10 special projects. At this point, it is likely that three special projects will be undertaken as part of the review, which brings the total for the contract with the National Centre for Socio-Legal Studies to an amount of \$323 076. The total amount for the review has been budgeted for expenditure within the 1993-94 financial year, from the Crime Prevention allocation.

In relation to the cost of Government involvement in the review, this will continue to come from within the existing resources of the Crime Prevention Unit. Having developed the framework and terms of reference for the review, the unit will now be involved in working with the review team, in order to facilitate their contact with all people involved in the Crime Prevention Strategy. Officers of the unit will also provide briefings for the review team on the four programs of the Crime Prevention Strategy, and make initial contact with those involved in all programs, so that they have an overview of the work of the review.

The Government is of the view that a considerable investment has been made in the development of the Crime Prevention Strategy (both in monetary terms, and commitment from those involved in the community). In order to be accountable for the expenditure over the five years to review and to critically appraise the implementation of the strategy, the Government has embarked upon a course which ensures the independence of the review. It also provides for a considerable degree of rigour in its assessment, so that future directions for crime prevention can be informed from the South Australian experience.

WOOL

In reply to the **Hon M. J. ELLIOTT** (21 April).

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Premier has provided the following response:

The view that the wool stockpile should be burnt is not supported by the Premier.

The Government supported the initiative of the Minister for Primary Industries who established the Wool Industry Review Committee on 28 April 1993 to examine the wool industry's structures and operational arrangements.

Management of the wool stockpile was a major issue which was addressed under the terms of reference of the review. The recommendations from the review were released in the committee's report on 4 August 1993.

The committee has recommended that a Government-owned company called Wool International be responsible for the commercial sale of the stockpile in ways that maximise its value. The level of stocks will be required to decline on a fixed schedule recommended by the committee as:

- 5 Kt per month from 1 November 1993 to 30 June 1994;
- 33 Kt per quarter from 1 July to 30 June 1997.

This program will reduce the stockpile by about two thirds from its current level.

Since the report was released, further industry comment has influenced the Federal Government to delay the commencement of the fixed schedule sales until 1 July 1994. The delay is supported by this Government to allow industry time to adjust.

The recommendation to reduce the stockpile by fixed schedule sales has received conflicting and mixed reactions from different sectors of the industry, but has been supported by the Wool Council of Australia, which is the major representative body for woolgrowers.

This Government does not need to comment on the feasibility of strategies, such as temporary quotas on producers, as these matters were considered as part of the total industry review process.

BENEFICIAL FINANCE

In reply to **Hon. J. F. STEFANI** (11 August).

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

1. Beneficial Finance paid \$52.5 million to the Tax Office in a global tax settlement. No part of the amount paid was separately identified as being attributable to Luxcar or any other transaction in dispute.

2. As a secured creditor Beneficial Finance is entitled to claim \$38 488.32 as at 1 October 1993 from the Benpac Ltd and Investpac Australia Ltd partnerships. Formal proofs of debt have been lodged with the administrators of the partnerships for this amount.

3. State Bank has brought to account all known liabilities and it is not aware of any future liability that would be incurred as a result of Beneficial Finance's involvement with the Benpac Ltd and Investpac Australia Ltd partnerships.

STAMP DUTY

In reply to **Hon. C. SCHAEFER** (25 August).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

The Government is already examining the possibility of introducing a stamp duty relief scheme in respect of the re-financing of certain rural loans.

The transaction costs associated with re-financing include establishment fees, documentation fees and discharge fees charged by financial institutions which in most cases significantly outweigh the cost of stamp duty. It is by no means certain therefore that stamp duty relief would be sufficient to encourage people to re-finance.

Moreover, stamp duty on mortgages is levied at the rate of only .35 per cent and it would therefore seem likely that persons able to achieve worthwhile interest savings by transferring from one financial institution to another would have no trouble in absorbing the stamp duty costs. In addition it is clear that the market is already responding, with some banks already absorbing stamp duty as part of re-financing.

The Government would need to be assured that only those in genuine need received relief and that the benefit of any such scheme did not flow to those who were re-financing their activities in the normal way.

CAR PARKS

In reply to **Hon. J.C. IRWIN** (18 August).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has provided the following response:

With respect to car parks administered by the Glenelg Council and subject to council parking resolutions under the Parking Regulations, the Minister has been informed that in 1990 when ticket dispensing machines were first provided for in the regulations there was no requirement for their use in car parks to be subject to a time

limit. In 1991 the definition of 'ticket dispensing machine' was altered to refer to their installation in a zone to which a time limit applied.

The Minister has been informed that at that time the council obtained legal advice that it was not necessary to impose a time limit in car parks where these machines were already installed.

Mr Howie claimed that it was necessary to do so. Without conceding the point, the council decided to save itself the expense of a possible legal challenge by Mr Howie and recently passed resolutions imposing a time limit in its car parks.

The honourable member referred to Mr Howie's view that a council is not empowered to make a parking resolution by adoption of a committee report or recommendation. The honourable member said that he took this matter up with the Minister in 1992 and that he had 'never received an assurance from the Minister that Adelaide City Council is complying with regulation 5 of the Parking Regulations'.

As claimed by the honourable member, on 16 December 1992 he raised the point in a letter to the Minister. By reply of 10 March 1993 the Minister advised that, contrary to Mr Howie's view, a council can make a parking resolution by adoption of a committee report or recommendation. It is a view supported by Mr K. Gifford Q.C. in his book *Council Meetings—Law and Procedure in South Australia (2nd Edition 1980)* and it was reaffirmed by the authors, Messrs. Goode and Williams, in their book *Council Meetings in South Australia (1st Edition 1992)*.

With reference to Ashford Hospital, the Minister has been advised that under the Private Parking Areas Act it is not mandatory for the owner of a private parking area to impose a time limit for the use of the parking area. In addition, the Minister has been informed that signs in the hospital parking area clearly indicate a maximum daily charge which the Minister understands is intended to ensure, among other things, that it is used only by visitors to the hospital and that there is a regular turnover of the available parking space.

The hospital Administrator has undertaken to examine whether signs and line markings comply with the prescribed code of practice and, if not, to correct them.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon. M. J. ELLIOTT** (4 August).

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Minister of Primary Industries has provided the following response:

1. The South Australian Government has no control over the issue of export licences. The Federal Government issues export licences and seeks comment from State Governments prior to issue. In this case the licence application indicated that a licence was sought to include the export of 100 000m of unprocessed sawlog and pullog of which 5 000m was anticipated to be drawn from the South-East of South Australia. The South Australian Government response indicated that the local sawmilling industry was resource constrained and was actively seeking additional resources.

2. The South Australian Government has been actively addressing means to promote value adding and has called for expressions of interest in sharing with the private sector the development of Forwood Products Pty Ltd. Other opportunities are being developed with industry. However, an unbalanced approach on trade in plantation grown sawlog may have the effect of depressing private investment in plantation forestry. Recent initiatives including the 1991 National Plantations Advisory Committee (a tripartite committee representing Government, industry and unions), the National Forest Policy Statement and the current Inquiry into 'Adding Further Value to Australia's Forest Products' by the Industry Commission all recommended the lifting of export controls on plantation grown resources. Current controls are seen by those groups as limiting investment in plantation forests, thereby limiting log resource to processing industries.

The Government is seeking means by which the domestic industry has the opportunity to adjust to international log prices and is committed to finding means to encourage further local value added processing.

3. The South Australian Growth and Yield Models are recognised as some of the best, if not the best, in the world. Within the policy of sustainable yield harvesting the Department of Primary Industries' forests will be managed to provide the best possible volume and mix of log.

While there have been recent claims that the forests are being harvested at below sustainable levels, professional foresters and other

experts in this area are reviewing the level of cut and silvicultural practices to determine whether, in fact, more log can be made available.

Professor Ian Ferguson, Professor of Forest Science at Melbourne University and an acknowledged authority in these matters, has also considered the level of cut and rotation length adopted in Department of Primary Industries plantations.

The level of cut from the forests is also under discussion with local industry, which is being encouraged to support any claims of under-utilisation of the resource. The position of the Government in this matter is that it will cut the maximum sustainable volumes of log in the sizes required by industry; however, it will not sustain overcutting of the resource.

As the Minister of Primary Industries has previously stated, a balanced approach will protect the local industry and at the same time permit a measure of log export where there is no demonstrable harm to the domestic industry. The Department of Primary Industries has asked for export controls to remain during the period of transition to ensure that the local industry in the South-East is protected.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (19 October).

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The STA's new corporate image campaign, 'Driving you into the Future' was launched at the Royal Agricultural Show on Friday 3 September 1993 as part of the overall plan to promote and develop the STA's commitment to customer service. It was not launched on the weekend indicated by the honourable member to specifically promote STA services.

However, an advertising and promotional campaign has been devised for forthcoming service changes commencing Sunday 21 November 1993. These service changes have been planned for some nine months and were officially announced in August of this year.

In order to best communicate to existing and potential customers, the STA has developed a comprehensive six week campaign that is based on a mix of radio, press and television. The campaign does not include targeted direct mail and, as such, no letters have been sent to marginal seat areas.

The budget for advertising, promotion and new Transit Link timetables is \$90 000. This represents an extremely cost effective buy and includes no charge, bonus or complimentary spots as never achieved before. The inclusion of new timetables is a new element in the campaign and accounts for \$15 000.

The campaign is certainly comprehensive in that it is based on the principles of effective communication and the correct mix of media; however, it is not the largest, most extensive or most expensive that the STA has conducted over the past four years.

Regarding the question on previous advertising, records show that the STA did not conduct advertising near or during the last State election campaign.

I was not consulted about the nature of this current schedule as the placement of advertising is an ongoing and operational matter; however, I am aware of the new corporate direction, 'Driving you into the Future', and it is one that I fully support.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (9 September).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Education, Employment and Training has provided the following response:

1. All costs, both human and financial, incurred through injury at work are unacceptable. The increase in costs of compensation in the Education Department has been monitored and analysed. A range of initiatives has been taken to reduce the incidence and cost. They include:

- Regular review of claims by the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office.
- Installation of claims management software to facilitate cost tracking.
- Re-establishment of an inter-departmental Risk Management Committee.
- The appointment of project officers to work in the principal risk areas of stress and manual handling injury.
- The training of managers in Occupational Health and Safety practice.
- The review and additional staffing of the Counselling and Rehabilitation Service in the Education Department.

2. The payment of workers compensation is not related to the number of teachers required and employed by the department.

WHEATMAN, Mr PAUL JOHN

In reply to **Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN** (8 September).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is not the policy at present to seek the views of victims of offences when considering home detention or other programs for offenders. However, where victim impact statements are available or when victims have taken the opportunity to comment, their views are taken into account when an application for home detention is considered.

The Department of Correctional Services has a 'Victims Contact Officer' who advises persons interested in making submissions that they may contact the Prisoner Assessment Committee, which considers home detention and leave programs or the Parole Board which sets conditions of release on parole.

In addition, when home detention or unaccompanied leave programs for persons convicted of offences against children are considered by the Prisoner Assessment Committee, the Parole Board and the Department of Family and Community Services are given the opportunity to comment prior to the commencement of these programs. In the case of the Parole Board this is done in an endeavour to ensure that conditions set are in keeping with likely parole conditions.

The request for comment from Family and Community Services has the effect that it alerts FACS that a person who has offended against children is under such consideration and presents the opportunity for the victim to make comment if he or she is still in contact with FACS.

MARALINGA

In reply to **Hon. PETER DUNN** (26 August).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has provided the following response:

1. The agreements are subject to negotiations between the Commonwealth and Maralinga Tjarutja. The State Government is not in a position to comment.

2. I understand that Maralinga Tjarutja is pursuing substantial compensation claims for foregoing use and possession of portions of the former test sites in line with the agreed clean-up option. These funds could be used for the purposes suggested by the honourable member, provided that such use is in line with the terms and conditions of the management of those funds.

3. Approximately 100 square kilometres of the area would not be suitable for continuous Aboriginal occupation.

4. No.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (12 August).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following response:

1. The golf course in Belair National Park is leased to private enterprise and the only access is through the adjoining caravan park which is situated on the Belair National Park grounds and is also leased to private enterprise.

Access through the caravan park is an unsatisfactory situation and it is only a matter of time before someone is injured. A new route for the access road was chosen which would provide access for both golf course and caravan park patrons without the need to use the caravan park or golf course as the thoroughfare.

The lessee of the golf course has agreed to construct the access road at his cost (normally it would be the lessor's responsibility) in return for a twenty year extension of his lease.

The construction of the road will require the removal of nine live native eucalyptus trees and five dead native eucalyptus trees. A tree management advisory group was established in July 1993 to assist the staff of Belair National Park on matters relating to the trees of the park; that is, removal, pruning, alternatives for retention, revegetation and publicity on the management of community interest in trees. The road issue was on the agenda for the first meeting of the group. The group comprises:

- members of the Sturt Consultative Committee;
- members of the Friends of Belair National Park;
- a representative of Mitcham City Council;
- three private individuals who have taken a particular interest in the trees in Belair National Park.

This group has inspected the proposed road and supports the proposal. An application has been lodged with the Native Vegetation Council for approval to remove the native trees. The application is currently being considered and a decision is expected shortly.

2. The lessee of the Belair Caravan Park within the Belair National Park has sought to undertake further development of the caravan park. Mr Lithgow has operated the caravan park for over twelve years and has shown himself to be a sound and responsible manager.

The plans he has submitted, together with a schedule of works, indicate a wish to realign a small section of Minno Creek within the lease area. Whilst I understand the proposal to realign the creek initially was not regarded adversely, it has on further consideration been seen to be inappropriate. It is not therefore proposed that approval would be given to realign Minno Creek.

INDUSTRIAL COURT

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (14 October).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety has provided the following response:

1. The Government is concerned about the comments of His Honour Justice Stanley in relation to the increase in the magistrates' cases set out in his annual report. Consideration is being given as to whether the delays in the hearing of magistrates cases can be overcome through improved mechanisms in listing procedures or whether the problems are essentially of a resource nature, given existing number of magistrates.

2. The Government agrees that a lead-time of four months before such matters can be heard is unsatisfactory and, as mentioned above, is investigating a number of strategies to correct this situation as well as actively monitoring the number of matters being lodged in the magistrates jurisdiction.

MINISTER'S STAFF

In reply to **Hon. L.H. DAVIS** (26 August).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety has provided the following response:

Ministerial staff appointed to permanent positions within the public sector in the past 12 months:

In the 12 months prior to 29 August 1993 three ministerial officers were appointed to the public sector.

Wendy Chapman, previously ministerial officer to the Minister of Transport, was appointed on 24 August 1992 and assigned to the position of Manager, Corporate Services in the Department of Correctional Services and commenced duty on 31 August 1992. The position was advertised and Ms Chapman was selected on merit.

Rosemary Clark, previously Press Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Planning, commenced a contract appointment for three years with MFP Australia on 4 September 1992. The position was advertised and Ms Clark was selected on merit. David Abfalter, previously ministerial officer to the Minister of Public Infrastructure, was appointed to the Public Service on 6 August 1993 for a term of five years and assigned to the position of Director, Public Infrastructure in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The position was advertised and Mr Abfalter was selected on merit.

In addition to the above appointments, Derek Robertson, previously ministerial officer to the Minister of Environment and Planning, was appointed to the Public Service on a temporary basis as Manager, Environmental Strategy Unit in the Department of Environment and Land Management on 14 December 1992. This appointment is for a period of 12 months only and therefore a formal selection process was not required.

Undertaking sought that the Government not offer ministerial staff permanent positions or contracts within the public sector:

The undertaking sought would be in breach of the Government Management and Employment Act. The general principles of personnel management contained in the Act, which apply across the State Public Sector, require that 'all selection processes shall be directed towards and based on a proper assessment of merit'.

The Act requires permanent appointment and appointments for a term to the Public Service to be the result of a selection process which involves open competition. Any member of the public, including a ministerial officer, may apply for a position which is advertised in the press. The most meritorious applicant must then be selected from amongst the applicants for a position.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-
GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO No. 2) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 October. Page 491.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I indicate support for the second reading of this Bill. The Bill addresses a range of issues, three of which are important to resolve, and they will be the subject of my observations. The remaining matters do not need to be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

When we last sat the week before last, I had indicated to the Government that I would propose to split the Bill with a view to enabling those matters which are urgent to be passed before the election, whilst the remaining matters could be dealt with after the election. It may be that those other matters are not particularly controversial, but because of the range of issues involved it was not possible to address them all adequately within the time that was available and particularly to consult with all those who may have been affected by those provisions.

The parts of the Bill about which we will facilitate consideration relate to the Trustee Act, the Trustee Companies Act and the Legal Practitioners Act. In relation to the Trustee Act, the Bill allows investment by trustees on first legal mortgage on land anywhere in Australia rather than on land only in South Australia. It extends that to perpetual lease which previously was not an adequate security. The Opposition has no difficulty with that. There are certain constraints imposed upon trustees: they must act upon a valuation; it is an amount of up to two-thirds of the valuation which they can lend; and it is first mortgage security.

In the general run of things, the trustees do have to periodically review the balance of investments to ensure that all eggs are not in the one basket. So, that presents no difficulty.

The Trustee Act amendment also authorises investment with all banks and not just those carrying on business in South Australia. It has been acknowledged that some smaller banks do not carry on business in South Australia, and that means that those such as, I think, the Bank of Melbourne and the R & I Bank in Western Australian are not recognised trustee investments, although they are banks within the recognised description of such an institution. The amendment to the Trustee Act also recognises investment in the common fund of National Australia Trustees Limited, which is a branch of the National Australia Bank. There again seems to be no reason why that common fund should not be recognised as a trustee investment.

In relation to the Trustee Companies Act, there is an amendment to the schedule which recognises IOOF Australia Trustees Limited as a trustee company in lieu of Farmers Cooperative Executors and Trustees Limited. That company, IOOF Australia Trustees Limited, also carries on the Bagot's Executor and Trustee Company Limited business. That proposal also is acceptable.

There is one other minor amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act which removes a reference to regulations. The amendment is consequential on some amendments we made in earlier legislation in the last session. I think it relates mostly to the master insurance policy providing professional indemnity and therefore protecting members of the public as much as protecting members of the legal profession.

It is those areas that do need to be passed before the election. If we pass them today, I am assured that they will

pass in the House of Assembly and be assented to before the writs are issued. That will facilitate a number of business, commercial and professional activities which otherwise might have to languish for another few months. I indicate support for the second reading and affirm an intention to move to split the Bill in due course.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I support the remarks of my colleague the Hon. Trevor Griffin. Likewise, I support the second reading and the clauses relating to the trustee measures. I find it disappointing that it takes almost 12 months from the introduction of an idea, namely, the National Trustees seeking trustee status for their common fund, to its fruition in legislation. It is a one line amendment required in the Trustee Act. As far as I can see, the National Australia Bank through its subsidiary, National Australia Trustees, has done everything it can to facilitate this very simple measure. The bureaucracy has taken an inordinate length of time to process this very simple proposal.

The portfolio Bill is an attractive way of putting through Parliament a number of disparate measures and, as my colleague the Hon. Trevor Griffin has said, we are looking only at this particular set of measures affecting National Trustees, a change of name for IOOF and also in relation to Permanent Trustees. I believe it is useful if Parliament can use this measure more widely for simple matters but most certainly to ensure that they are dealt with more expeditiously than has been the case, particularly in reference to the National Australia Trustees.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole Council on the Bill that it have power to divide the Bill into two Bills, one Bill comprising clauses 1, 9, 30 and 31, and the second comprising clauses 2 to 8, 10 to 29 and 32, and that it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole Council on the No. 2 Bill that it have power to insert the Words of Enactment.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1, 9, 30 and 31 passed.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move to insert the following new clause:

2a. A reference in this Act to the principal Act is a reference to the Act referred to in the heading to the part in which the reference occurs.

New clause inserted.

Title amended by leaving out all words after 'an Act to amend' and inserting 'the Legal Practitioners Act 1981, the Trustee Act 1936 and the Trustee Companies Act 1988'; title as amended passed.

Bill No. 1 read a third time and passed.

As to Bill No. 2:

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

**HOLIDAYS (PROCLAMATION DAY, AUSTRALIA
DAY AND BANK HOLIDAYS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 October. Page 652.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on behalf of the Liberal Party to support the Holidays (Proclamation Day, Australia Day and Bank Holidays) Amendment Bill 1993. This Bill does a number of things. It amends the Holidays Act to provide for the observance of the Australia Day Holiday on 26 January each year, except when

that day falls on a Saturday or a Sunday in which case the holiday will be observed on the Monday following. Secondly, it will provide for a change in the day of observance of the Proclamation Day holiday each year to more closely align with the Boxing Day holiday observance in other States.

As the Minister has indicated in his second reading explanation, this particular matter is part of a move amongst all the States towards national uniformity to mean that instead of having a Proclamation Day holiday we will, in essence, be celebrating a Boxing Day holiday, and on most occasions there will now be a continuous break over that Christmas period to ensure that we do not have the on again off again situation that afflicts industry at the moment, with a holiday on Christmas Day if it happens to be at the start of the week and then followed technically by working days and then a holiday again on 28 December. That is something that industry and business groups have opposed for some time.

The Minister indicated that over the past 10 years or so the Industrial Relations Advisory Council (IRAC), which is a key advisory group of employers and employees, has discussed this vexed question of the observance of the Proclamation Day holiday. On a number of occasions they have made recommendations to the Government that the observance should be transferred in specific years to avoid the stop/start work patterns, particularly in the retail industry. We were again advised in March of this year that IRAC supported this particular proposition in line with national uniformity, and for those reasons and other commonsense reasons the Liberal Party has indicated its preparedness to support that aspect of the Bill.

The second key feature of the Bill is that it repeals the provisions of the Act to prohibit banks from trading on Saturdays. The Bill places no obligation on a bank to open on a Saturday but provides the freedom of choice to do so. The Bill has been introduced as a result of submissions made by the banking industry and the Co-operative Building Society, which will become a bank on 1 January 1994.

The Co-operative Building Society has evidently been able to trade on Saturdays for many years and obviously wishes to continue to do so once it becomes a bank in January 1994. This proposal has been discussed with representatives of both employers and employees in the industry and cooperative societies in this State and there is general agreement for this provision. Therefore, I indicate the Liberal Party's preparedness to support the second reading of this Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATE LOTTERIES (INSTANT LOTTERIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 October. Page 739.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): The Liberal Party supports the second reading of this Bill. The Bill resulted from a New South Wales case where legal action was taken to claim prize money when the description on the instant money ticket was 'match three numbers to win'. The ticket that was the subject of the action showed only three pairs of numbers rather than three identical numbers. Someone who was obviously quite clever in New South Wales found that loophole in that State's instant lottery ticket legislation. Instead of having to get three six, \$5 000 or

\$100 000 symbols—as we all understand the tickets—it was argued, and in the end evidently successfully, that if you had three pairs of numbers, for example, two \$500, \$1 000 and \$250 000 symbols, for some strange reason that was a winning ticket. Needless to say, the powers that be in New South Wales were not particularly happy with that interpretation of the legislation and moved to close that loophole. We are advised that other States similarly are looking at their legislation to ensure that the loophole does not exist.

I must admit that, in considering my position on this Bill, I did sneak through the files to see whether I had any stray instant lottery tickets with three matching pairs, one with \$250 000 on it that may or may not have affected the way I voted on this legislation, but I could not find any such unsuccessful tickets that might have been made successful by this loophole, and therefore I have no temptation one way or the other in relation to the legislation. I think it is commonsense. For 15 years we have had instant lottery tickets in South Australia. We have all understood that we needed three matching numbers to win. We have all probably thrown away tickets that had three paired numbers and not thought too much about it at all.

There is an aspect of retrospectivity in this legislation. As we have said on many other occasions, the Liberal Party treats retrospective legislation with caution. I think it is fair to say that we would certainly prefer not to support retrospective legislation and we therefore need to be convinced that there are very strong reasons for overriding the principle of such opposition. There has been a number of examples where the Liberal Party and other members in this Chamber have fought long and hard about a particular aspect of someone's rights being taken away retrospectively.

However, the Liberal Party's view is that this really is a commonsense provision. We believe that everyone understood the position to be that you needed three identical, distinct numbers to win with an instant lottery ticket. There certainly could never be claimed to be confusion in relation to this matter during those 15 years. It has really only been this case in New South Wales that has thrown up the doubt. The one claim that is evidently being considered at the moment can certainly be considered to have arisen as a result of that New South Wales situation, and therefore it could be described by some as being opportunistic and not a claim of principle in relation to any person's understanding of the instant lottery legislation over the past 15 years. Therefore, I indicate the Liberal Party's support for the second reading of this Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE (REPEAL AND VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 October. Page 739.)

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill. The Government Agency Review Group has completed a review of the Parks Community Centre at the request of the centre's board.

Following the review, the GARG recommendation resulted in a move to bring all the fragmented sections of the centre under one administration with a view that at a later

stage, possibly within 12 months, management and ownership of the centre could be negotiated with the Enfield council and the transfer consolidated. This Bill repeals the existing Parks Community Centre Act, setting up a new Act with the administrative and financial functions of the centre to be assumed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The initial savings are expected to be between \$600 000 and \$950 000 as a result of the redistribution of resources to more effectively meet the needs of the local Parks community. I understand the Government's view is that funding arrangements to achieve this objective can only be met through savings in efficiency and resources and a full cost recovery from the agencies operating at the centre.

It is anticipated that the administrative transfer to the Housing and Urban Development area will be completed by December this year and negotiations with the Enfield council are hoped to be concluded within 12 months. Job losses will be a mix of GME Act employees and weekly paid staff, and there will possibly be some associated industrial problems for the Government on these issues. Joint use arrangements for the library at the centre, between the centre and the Enfield council, are still subject to future negotiations.

I understand that my colleague the shadow Minister in another place, Mr John Oswald, asked a couple of questions during the debate in that place, and I am aware that the Minister in this place, the Hon. Anne Levy, has answers to those questions. So, to enable the record to be kept straight and to have some clear understanding of the answers to those questions recorded, I will formally ask the Minister the same questions as Mr Oswald asked: first, where precisely have the savings occurred and, secondly, what level of staff are involved and how many? With those remarks, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I would like to respond to the questions raised by the Hon. Mr Irwin in his supporting of this Bill and by members of the Opposition when this Bill was considered in another place. The specific questions were: where have the savings occurred in the Parks Community Centre; and what level of staff were involved and how many?

In response to the first question, I indicate to the House that the original estimate of savings from the review which occurred was initiated by the Parks board back in 1991. The estimate of savings at that time was \$600 000, while in fact a saving of approximately \$850 000 is likely by the end of the current financial year. The pace of the change has exceeded what was designed for a three-year program in the review. This is directly attributable to the positive manner in which all of the main affected parties have embraced the spirit and direction of the recommendations in the review and, as I say, it has been implemented at a greater rate than originally envisaged.

With regard to the staffing, I first indicate what the review proposed should occur. The review suggested a total of 14.06 full-time equivalent positions should be rationalised: these were four in corporate services and central administration; .5 in computer services; 2 in human resources; 2.5 in finance and supply; 4.06 in community services; and 1 in the theatre area.

In detail, in the corporate services and central administration area the four positions which were proposed to be abolished have been abolished. They were the general

manager, the community relations consultant, the project officer and the marketing officer. In computing services, the .5 position remains at this stage, as support has not been available through the host agency. However, the capacity of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to absorb this function is currently being looked at, and this saving may be achieved at a later stage. In the human resources area the two positions of human resources consultant and personnel officer have both been abolished and they have been replaced by one temporary ASO3 until such time as the host agency can further rationalise its corporate services functions and absorb this position. So that is a temporary situation only. In the finance and supply area the board had proposed that the section should be reduced by 2.5 full-time equivalents overall—that was from 5.5 to 2 full-time equivalents in CCRC and one full-time equivalent in BAPSO on the basis that adequate financial services and parallel support could be provided by the host agency. This area has been in flux over a period, with the numbers of temporary staff growing and appointed on the basis of need. For the current financial year, 1993-94, CCRC will receive its finance and supply support through the rationalisation of resources in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and, as the functions of corporate services are further rationalised and amalgamated within that department, further savings can potentially be made at the Parks.

In Community Services, of the proposed reduction in this section of around four positions, one, the community services manager, has been abolished, and a further detailed evaluation of the community services unit is being undertaken to allow for further rationalisation and improvement of service outcomes as part of the overall restructuring process. The venues coordinator's position has been abolished as proposed, and a number of other positions in the staff establishment have been abolished over the past 12 months. These include, at the middle management level, a full-time equivalent operations finance manager, a full-time equivalent library and information services manager, and one recreation services manager. Other positions which have been rationalised include a full-time equivalent support services supervisor, a .4 clerical library and information services position, 1.03 full-time equivalent cleaning staff, 1.4 full-time equivalent clerical officer, central administration, and also one full-time equivalent employment and training officer. Some further variations to resources have been made by way of increases. There is a .5 full-time equivalent art/craft workshop assistant and a .5 clerical theatre assistant, a .4 casual sports assistant and a full-time equivalent BAPSO manager on temporary contract.

As the corporate service functions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development are further rationalised, it will be possible to undertake further rationalisation of other positions at the Parks as integration with the host agency occurs.

I would like to add that, with regard to the host agency, as was mentioned in another place, discussions have commenced with the City of Enfield with regard to its capacity to become the host agency and its possible capacity to absorb similar functions, whereby ongoing rationalisation of the Parks Community Centre staffing structure can occur.

However, discussions with the City of Enfield are at an early stage only, and it is not possible at this time to say whether eventually it will become the host agency for the Parks Community Centre or whether it will remain with the Department of Housing and Urban Development. As I said,

discussions are continuing, and when the results of such discussions are known they will certainly be made public.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 4.27 to 5.27 p.m.]

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That the Council do not further insist on its amendments.

It would appear that there is simply no agreement between the Houses on this matter and that it is likely to go to a conference, so I think I will keep my remarks very short in that case.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition's view is that the Council should insist on its amendments and, as the Minister predicts, the Bill will ultimately end up in a conference where the issues can be discussed.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Democrats insist on our amendments. I communicated with the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services yesterday by fax reminding him of a request I made when we last sat some 11 days ago that he might release advice received from various Government departments, instrumentalities and agencies. He did not make that information available when requested and he is still not making it available. In fact, I am surprised, if he is genuinely seeking a resolution to this problem, that I have not been contacted on a single occasion since the Council last sat. I do not know what conclusion to draw from that, but if the Minister is seriously trying to resolve the problem I would have thought that some serious attempt would be made.

I am also rather surprised that none of the agencies that previously supported the Government's position have made any approach to me. I am not sure what conclusion to draw from that, either. Nevertheless, I protest most strongly that when information produced by the Public Service of this State is sought it is not made available to members of Parliament to use during the considerations they have to make in relation to this important legislation. I think that the refusal to provide that information is an abuse of the ministerial position and I am most disturbed by it. In fact, I am forced to assume that the non-provision of it suggests that it does not support his argument.

Motion negatived.

The House of Assembly requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's amendments to which it had disagreed.

The Legislative Council agreed to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 7.30 p.m., at which it would be represented by the Hons M.J. Elliott, K.T. Griffin, B.S.L. Pfitzner, T.G. Roberts and C.J. Sumner.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 10.50 p.m.]

At 10.50 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the Council:

As to Amendment No. 1:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 3 to 8:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 9:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word 'must' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'should'. And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 10 to 15:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendment No. 16:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 17:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 18 to 20:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 21 to 26:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Agreement has been reached on the dispute between the two Houses. It is fair to say that the Parliament has resumed for this one day sitting after the election was called to complete this outstanding business relating to the Children's Protection Bill, which it is necessary to bring into effect in order for the juvenile justice package of legislation to come into effect on 1 January next year. Everything else is in place, including the appointment of a judge of the new Youth Court, or is in the process of being put in place to enable this starting date to operate. So, it was essential that this Bill be passed today, because without it there was no Children's Protection Bill to replace the old Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, which was repealed by the juvenile justice package of Bills.

So it was essential that this Bill be passed to complete Parliament's business for this session and to enable the Council then to rise for the election. It is fair to say that both sides of the Council—indeed all Parties in the Council—wanted this matter resolved and wanted the juvenile justice package to commence as soon as possible, and certainly on 1 January.

It was essential that agreement was reached and, as I have said, agreement was, in fact, reached. However, it is probably fair to say that the Legislative Council achieved virtually all that it wanted in the amendments that were put forward. I guess that our managers were fairly intransigent in the face of the position taken by the House of Assembly. I will make some comments about that from a personal point of view in a minute.

But, basically, without going through the whole list of amendments, I will say that the major area of contention was the question of child advocates, which the House of Assembly conceded, that is, that child advocates can be brought into the family conferences and, while the Government had some doubts about whether that should be obligatory in all circumstances, it virtually has been made obligatory now—at least the care and protection coordinator must arrange for a suitable person to act as an advocate for the child at the meeting unless satisfied that the child has made

an independent decision to waive his or right to be so represented.

The effect of that will be that the child will have an advocate at these family conferences in virtually all circumstances, and, of course, that just adds another party to the conference. Nevertheless, that is what was wanted. It should be borne in mind, of course, that the Department for Family and Community Services intervenes in any event only when a child is in difficulty and to protect the interests of the child.

The other issue of major concern to the House of Assembly was whether or not the care and protection coordinators should operate from within the Department for Family and Community Services or from the Youth Court. The Council took the view that it should operate from the Youth Court. The House of Assembly and the Minister of Health, in particular, took a strong view that this was a misconceived proposition and that these conferences should be conducted within the Department for Family and Community Services. However, the Legislative Council has insisted, and the Minister of Health, not wanting to delay this package of legislation, has capitulated.

The third point I should mention is that the House of Assembly agreed to the establishment of the children's protection advisory panel, notwithstanding that there is already in place a Child Protection Council and a number of other committees dealing with child protection. In summary, apart from some of the peripheral matters, we now have child advocates who will be present in almost all family conferences.

Family conferences are now being conducted by care and protection coordinators operating out of the Youth Court not out of FACS, and we now have a Children's Protection Advisory Panel. Those matters have been agreed to; however, I think it is fair to say that they were reluctantly agreed to by the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services because of the necessity to get this legislation through.

I want to put on the record a couple of comments about this legislation. I think that the system we have created may well not work. I know that members opposite do not agree with that, but we run the risk of having created a bureaucratic monster to deal with this issue. We have layered committee on committee and professional on professional, and I am not sure that we have come up with the best proposal by any means; in fact, I have severe doubts as to whether we have. My guess is that almost certainly next year, probably earlier rather than later, whoever is in Government will bring a Bill back to this Council to amend this legislation, because they will find that the manner in which it has been set up does not work and is probably too expensive anyhow.

Regrettably, what we have done is over-bureaucratised the process. Instead of having one family care conference, there will now be two. One family care conference will be conducted, as must occur, within the Department for Family and Community Services, with the department intervening in order to try to get the family together, as it must. It will prepare its professional reports. So, the kid will be put through that family conference. We will then put the kid through another conference, which will be under the auspices of the court, and if the matter is not resolved it may formally be referred to the court by the department. Through all this process, at least through the court process of a family conference, child advocates will be involved.

We have also decided to establish yet another advisory panel on the topic, and that seems to me, again, to be overkill. No-one denies that this is an important area or that there must

be adequate protection of children, but I wonder whether what we have ended up with will work in the best interests of children or more in the interests of the professionals in the bureaucracy and the courts. I have grave concerns about this legislation. It may well be that sometime next year we will come back to amend the Bill. It will be more expensive, so the Opposition will have to wear the budgetary impact resulting from these care and protection coordinators operating out of the Youth Court. There is no budgetary provision; that will have to be added, and it will be clearly marked that it was added to the Government's budget by the Opposition.

I am not even sure that the courts will want this function. However, whether they do or do not is hardly to the point. The Government has put its point of view: namely, that this function should not be conducted by the court. The Opposition and the Democrats have insisted that we have it, so the courts will have to wear it whether or not they like it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I note the Attorney-General's reservation about the system. Right from the start the Opposition expressed some reservation about the institutionalisation of the family care meeting. In a number of the representations that were made to the Liberal Party, we expressed concern about the concept of the formal family care meeting being incorporated in legislation. We acknowledge that there has been an informal arrangement within the Department for Family and Community Services which seeks to resolve issues where children are deemed to be at risk. However, once the structure is formalised by including it in legislation, it raises other issues about representation, balance, powers and responsibilities. It may well be that the Attorney-General's reservations—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You can't get out of it like that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We have expressed concern about them. I am not talking about the other issues but about the family care conference. The whole concept of the family care meeting was an area of concern, but once it is institutionalised and formalised we take the view that there ought to be some protection built into the system recognising that the coordinator is a particularly influential person who is proposed to be employed by the Department for Family and Community Services. That coordinator was not to be also a case worker with day-to-day responsibility for the investigation of issues relating to the child. So, in any event there was to be a person separate from the case worker, and that coordinator would have to be briefed. The Minister has indicated that it was proposed that the coordinators would be in a separate section within the Department for Family and Community Services, so they would be removed from the day-to-day issues relating to a particular child. They would have to be briefed to be able to make the decisions they are required to make under clauses 30 and 31 of the Bill.

They make decisions about who shall attend; about who should be the advocate; if someone has examined, assessed, counselled or treated the child; whether that person should also attend the family care meeting; and a variety of other decisions. So, the coordinator was in a particularly influential position, and the view which we took was that whether it was the Courts Administration Authority or some other agency of Government, there had to be a measure of independence of the coordinators away from the department which had the responsibility for providing the investigation and initial services related to a child to ensure not only that all those who attended the meeting could see that the coordinator was

independent but also that that fact of independence was also present.

We took the view that there ought to be a measure of independence. We suggested that it did not necessarily have to be the courts. It could be some other agency of Government, but certainly it needed to be away from the Family and Community Services Department.

We also took the view that there ought to be advocates or persons to support the child, with one exception which is specified in the Bill. Whilst the Minister in an early stage in the House of Assembly was suggesting that we were trying to ensure that there was legal representation, that was far from the truth.

We took the view that the advocate was a support person for the child in what could be a particularly threatening situation, where the coordinator did not necessarily have the capacity both to be the coordinator and also to represent the interests of the child adequately.

We also took the view that the definition of 'abuse' ought to be amended, and that now puts abuse into its proper context. It is not, as again the Minister suggested at some stage of the debate, that smacking a child or even shouting at a child would constitute abuse. When one looks at the definition which is now there, it is clear that abuse is more than that.

In relation to the principles which have to be observed, we did concede that in the exercise of powers the safety of the child is to be the paramount consideration and that the powers must be exercised in the best interests of the child. Whilst we placed some emphasis on the word 'welfare' being included, we finally conceded that always the powers must be exercised in the best interests of the child.

There were other amendments which we did not insist upon and which were really peripheral to those major issues to which I have referred. The Legislative Council members of the conference did genuinely endeavour to find solutions to the dilemma relating to the status, responsibility and accountability of the coordinator, but we were not finally able to achieve anything other than to adhere to our amendments which were moved in the earlier consideration of the Bill. I support the motion.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: My contribution will be very brief, as we have debated the issue at conference for over three hours and tried very hard to come to a compromise that we could accept with any conviction. We are pleased that the three main issues, that is, the three main amendments have been sustained, the first one being that of a definition.

I am aware that field workers have difficulty with the word 'significant'. Especially they ask, 'What is a significant injury or what is a significant abuse?', for they believe that 'abuse' or 'injury' on its own is significant enough. It does not include just a scratch or just a bruise. If one were to work in the area of child abuse, one would definitely know what abuse and injury are. So it is with the amendment to the definition. The introduction of the word 'detrimental' is important, because it has the connotation of long-term future problems.

Physical abuse might heal, but perhaps psychological and emotional types of abuse would continue. This definition does support and strengthen the objective of the Bill which is that the child should reach his or her full potential. So, I am very pleased that we have this amended definition.

Secondly, it was our view that the coordinator should be separate from the department that was investigating the abuse of the child, as we felt that the function of each was separate

but important. It is important that the coordinator should be removed from and be objective of the whole situation.

The Attorney-General has raised the suggestion that it would be a duplication of investigation of these children. We do not believe so because, if one looks in section 30 at the constitution of the family care meeting, one can see that reports are required by a FACS worker, and a report is possibly engendered from the person who has examined, assessed, counselled or treated the child, and a report is expected from an expert who has investigated the child as well. So, I do not believe that the coordinator will go into investigating further after receiving three reports from three very specialised personnel.

I would see that the coordinator would be more of a facilitator and be a more objective observer and reviewer of the whole case at the Family Care conference. Therefore, I do not believe there is a redundancy and overlap of work. I am again pleased that we have been able to sustain the amendment that the coordinator should be separate from the department that is investigating the child.

Finally, regarding the advocate for the child, one knows that during meetings, the Family Care Meeting or meetings of the family with the father and the mother and the relatives, the child is often overawed, intimidated, and his or her point of view is not put well and not put properly, and so an advocate, be it a legal person, a family friend, an expert social worker or psychologist, would be an essential person to make sure that the best interests of the child are pouped.

I think these three important amendments should be sustained, and they have been sustained. We have not been able to keep the amendment regarding principles to be observed according to safety and welfare of the child. To my mind, as a field worker, safety would apply to a physical safety whereas welfare would apply to either psychological, emotional, or intellectual welfare of the child. By removing the word 'welfare' I feel we have lost some of the principle that we want to engender. Further, as to the advocate himself or herself, we have not been able to sustain that the advocate should also be consulted or should concur with certain decisions of the coordinator. The advocate's position is now of a lesser degree, but he or she will still be able to speak strongly on behalf of the child. In view of the sustained amendments, I support the motion.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I will focus my comments in relation to those amendments which affect the Family Care Meeting and the position of the care and protection coordinator. That was the matter which proved to be the greatest sticking point and I believe that the position that we have adopted is a superior position to that in the original piece of legislation. That is an opinion not only held by me but certainly a position held by the Child Protection Coalition, which is made up of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, Action for Children South Australia, Anglican Community Services, the Law Society of South Australia, Catholic Family Services, Norwood Community Legal Service, the Youth Housing Network, Service to Youth Council, Emergency Foster Care, Placement of Prevention Subsidy Care Association and the Australian Early Childhood Association.

In the past couple of days I have received a letter from the Children's Interests Bureau, which unanimously supports the position that was insisted upon by this Council—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: No, they wrote separately, but they also support the position that we took. I also have

correspondence to the Minister himself from the South Australian Child Protection Council which is made up of members including the Police, Victims of Crime, the Attorney-General's Department, the Children's Court, the South Australian Law Society, the Family Court, Disability Services, the Children's Interests Bureau and the Flinders Medical Centre which again said, in one part of the letter:

All matters have been agreed to unanimously by committee members.

In relation to the specific matter, it said:

Concern is again expressed with the coordinator's role in as much as not being independent from the department and being able to exclude a professional who had previously been involved with the child from a meeting.

Among quite a few groups there is very strong support for the position taken by this Council. Having said that, I note also that I made repeated requests, which were always denied—by way of no reaction whatsoever—for internal reports from various departments and agencies, and I can only conclude that the failure to table those was because all of them supported the position taken by this Council. In fact, if you listened to the names that I listed earlier, they probably cover many of those agencies in any case. The Minister, along with his department and SACOSS, were at odds with almost everybody else.

My feeling is that what we did was supported by the vast number of community interest groups. Having said that, during the second reading stage, and again when the Bill was returned to us, I expressed some concern that the coordinator was having to fulfil several functions. I think the Attorney-General is right, that this legislation may end up returning to Parliament to be rectified in some regards, but I think it would have had to come back regardless of which model we adopted; whether we adopted the Minister's model or the one the Council insisted upon, because, fundamentally, I think we are making some conflicting demands upon the coordinator which will need to be addressed later. There was a suggestion that perhaps the whole concept of the Family Care Meeting should be taken from the legislation. That would be a drastic mistake. I think the whole concept of a Family Care Meeting and putting it within a legislative framework is a very important one and I am glad that any suggestion of taking it from the Bill was only a momentary one.

I think the other matters have been largely covered by earlier speakers. I might just add though, in relation to those amendments conceded by this Council, I do think it is unfortunate that we conceded the amendment to clause 4(2)(a), where the word 'welfare' was removed. However, aside from that, I think that the Council can be well pleased that we have done the best we could with the legislation. The legislation was not in this Chamber for very long and I think that with a little more time we may have rectified that area in relation to the care and protection coordinator. With those comments I support the motion.

Motion carried.

MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That this House resolves that--

(a) on or before 31 August in each year, the Minister of Health should prepare a report on the care of the dying in South Australia, noting progress on the implementation of the Select

Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying recommendations, with particular reference to:

- (1) provision of palliative care services
- (2) adequacy of hospice care services
- (3) the effectiveness of prevailing legislation and public awareness of its provisions
- (4) professional education in relation to the care of the terminally ill and the dying process
- (5) care and treatment of terminally ill AIDS patients
- (6) and any other relevant matter;

(b) the Minister should confer with the Hospice Care Coordinating Committee in the preparation of the report;

(c) the report must be tabled in Parliament within 14 sitting days of the Minister receiving it and shall stand referred to the Social Development Committee for its consideration.

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

That the Council concur in the resolution passed by the House of Assembly.

This resolution arose out of a Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying and provides for a report from the Minister on or before 31 August in each year relating to issues considered by the that select committee and I commend it to the Council.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Liberal members in this Chamber I have pleasure in supporting the resolution to which the Attorney has just spoken. I cannot and do not intend to add much more than the Attorney has indicated in his brief remarks. From our view of point it seems to be a commonsense resolution from the select committee. It is an important issue and whilst there have been differing views perhaps about details of the legislation, I think that everyone agrees that the issue itself is important and I am sure will be debated in the next Parliament irrespective of which Party is successful at the election. As a measure to go hand in hand with the potential passage of future legislation, or indeed even if this legislation were not to be successful, this resolution does stand on its own and the Parliament deserves to be updated on a 12 monthly basis on progress in relation to these aspects of the select committee report. Therefore, on behalf of Liberal members, I am pleased to support the resolution.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the Council at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 8 February 1994.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I wish to put a few words on record in respect of the retirement of both yourself, Mr President, and the Hon. John Burdett. At this late hour I will be fairly brief, but less than justice would be done, certainly by myself, if I did not place a few words on the official record of Parliament in respect of my thoughts and knowledge of John Burdett and yourself, which has been a very long association and from time to time a very fruitful association.

Some of us, myself included, did not rise when Parliament last met because we were uncertain that it was the appropriate time and, as the events have shown, our suspicions were correct. We were uncertain whether that would be the last of the parliamentary sitting. We therefore stayed in our places and did not rise to place on record our appreciation for both yourself and the Hon. Mr Burdett. I would hope that no sleight would be felt by anyone with respect to this matter:

certainly no sleight was intended by myself or any other member on this side that I am aware of.

As I said, the fact that we chose not to speak was because we did not know whether or not it was an appropriate time and whether it was the last day of sittings of the House. Consequently, myself and at least one other member seek to ensure that we now place in the *Hansard* some thoughts in respect to the Hon. Mr Burdett and yourself.

I first came to know the Hon. John Burdett when he was a Minister in the Tonkin Government from 1979 to 1982. At that time I had succeeded my predecessor in 1981, as I recall it, as Secretary of the State branch of the Liquor Trades Union. The Hon. John Burdett, in the mix of portfolios for which he was responsible as a Minister in his Party's Government at that time, had amongst that mix a portfolio which of course I was much concerned with as Secretary of the major union in the hospitality industry, namely, the portfolio that covered the Licensing Act in South Australia.

On quite a number of occasions, I sought an appointment with the honourable member to discuss matters with respect to proposed changes or changes to the Act that our union had felt necessary. I always found him to be a very courteous Minister indeed, and I must place that on record. In my humble opinion, he also was a most honourable Minister, in that on any occasion that I had to go to see him—and there were quite a number of occasions, as I am sure he would agree—he always listened. If the honourable member thought you were right, he would give an objective and honest appraisal of the point you were making, and I found that, even though, in a philosophical sense, we were on opposite sides of the fence, with respect to any problems that I had brought to him he showed me objective honesty. He was beyond reproach relative to the honest discharging of his functions as Minister responsible for that portfolio.

Of course, I have had a chance of comparing John with other Ministers who have the same portfolio, and he certainly lacks nothing in comparison with those other Ministers with whom I have had to deal. He certainly lacks nothing in respect of any comparison I might like to make. As I said, I found him an honest and approachable human being, and it would have been shallow tarnish for me not to have placed that on the record.

I turn now, Mr President, to you. My relationship with you is somewhat longer than that which I have had with John Burdett—longer, that is, by length of time. Of course, it was brought about in a similar fashion: some 20 years ago you, Mr President, were an organiser with the Liquor Trades Union, as was I. You had been the President, I had succeeded you as President, and the two of us held the office of President for 17 years straight—a record in terms of the Liquor Trades Union. You then became Assistant Secretary of the union, and in 1979 were preselected by the Labor Party to come in on its ticket at No. 4, where you succeeded by becoming a member of this Council and then succeeded again in being re-elected. Of course, from there you became President of the Council—only the second Labor Party President this Council has seen, after the Hon. Anne Levy—and it is such a great honour with respect to both you and the Party you represent.

I will certainly miss you: you are one of a kind, Gordon. You certainly would not be what I would call a self-opinionated person, but you would be a person of strong opinions who, once you get your teeth into them, is very difficult to persuade.

Even the President of the Legislative Council can from time to time maybe not so much be wrong but show an impartiality in that direction, in relation to which it is sometimes difficult to persuade you. Mr President, I shall be sorry that the closeness of our relationship has come to an end. Whilst we will still see you from time to time, it certainly will be for me a watershed, having known you for almost the past 30 years. Truly, we have grown grey together.

John Burdett, another acquaintance of mine of long-standing, I cannot say has grown grey with me, but perhaps his mark is that he has to attend the barber much less than I do or than we both had to some 15 or 20 years ago when I first knew him.

I wish John well. He was a good Minister, he was an approachable Minister, and he did many good things for the members of the union which I represented, which I must say surprised me but nonetheless pleased me. I wish you, Mr President, and John a good retirement with your families. I am sure that we will see both of you from time to time. From me to you both, a job well done. It has been my pleasure to know both of you. I thank you.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I feel almost compelled on this occasion to rise to say a few words in recognition of the parliamentary contribution of the Hon. Mr Burdett to this Council. For the past almost 11 years I have had the honour of serving with the members of this Council, and I must say in all honesty that I have found the Hon. John Burdett to be an honest and sincere person. Over the years I have appreciated his friendship. I served with him on a committee for a number of years. At all times he displayed in many ways his courteous manners, not only towards me but towards all members.

As a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and then the Legislative Review Committee, Mr Burdett has been of great assistance, especially to me as Chairman. His legal expertise meant a lot to all members of the committee. When dealing with regulations I often had to rely on his expertise and I appreciated, above all, his unbiased way of approaching matters during meetings. Like all members, I will miss him. However, he has served this Council for, I think, 20 years and given great service to the Parliament and to the community of South Australia, and he deserves now to retire and to enjoy the rest of his life in the company of his family and close relatives. We will all remember him for his kindness. Personally, I wish him the best of health in the future.

To you, Mr President, I must praise the way in which you have conducted the sittings of this Council. At all times, you have been unbiased and you have conducted the sittings with fairness. Your sense of humour is a particular part of your personality. I will also remember you as a good friend and Party colleague, and I wish you a good retirement in the years to come and I hope that we will see each other occasionally.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage): I wish briefly to enter this debate. Like other members on this side, I did not make any comments on the Thursday when we last sat, as I strongly suspected that was not our last sitting day, and felt it would be appropriate to wait until we did sit again.

I do not wish to take up much time of the Council, Mr President, but I would like to pay tribute to both yourself and John Burdett. Certainly, I had not met the Hon. Mr Burdett before becoming a member of Parliament, but in the interven-

ing years I have certainly come to respect him considerably. While obviously we differ politically, I certainly have regarded John as a friend, and I hope he has reciprocated that feeling. He has certainly been a very conscientious and valuable member of this Chamber, not given to wild flights of fancy or hyperbole, but his contributions in this place have always been well considered, thoughtful and worthy of consideration. Certainly, I have appreciated knowing him.

I feel slightly apprehensive at the thought that he will no longer be in the Chamber. He currently has the status known as 'Father of the Council', although perhaps one should call it 'Parent of the Council', and when he is no longer here that title of 'Parent of the Council' will fall jointly on the Attorney-General and me.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: My God!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: We certainly entered this Chamber on the same day and, despite my having been higher on the ticket, the Hon. Mr Sumner was sworn in before I was, as he took the oath and I affirmed, and the oath always takes place a few minutes before the affirmations. I do not wish to fight him for the title. Perhaps we can be joint 'Parents of the Council'. As I say, it is with rather a shock that I realise we will have this title when the Hon. Mr Burdett is no longer a member of this place. I think he has certainly worn that honour of 'Parent of the Council' very gracefully.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I thought it was 'grandfather'.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: 'Father' I think is the usual term. I can assure the honourable member that I, amongst others, will miss him for many reasons.

With regard to yourself, Mr President, it is again hard to imagine the Legislative Council without your presence. I knew you obviously before you came into this Chamber, but your humour and down to earth commonsense has been a great asset to this place. While we at least on this side of the Chamber will miss your contributions to the Council, we certainly hope to continue seeing a great deal of you and benefiting from conversation with you, perhaps also continuing to learn from you on the desirability of good wines, which are the ones to sample, which are those to buy, and that your invaluable advice in this respect can continue to be shared with your former colleagues.

Certainly I wish both you and the Hon. Mr Burdett a very happy retirement and trust that when you are no longer members of this place you will each have fond memories of your time here.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Transport Development): I, too, would like briefly to take part in this debate. I must say that I rise reeling rather in shock from the realisation that has just been brought upon me by the Hon. Anne Levy's remarks when she reminds us that, on the parting of the Hon. Mr Burdett, she and the Hon. Attorney-General will become the respective mother and father of the Council. I find this rather shocking because I have laboured under the view for some time that these people are not very much more advanced than I in years and that we are in something of a similar political era. It worries me enormously to think that I am approaching the stage of my political career where I might at some stage be referred to as a parent of the Council! It sounds appalling. However, that was not the reason I wanted to enter the debate. I would like briefly to pay a tribute to the Hon. Mr Burdett and to you, Mr President.

In the case of the Hon. Mr Burdett, I did not meet him until I was first elected to Parliament. When I entered Parliament I took a keen interest in community welfare issues

and I recall that one of the earliest debates in which I took part was on the Community Welfare Bill, which the Hon. Mr Burdett introduced into the Legislative Council and which completely rewrote the community welfare legislation. I handled the legislation from an Opposition perspective when it passed through this Chamber. I was very green and very unaccustomed to debates of that sort at that time and I very much appreciated the courtesy that the Hon. Mr Burdett showed towards me during the course of that debate.

I was equally impressed by his participation and performance in the Subordinate Legislation Committee, of which I was a member for a short time before I became a Minister. During the time that I have served in this place alongside the Hon. Mr Burdett, I have, like other members, regarded him as a very fair and reasonable member of this place. I cannot help feeling that, with the Hon. Mr Burdett leaving this Chamber, we are seeing the end of an era in politics because I think that he represents the type of member that we have not seen too many of since that time.

As for yourself, Mr President, you and I were elected on the same day in 1979. In fact, we shared an office for the first six years after we were elected. It is often a difficult thing, I think, for members of Parliament to share accommodation in this place and we all know that the accommodation generally is not very satisfactory, particularly for members of the Opposition. The problem of having to share accommodation is obviously rather a trial for some members if they do not get on terribly well or if they are not considerate of each other's needs for privacy and other things.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You both smoked in those days, didn't you?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Neither of us smoked—no, that is not true; I did smoke when I was first elected. I hope that my smoking, Mr President, did not offend you too much, but I do not think I smoked very often in our room.

However, I certainly found that it was a pleasant experience knowing the Hon. Mr Bruce during that time and we very happily were able to share accommodation with all its inadequacies. I have found Gordon to be a refreshing member of Parliament. He has original ideas on most issues, I think. Whilst I do not always agree with his point of view on some of the things that we discuss, nevertheless I think that he has played an important part in our Labor Party team and he has certainly played an important part in the business of this Chamber as President. I would like to wish both you, Mr President, and your wife Olive, and the Hon. Mr Burdett and his wife Jean the very best for your retirement. I hope that you enjoy your future life very much and that you have the opportunity to travel and do all the things you would like to do in retirement. I join with other members in saying that we hope that from time to time we will see something of both of you.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Mr President, the last Thursday that we met some things were said about both you and me and we both responded, and I do not intend to repeat my comments. However, I would like to respond briefly to the members who have spoken. First, I congratulate the Hon. Trevor Crothers that an Irish horse with an Irish jockey and an Irish trainer won the Melbourne Cup today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Hon. Trevor Crothers mentioned that when he was Secretary of the Liquor Trades Union and I was Minister of Consumer Affairs that we had a good relationship, which was true. That should always

relate to a Minister and to the persons on any side of politics who have business to do with the Minister. Communication is the name of the game and it goes two ways. The credit was not only on my side; it was also on the side of the Hon. Trevor Crothers, because he was always quite honest in saying what the matters were that he was bringing to me. Both of those things have to happen; the people on both sides have to say what their problems are. I certainly have appreciated very much my association with the honourable member, both at that time and since we have both been in the Council together.

I also appreciate the comments of the Hon. Mario Feleppa. We have been friends on the Subordinate Legislation Committee and the Legislative Review Committee. I must just relate one little incident. When I went overseas last year and was going to Italy, among other places, the honourable member was instrumental in setting up a very good series of interviews, with judges, ministers and other people I wanted to see because I was interested in juvenile justice and child abuse. It all worked perfectly; nothing went wrong.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The honourable member just interjected 'Not with me'. A short time ago he went to Italy and he tried to set up the same arrangements and they did not work. So, I thank the honourable member very much for that. You try to help your friends and sometimes it does not work for you.

I very much appreciate the remarks made by the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, and I have a mutual respect for her. As she said in regard to me, we are on different sides of politics and we do not have the same philosophical views. We have been on a number of select committees together and I certainly have a very healthy respect for her and I appreciate what she said with regard to me.

The Minister of Transport Development referred to the Bill that was introduced when I was the Minister for Community Welfare and said she appreciated the way in which it was debated. I remember her coming to see me at that time and talking to me. I particularly appreciated a remark that she made towards the end of her speech when she said that I was the kind of politician that was perhaps leaving Parliament and that this kind of thing might be lost to Parliament. I hope it is not lost; I do hope that we can continue. I know that it is becoming more strained, but I hope that we can continue, despite the need vigorously to debate matters in this House and in the other Chamber when they are Party political and when they are matters that do have to be thrashed out and cannot be settled in any other way. But I do think it will be a great shame if, as the Minister said, we cannot talk to each other, not only socially and in private but also in relation to important matters when the time comes without compromising our Party loyalties.

Mr President, that is all I want to say. As I said, on the last Thursday that we met I made my general remarks, but I very much appreciate the remarks which have been made about me tonight.

The PRESIDENT: Just before we wind up, I said I would not tonight get into another speech, and I will not, but I would like to thank my colleagues on the Labor side for the tribute they have paid to me, and I appreciate it. I took *Hansard* home last time thinking it was our final night, and I will be very pleased to take *Hansard* home tonight and show my wife.

But there is just one thing that concerns me. I have the right of reply, and the Hon. Mr Irwin in his last statement about me said that I said, 'God preserve me from principles.' That is true. I was with the Liquor Trades Union for many, many years and I used to go around and try to join up members for the union. They used to say, 'No, I don't really think I should be in the union; it is the principle.' When it was all boiled down it was about money. They did not want to pay money. So my attitude was: God preserve me from principles, because they could always be bought or sold. So, you have to watch out.

I thought I had better respond to that, because I do have principles and I try to live by those principles. I have enjoyed my time in this Parliament and thank you very much for your comments.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): It is now the final day: not just the end of a session, but also the end of a Parliament—on the assumption that the Premier carries out his stated intention and goes to the Governor in the next day or two and advises her to dissolve the House of Assembly and issue writs for a new election. But I think one can assume that that will occur, and if it does, as I said, it is the end of the Parliament. As such, I would like to thank everyone in the Parliament for their assistance during the whole of the last four years—members of staff and everyone else who assists in the parliamentary process.

I acknowledged previously the retirement of the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Bruce. The Hon. Mr Burdett was generally regarded as a competent and compassionate Minister of Community Welfare and I wish him well in his retirement. You, Mr President, brought your own style in attempting to provide in this Legislative Council a forum for friendly debate.

I must confess, Mr President, that you were not always successful in that desire, but I appreciate the service which you have provided to the Parliament and to the Council over the years of your time here, particularly during your time as President. I personally would like to thank you for your comradeship over the past 14 years. The one thing we will miss from you, Mr President, is the view of the Broadview Bowling Club—or probably now the Brighton Bowling Club—which were, through your mouth, an infallible guide to the political fortunes of us all. I do not know why the political Parties have wasted their time on elaborate polling, which we all carried out: we could have saved our money by having a chat with you, Mr President, and picking up the views of the Broadview and Brighton Bowling Clubs, which were inevitably unflinchingly accurate in their assessment of the public view of South Australians.

I used to have another sounding board. Some years ago, one of my staff was also a participant in the Lyndoch Cricket Club and, if I wanted to know what was happening in the political world, what the public opinion was on a particular topic, I would ask him what the view of the Lyndoch Cricket Club was, and that was unflinchingly accurate as well. So, between the Lyndoch Cricket Club and the Broadview and Brighton Bowling Clubs, I got a better view of what was happening in the opinion of the public and the political scene in South Australia than from the best conducted political survey.

I may have been somewhat flippant in those remarks, but it is true, Mr President, that you do have a fairly reliable weathervane as far as the political feelings in the community are concerned. While you may not be formally here after the

election, I am sure you will return from time to time and, if I am still here—as I suspect I will be—I will look forward to picking up your latest views on the public opinion that I have mentioned. Thank you, Mr President, once again for your contribution to the Parliament and, as I said, for your comradeship over the past 14 years.

Motion carried.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT
(ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO No. 2)
BILL**

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.17 a.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 8 February 1994 at 2.15 p.m.