LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

INQUIRY INTO THE PRIORITIES REVIEW BOARD REVIEW

Report Number 2 of the Standing Committee of Public Accounts
December 1990

RESOLUTION OF APPOINTMENT

On 23 May 1989 the ACT Legislative Assembly established a Standing Committee on Public Accounts with the following terms of reference:

(1) Examine –

(a) the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Australian Capital Territory Executive;

(b) the financial affairs of authorities of the Australian Capital Territory; and

(c) all reports of the Auditor–General which have been laid before the Assembly.

(2) Report to the Assembly, with such comments as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them to which the committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Assembly should be directed; and

(3) Inquire into any question in connection with the public account which is referred to it by the Assembly and to report to the Assembly on that question.

MEMBERSHIP

Ms Rosemary Follett (Presiding Member)

Mr Norm Jensen

Ms Carmel Maher

Secretary: Ms Karin Malmberg

Research Staff: Ms Judy Starcevich

Keyboard/Administrative: Mrs Kim Blackburn

Inquiry Terms of Reference:

That the Committee inquire into and report on:

- the conduct and processes involved in the review;
- the costs involved and the use of consultants in the review.
- other matters to which the Committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Assembly should be directed.

Contents

Recommendations

The Committee recommends that:

- **in future inquiries all relevant documentary material, including records of the meetings, agendas and minutes should be identified and kept in an appropriate place which is easily accessible to the public.**

  Paragraph 2.9

- **in future wide ranging inquiries include members who are representative of all major groups within the community.**

  Paragraph 2.12

- **an initial assessment of areas already under investigation be an essential part of the processes of future inquiries to avoid unnecessary duplication.**

  Paragraph 2.18

- **in future inquiries the cost of all resources used, whether from within the public sector or externally, be included in the total cost of such inquiries.**

  Paragraph 3.10

- **when the draft "Guidelines for Selecting and Managing a Management Consultancy" are finalised, all relevant ACT Government Service staff be fully advised of their status and use.**

  Paragraph 4.5

- **attempts to engage consultancies for the ACT Government Service should include seeking expressions of interest from ACT based consultants.**

  Paragraph 4.16

- **the criteria for including a management consultant on a short list include the availability of consultant/s to perform the task.**

Paragraph 4.19

- **the guidelines be refined to further clarify their use to ensure only in exceptional circumstances should the normal competitive processes for awarding consultancies not be followed in order to minimise any possibility of impropriety.**

Paragraph 4.31

- **the Government give consideration to upgrading the status of the guidelines by making them mandatory except in exceptional circumstances where approval by agency heads should be required.**

Paragraph 4.33

- **the guidelines be made more specific regarding when contracts are to be used. When contracts are not used the exchange of letters should include a specific cost and/or time duration.**

Paragraph 4.37

- **the guidelines be refined to specify that a written report be provided in all instances regardless of the size or duration of the consultancy.**

Paragraph 4.42

- **in all use of consultants an officer of the ACT Government Service be responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of consultants at all times.**

Paragraph 4.45

1. Introduction

1.1 On 11 July, 1990 the Public Accounts Committee resolved to inquire into and report on aspects of the Priorities Review Board (PRB) review.

1.2 The terms of reference were that the Committee inquire into and report on:

- the conduct of and processes involved in the review;
- the costs involved and the use of consultants in the review; and
- other matters to which the Committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Assembly should be directed.

1.3 The inquiry was advertised in the Canberra Times on 14 July, 1990 calling for submissions from the public. Thirteen submissions were received. A list of those persons and organisations who provided submissions is at Attachment A.

1.4 The Committee met privately with two members of the Board to discuss general issues in connection with the review.

1.5 The Committee also held public hearings on 5 and 6 September, 1990. At these hearings evidence was given by Mr Bill Harris, Secretary of the Chief Minister's Department and Mr John Collins, Acting Head of the Office of Public Sector Management.

2. Conduct of and Processes Involved in the PRB Review

Background

2.1 On 13 February, 1990 the Chief Minister in a statement to the Legislative Assembly announced the establishment of the Priorities Review Board.

2.2 The Board was established to provide an independent review to determine priorities for the improvement of the management of the ACT public sector. In information provided by the Chief Minister's Department it was stated that:

> "In establishing the PRB the Government placed particular emphasis on the identification of opportunities and options for improvement in the functioning of the ACTGS in both the short and longer term."[1]

2.3 The Priorities Review Board reported to the Chief Minister on 24 May, 1990. The Chief Minister then tabled the report in the Legislative Assembly on 29 May, 1990.

Methodology

2.4 The report of the Priorities Review Board included an outline of the list of activities which formed the methodology adopted by the Board for its inquiry. A "Statement of Principles" was also included which indicated those factors which guided the members of the Board in their deliberations. In addition to this, the Committee was provided with further information by the Chief Minister's Department which specifically outlined the nature of the activities undertaken.

2.5 At the outset the Committee addressed the question of whether it was more appropriate for the inquiry to be conducted internally or externally. As a result it has accepted that the combination of approaches of external people with full-time ACT Government Service (ACTGS) staff seconded to the PRB secretariat provided for a balanced review. ACT Government Service staff provided local knowledge of the ACT administration.

2.6 As indicated above, the Committee sought and obtained further information on the conduct and methodology of the Review. However, the Committee noted that there was very little documentation of the number and details of meetings of the Board.

---

1 Chief Minister's Department Submission.

2.7 The Committee notes that the Committee of Inquiry into the Assets and Public Debt of the Australian Capital Territory pointed out that:

> "The documentary material which the Committee received and collected is substantial and, as some of it forms the basis of the Committee's inquiry and findings, it should be available for public access in some convenient location. Records of the Committee's meetings including agenda and minutes should be treated in the same manner. The Committee accordingly recommends that all the above documentary material be separately identified and deposited in an appropriate and accessible place, such as the Central Library of ACT Library and Information Service, Kingston."[2]

2.8 The Committee believes that the documents relating to the PRB review should also have been made available to the public. This is particularly the case given that the members were claiming travel, accommodation, sitting and other expenses.

2.9 The Committee recommends that:

- **in future inquiries all relevant documentary material, including records of the meetings, agendas and minutes should be identified and kept in an appropriate place which is easily accessible to the public.**

Membership of the Board

2.10 The Committee also addressed the issue of the membership of the Priorities Review Board. While acknowledging it is the Chief Minister's prerogative to appoint Board members, the Committee noted that while the business community was well represented, representation from the non–business community was not included on the Board. Such appointments may have assisted the Board during consideration of community related issues.

2.11 For example, the submission from the Koomarri Parents and Citizens Association expressed concern in relation to recommendation 6.5 relating to the use of para professional staff in schools. The Committee was advised by the Chief Minister's Department that this recommendation was made following discussions on the potential savings in using para–professionals between Board members, the Executive Officer and Department of Education officials.[3] Wider community representation on the Board may have assisted it to examine further the broad ramifications of such a recommendation.

---

2 Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Assets and Public Debt of the Australian Capital Territory. May 1990, p. 2.

3 Supplementary Information Chief Minister's Department. Attachment D.

2.12 The Committee recommends that:

- **in future wide ranging inquiries include members who are representative of all major groups within the community.**

Selection of Areas of Inquiry

2.13 The Committee also sought to determine how and why the Board chose particular areas for study while excluding other areas for investigation.

2.14 The Committee was informed that:

> "Given the time frame faced by the Board, it adopted an iterative approach to identifying current issues and possible solutions, and in particular worked concurrently on identifying current situations and future scenarios."[4]

2.15 Furthermore, the Priorities Review Board Newsletter stated that the major areas selected for the PRB to examine in depth were health, education, information and communication technology and administrative overheads with other areas being investigated to include energy and water, public transport and forests.

> "As you may be aware, however, forests are also being examined by the concurrent inquiry into the ACT Assets. So, to avoid duplication, this area is not likely to become a separate major topic for the PRB.[5]

2.16 The Committee notes that the PRB then engaged ANUTECH to examine forests in the ACT at a cost of $11,760 from 5 – 23 April, 1990.

2.17 The Committee believes that areas chosen for detailed examination without due regard for other investigations of a similar nature being undertaken leads to unnecessary duplication and thereby a possible waste of government funds.

2.18 The Committee recommends that:

- **an initial assessment of areas already under investigation be an essential part of the processes of future inquiries to avoid unnecessary duplication.**

---

4 Ibid. Attachment F.

5 Ibid.

Time Frame

2.19 The Committee noted that the review had been conducted during the period February 1990 to May 1990 to enable the report to be completed and available for public comment prior to the framing of the 1990–91 Budget. The Committee acknowledges that this short time period may have resulted in some matters not being fully investigated. All advice received by the Committee was that the Budget preparation timetable including the development of a budget strategy did not allow for a longer inquiry period.

2.20 The Committee appreciates that the time frame for the review was the prerogative of the Government. However, it would like to emphasise that throughout its inquiry the Committee found that any perceived deficiencies with the review were related to the short time frame of the inquiry.

3. The Costs Involved in the Review

3.1 The Committee addressed itself to the issue of the total cost of the review.

The Board

3.2 Expenditure by the Board totalled $340,047 which is listed as follows:

. Cost of engagement of Executive Officer	$87,303
. Other consultancies	$170,583
. Secretary's salary	$12,388
. Office equipment and supplies	$33,725
. Other expenses	$36,048[1]

The Members of the Board

3.3 The Committee examined the claims for sitting fees made by the members of the Board whereby sitting fees and travel allowance in accordance with Remuneration Tribunal (Category 2) rates were paid. The Chairman received $210 per day and the other members $170 per day which represented standard daily sitting fees.[2]

3.4 The Committee recognises that there were no limits put on the amount the members could claim as this was not a matter for predetermination. However, while there were wide discrepancies in the amounts paid to various members of the Board, such amounts cannot be described as unreasonable. In fact, the Committee recognises that the different amounts can be attributed to a number of factors. For instance, Canberra based members put in more days than interstate members, one member did not claim travel or related expenses and a second did not claim sitting fees.

3.5 Furthermore, the Committee was advised that there was full acquittal of payments with the Secretariat keeping a record of these expenses.[3]

---

1 Chief Minister's Department Submission.

2 Supplementary Information Chief Minister's Department. Attachment A.

3 Transcripts p. 37.

3.6 Payments made to members of the Board are listed as follows:

- Sitting fees:

Robert White	$1,000.00
Rear Admiral Crawford	$1,000.00
Professor Yerbury	$1,270.00
Denis Page	$4,318.00
George Snow	–
Total	$7,588.00

– Reimbursed travel, accommodation, etc	$2,248.00
– accommodation paid direct	$568.80
	$10,404.80[4]

The Secretariat

3.7 As indicated earlier, support staff for the review were seconded from the ACT Government Service. These staff consisted of three ASO 8s and one ASO 7 who commenced duty on 8 February until 31 May, 1990. Two of the secretariat staff were drawn from the Budget Management Branch of the Treasury and two were drawn from the then Corporate Development Branch of the Chief Minister's Department.[5] In both cases the positions that these people had been occupying were not filled during their secondment to the PRB duties. During public hearings the witnesses confirmed the Committee view that the cost of the salaries of these staff could be roughly estimated at $50,000.[6]

3.8 While these public servants were seconded to form the secretariat for the PRB they were not counted as a part of the total cost of the review. The Committee was advised by the Chief Minister's Department that this was because the use of such staff was seen not as an additional cost to the public sector, but simply a rearrangement of staff within the ACTGS. The Committee was also advised that the duties of the officers' normal positions were very similar to those positions in the PRB Secretariat.

4 Supplementary Information Chief Minister's Department. Attachment A.

5 Transcripts p. 3.

6 Transcripts p. 4.

3.9 However, the Committee believes that the cost of such personnel should be included in the overall cost of the review to ensure that the total costs to the public purse are identified.

3.10 The Committee recommends that:

- **in future inquiries the cost of all resources used, whether from within the public sector or externally, be included in the total cost of such inquiries.**

4. The Use of Consultants by the PRB

The Guidelines

4.1 The processes involved in the use of consultants are covered in the draft "Guidelines for Selecting and Managing a Management Consultancy" which were prepared by the Chief Minister's Department. The Department also follows those guidelines set out as a result of the Commonwealth Government's purchasing reforms of November 1989.

4.2 At the outset the Committee notes that while the guidelines for the ACTGS were prepared by the Chief Minister's Department in early 1990 they continue to remain draft only.

4.3 The Committee also noted that during the 1990 Estimates Committee hearings the timing of the completion of the guidelines and their introduction into the Service was raised.[1] In its response to the report by the Estimates Committee the Government confirmed this by stating that:

> "The Office of Public Sector Management (OPSM) and Treasury will be undertaking a joint review of 1989–90 consultancy use to ensure best value for money and that ACT Government Service staff are used in preference to consultants wherever possible. Guidelines on the selection and use of management consultants will be issued by OPSM in December 1990."[2]

4.4 The Committee believes that when the guidelines are finalised all relevant ACTGS staff should be made fully aware of the status of these guidelines and their applicability.

4.5 The Committee recommends that:

- **when the draft "Guidelines for Selecting and Managing a Management Consultancy" are finalised that all relevant ACT Government Service staff be fully advised of their status and use.**

4.6 Using both the ACT draft guidelines and the Commonwealth guidelines provides a comprehensive set of processes for ACT government agencies to refer to when engaging consultants. In so doing they address the best possible means of selecting, evaluating and monitoring private consultants to undertake inquiries for the public sector.

---

1 Transcripts p. 1272.

2 Government's response to the Estimates Committee Report on the Appropriation Bill 1990–91 tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 20th November, 1990.

4.7 The Committee is aware that while the Commonwealth guidelines emphasise value for money and open and effective competition they also allow for substantial flexibility. It should be noted that the ACT Guidelines emphasise the relevant experience of the consultants and their perceived understanding of the issues under consideration as well as the proposed consulting fees.

4.8 During its inquiry the PRB engaged a total of eleven separate consultancies. These consisted of one as the Executive Officer to co-ordinate the review for the PRB and ten other consultancies to examine particular areas of ACT administration.

The Executive Officer

4.9 Mr James Lumbers of PCEK/Bevington was engaged as Executive Officer for the PRB. In this position Mr Lumbers was responsible for the co-ordination of all aspects of the PRB's work including the supervision of consultancies and seconded public servants as well as the preparation of the final report.

4.10 The Committee was told that because of the desire for the review to be completely independent of the ACT Government Service it was seen as essential that the "Chief-of-Staff" role for the Board should be filled by someone outside the ACT public service.[3]

4.11 The Committee learnt that the Chief Minister's Department had contacted the Commonwealth, Victorian and South Australian Governments to possibly second an SES officer for the period of the review.[4] As a result of the short time frame those Governments were unable to make an officer available and an administrative decision was made to engage a senior private consultant with public sector experience to carry out the work.

4.12 In this process lasting two to three weeks the Department approached four management consultancy firms from outside the ACT. They were PA Consulting Services; Touche Ross; Papas Carter Evans and Koope, and PCEK/Bevington. Once again due to the short time frame only two firms out of those four, PCEK/Bevington and PA Consulting Services, were able to provide a consultant. Furthermore, it was later determined that the consultant from PA Consulting Services would not be available as a result of his permanent appointment to a position in the Taxation Office.[5]

---

3 Transcripts p. 7.

4 Transcripts p. 8.

5 Chief Minister's Department Submission Attachment E.

4.13 The Committee was told that the Department did not consider approaching other firms because the one person that was available was considered capable of doing the job, had a suitable background and whose fee rates were to the lower end of the range of daily fees that would be expected. Documentation of the selection and engagement of PCEK/Bevington to provide the Executive Officer to the PRB was provided to the Committee which showed that Mr Lumbers had extensive experience in public sector management at a senior level as a SES officer with the CSIRO.

4.14 The Committee was told that, due to time constraints, the Acting Head of Administration did not use the normal procedures for the selection of the Executive Officer and a major part of the negotiations was done on the telephone.[6]

4.15 However, since it was not possible to second an SES officer from the three Governments approached and only one of the firms were on the short list, the Committee considered that further action could have been taken to check the availability of suitable consultants including from ACT based firms. The Committee notes that no Canberra based management consultancy firm was approached to provide the Executive Officer to the PRB. Given the large numbers of such firms in the ACT, the Committee believes that any attempts to employ consultancies should also include an initial assessment of ACT firms.

4.16 The Committee recommends that:

- **attempts to engage consultancies for the ACTGS should include seeking expressions of interest from ACT based consultants.**

4.17 Furthermore, the "Guidelines for Selecting and Managing a Management Consultancy" advises that a government agency should:

> "Select a short list of usually no less than three firms by assessing them against your criteria."

4.18 The Committee is concerned that, of the four consultancy firms approached, there was essentially only one that had a consultant available. Consequently, the Committee believes that one of the criteria that should have been applied is "availability to do the task". In this way the Committee believes that the agency failed to adequately address what should be suitable criteria in determining who should be selected to carry out the consultancy. Consequently, the Committee believes that a firm should not be included on a short list unless they are available.

4.19 The Committee recommends that:

- **the criteria for including a management consultant on a short list include the availability of consultant/s to perform the task.**

---

6 Transcripts p. 22.

The Other Consultancies

4.20 The nature of the ten individual consultancies engaged by the Priorities Review Board varied considerably. For instance, the consultancies ranged in cost from $1,817 for a review into industrial relations by Trend Consulting to $60,871 for a review into public transport by Travers Morgan. They ranged in time period from a few days to well over a month.

4.21 Despite the variations, the Committee was concerned as to whether the processes used for the selection, monitoring and evaluating of each of the ten consultancies employed by the PRB were also in keeping with the draft guidelines.

4.22 The Chief Minister stated that in terms of deciding consultancies and the general expenditure of moneys, the normal departmental processes were followed.[7] This was verified by the Chief Minister's Department in its submission to the inquiry where it stated that value for money was obtained in that in their reports and advice, the consultants comprehensively addressed the their various terms of reference and completed the work within approved budgets and time frames. The Chief Minister's Department also pointed out that all the consultants were acknowledged experts in their respective fields. The Committee also learnt from the submission that for the major consultancies formal terms of reference were developed by the PRB Secretariat while for the smaller consultancies detailed discussions took place on the Board's requirements prior to engagement of the consultants. The consultants were also advised in writing of their engagement, including a description of the work to be performed and the terms and conditions of engagement.

4.23 While on the face of it the manner of the engagement of the consultants was in keeping with public service guidelines, the Committee, nevertheless, has a number of reservations about the details of the processes involved as well as the actual status of the guidelines.

4.24 The Chief Minister's Department submission noted that :

> "Under the draft guidelines it is not necessary in all instances to obtain a variety of quotations before engaging consultants. In particular where:
>
> . the amount of the proposed consultancy is small (under $10,000) and there is particular urgency associated with the consultancy assignment;
>
> . the proposed consultancy has particular skills and experience relevant to the consultancy
>
> there is discretion for ACTGS agencies to dispense with the seeking of competitive proposals."

---

7 Chief Minister's Submission.

4.25 However, the actual guidelines also state that:

> "Open and effective competition is also a central principle of government purchasing and is a key concept underlying value for money...
>
> It means processes of obtaining goods and services must be visible and accessible and there must be opportunity for suppliers to do business on an equal footing."

4.26 Because of the exclusions listed by the Chief Minister's Department a number of consultancies commissioned by the PRB did not require competitive tenders. The Committee is concerned that the exclusions listed in the Chief Minister's Department's submission are so broad as to effectively negate the guidelines.

4.27 In the PRB inquiry the severe time limit could be applied so as to make competitive tendering avoidable in all cases. Four of the ten consultancies were under $10,000 also making it possible to avoid competitive tendering. Of the ten consultancies awarded, more than one consultant was considered in only three instances, meaning that with the seven other consultancies, one consultant was awarded the contract without competition.

4.28 The Committee was told that only one consultant was considered in some cases because

> "either, again, it was timing and the availability of a consultant, or they were very small consultancies, and the individual selected for the consultancy had a well established reputation in the field."[8]

4.29 The Committee therefore found that while the agency would normally seek bids from several consultants, because of the very tight time frame surrounding the PRB review there was a number of instances where competitive bids were not sought. Provided the consultant had a particular background and was capable of doing the work, and the daily fee rates that were being proposed were within the normal sort of ranges, they were appointed.

4.30 The Committee believes that opportunities for more open and competitive processes and the use of ACT based consultants should be explored wherever possible, even when a short time frame for appointment is available, as was the case for these consultancies. It is important for justice not only to be done but must be seen to be done and special appointments must be the exception rather than the rule. While the Committee noted that one of the consultancies was awarded to a firm from which one of the Board members was a managing partner, evidence was provided to show that the consultancy was awarded after an open and competitive process. However, the Committee recommends that the guidelines for employment of consultants should discourage such appointments.

---

8 Transcripts p. 20.

4.31 The Committee recommends that:

- **the guidelines be refined to further clarify their use to ensure only in exceptional circumstances should the normal competitive processes for awarding consultancies not be followed in order to minimise any possibility of impropriety.**

4.32 Throughout the inquiry the Committee was made aware of the draft status of the guidelines and that they were only guidelines and not mandatory. Like the exclusions listed above this allows for considerable flexibility for the engagement of consultants. The Committee believes this degree of flexibility be the exception not the rule. Deviation from standard guidelines should only be permitted following approval by agency heads.

4.33 The Committee recommends that:

- **the Government give consideration to upgrading the status of the guidelines by making them mandatory except in exceptional circumstances where approval by agency heads should be required.**

The Use of Standard Contracts

4.34 The Committee addressed the question of whether a standard contract was used for all consultancies under the PRB. The guidelines provide for standard contracts. This standard short form of contract for the engagement of consultants has been prepared by the supply area of the Department of Urban Services, with Law Office input.

4.35 In the case of the Chief Executive Officer, the standard set of conditions was appended to a letter which went to PCEK/ Bevington, which is the normal procedure for engaging management consultants. They confirmed their agreement to those standard terms.

4.36 However, with some of the ten other consultancies there was only a exchange of brief letters. With the very small consultancies there was just an exchange of letters with the individual, setting out the fee for the days input.

4.37 The Committee recommends that:

- **the guidelines be made more specific regarding when contracts are to be used. When contracts are not used the exchange of letters should include a specific cost and/or time duration.**

The Provision of Reports by the Consultants

4.38 Of the ten consultants engaged to examine particular aspects of the ACT Government Service, five of the reports were produced in a second volume to the main report with three further reports made available separately from the Office of Public Sector Management. It was argued that because two of these consultancies were incorporated in the body of the Board's report separate publications were not considered necessary. The third of these reports was not produced in final form until after the Board had reported.

4.39 The Committee is concerned that the two remaining consultants provided verbal advice to the Board on their particular areas of consultancy.

4.40 In further information provided as a result of the public hearings the Committee was informed that:

> "John Steinle held discussions with senior officers of the ACT Institute of TAFE and the ACT Department of Education. Board members were present during most of the discussions. The Executive Officer and a member of the Secretariat were also present. All these discussions were reported to Board members in the course of the Board meetings.
>
> Mr Steinle did not produce a formal written Report, but rather had extensive input through the drafting of that section of the Board's Report."[9]

4.41 The Committee was also informed that Trend Consulting was not required to provide written material on their consultancy into industrial relations issues. The Committee believes that this aspect of the guidelines must be improved to require written reports to be mandatory.[10]

4.42 The Committee recommends that:

- **the guidelines be refined to specify a written report be provided in all instances regardless of the size or duration of the consultancy.**

---

9 Supplementary Information Chief Minister's Department. Attachment B.

10 Ibid.

The Monitoring and Evaluation of the Consultants

4.43 An important part of the engagement of consultants by the public sector is that they be monitored throughout and evaluated at the completion of the project.

4.44 In the case of the PRB, the Committee found that the Executive Officer was responsible to see that the project was within time and budget. The question then must be, who is responsible for the Executive Officer in terms of public accountability? Direct work load supervision of the Executive Officer was by the PRB. The Committee is concerned, however, that there was no clear line of public accountability for the Executive Officer.

4.45 The Committee recommends that:

- **in all use of consultants an officer of the ACT Government Service be responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of consultants at all times.**

5. Any Other Matters

Third Term of Reference

5.1 The Committee decided that other matters pertaining to the PRB report were mostly outside the Committee's general terms of reference and, therefore, did not warrant investigation by the Committee.

Further Action

5.2 The Committee remains interested in the management of consultancies by the ACT Government Service and intends to undertake a broad review of this matter in 1991.

Rosemary Follett MLA
Presiding Member
10 December, 1990.

Attachment A

Submissions Received:

ACT Council of Social Services

ACT Council on the Ageing

ACT Shelter

ACT Workers With Youth Network

Australian Early Childhood Association

Australian Early Childhood Association

CARD

Chief Minister

Ernst & Young

Koomarri P & C Association

Peak Community & Church Congress

Priorities Review Board

Snow, George