

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 September 1980

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:

Mr. G. M. Gunn

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
 Mr. E. S. Ashenden
 Mr. H. Becker
 Mr. R. E. Glazbrook
 Mr. K. C. Hamilton
 Mr. J. W. Olsen
 Mr. H. H. O'Neill
 The Hon. J. D. Wright

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the sessional orders it is necessary that the Committee agree to a time table for the examining of the items of proposed expenditure and to advise the Speaker. A draft time table has been circulated and I seek a motion for its adoption.

Mr. BECKER: I move:

That the draft time table be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We are looking at the draft time table for the total Committee discussions for the six days of the Committee.

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Six votes are set down for today. I think it is desirable that honourable members indicate at this stage how they wish to allocate the available time to the votes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I find that very difficult to do. I believe we should just make progress. There has been an agreement that all the matters placed before this Committee will be finalised by 10 o'clock this evening. I do not think it is therefore possible to place a particular time limit on each of the votes. All that is essential is that the entire work load for today be completed by 10 o'clock this evening.

Mr. BECKER: I agree. The main thing is to see how we go with the first portfolio to be considered, and we can work from there. I think we should feel our way as we go along. I agree with Mr. Wright that we should do all we can to ensure that a reasonable time be spent on each vote, since we are obviously limited in time. I think we should feel our way with the idea of concluding by 10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: As long as the Committee is aware of the number of items that it must consider.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that, when it comes to the Loan works programme, the Loan works for the Education Department, Department of Further Education and other Government buildings comes under my line, so it will be necessary to deal with quite a large volume of work in that area. I would not want any misapprehension that the Loan works programme may seem to relate to other Ministers' portfolios; such references specifically come under my Loan works line.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would like to protest about that. I think it is absolutely shocking if the Minister of Education will not be present during that discussion. It is quite obvious that the compilation of our Committee representatives has taken into consideration that those people with expertise in the education area will supplement the Committee as provided by the House in

arranging for the exchange of members. I think it would be quite wrong if the Minister of Public Works was expected to answer the questions that will necessarily come from members of our Committee in this area. I would request from you, Sir, that you give some ruling at this stage whether or not you consider it is competent for the Minister of Industrial Affairs to answer those questions about schools and the like from our representatives.

I think, Sir, it would be quite wrong not to have the Minister of Education here to answer those questions, because there will be no other opportunity for the Minister of Education to be questioned about school buildings, etc. If the line relates to the area of the Minister of Public Works that is just too bad. I believe the Minister of Education should be here so that the specific questions requiring answers can be directed to him, and not to the Minister of Public Works, who, without being critical of him, would not know what is happening in the area of education. In my view, the Minister of Education should be here if the Committee is to be able to get off to a proper start. Surely, the purpose of these Estimates Committees is to obtain the information that is required. I do not believe the Minister of Public Works is able to give that intricate information that could only be the property of the Minister of Education. I ask, Sir, for your ruling in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that on page 6 of the Loans Estimates, under the heading "Minister of Public Works: Public Buildings Department", the primary and secondary schools and further education buildings are listed under the name of the Minister of Public Works. Therefore, I would suggest to the Deputy Leader that there was no objection at the time of presentation to the House, and it would be my view that the Minister of Public Works would be the appropriate Minister to answer queries on that line.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that we do have that detailed information. As Minister of Public Works, I allocate the funds and approve of each individual project. I should know the details of any Loan works programme better than does any other Minister. I can assure the Deputy Leader that there will be advisers here from the Education Department and the Department of Further Education if any greater detail is required beyond that which I already have. I assure him that he will be given the detailed information to any questions that he has.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Did the Minister say that the departmental officers from the Education Department will be in attendance during the discussion of those lines?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Before we get down to the nitty gritty, I would just like to clear up whether we will proceed, as we have in the past, line by line from the Estimates of Expenditure, adopting the practice that previously applied, or will we be able to operate on the other document, the Estimates of Resources Allocation as well? There is some added information in the latter document which is not in the Revenue Account. Will we go through line by line, but, if we see it as necessary, are we permitted to come back to the document provided by the Government?

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will consider the vote line by line. If the Deputy Leader looks at page 38, he will see "Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$6 124 000". We will consider that vote on which there are a number of lines. Once the Committee has finished discussing that vote we will not return to it; we will proceed to the next vote.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have some questions on the

lines. I do not want to be impeded, having progressed from one line to another, from asking questions in relation to this particular document. Have we the best of both worlds? Are we able to ask questions directly on the lines and also from the document provided? Otherwise, there is no good purpose in the document's being provided.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There will be no attempt to unduly impede any member. What will take place is that, when we are discussing a particular vote, the honourable member will be able to refer to the lines under that vote and he will also be able to refer to the document. However, I have to point out the only actual official document we have before us is the Estimate of Expenditure as presented to the House.

Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$6 124 000

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. L. B. Bowes, Director, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr. M. C. Johnson, Deputy Director, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr. B. J. Bartlett, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr. BECKER: The line I refer to is "Members fees, Motor Fuel Licensing Board". The Estimate for the proposed sum is \$23 000, and for the Council on Technological Change, \$6 000. Last financial year, the actual payments were \$20 415. Can the Minister provide information as to the fees paid to the members of those committees, in particular the Motor Fuel Licensing Board? I would also appreciate the names of the members of the board and whether they are public servants or not. I understand that Government policy recommends that public servants serving on the boards will no longer be paid a fee if the committee meets during what is considered normal working time.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The members of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board are Mr. D. M. Quick (Chairman), Mr. E. H. Crimes, Mr. J. J. Nyland and Mr. F. H. Lyle. Mr. Lyle is a retired public servant and, obviously, does not come under the classification referred to by the honourable member. Those people who officiate at public hearings and members of the board receive a fee of \$3 500 per annum for the Chairman and \$2 750 for each member, plus \$150 for the Chairman and \$110 for each committee member per day for public hearings when public hearings are held outside committee meetings.

The membership of the Council on Technological Change (which is the correct title) was announced by me as Minister only yesterday, and I am delighted to bring that fact to the attention of this committee, because it has not previously been referred to. The Chairmanship is to be taken on by Professor Donald Stranks, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. It is a real tribute to the Government and to the standing of this committee that a person of such high standing within the community should be willing to take on a role such as this. The other members of the committee are Professor Dick Blandy, from Flinders University; from the Institute of Library Studies, Mr. E. B. Davis, a person who is a well-known author in the area of technological change and who is from the Defence Research Centre, Salisbury; representing private employers is Mr. Brian Sallis, who is, I understand, General Manager of Advertiser Newspapers Limited; Mr. Terlet, Managing Director of Fairey Australia Proprietary Limited, which is a high technology

company operating out of the Defence Research Centre area; representing the employees in the industry is Mr. Bob Gregory, Secretary of the United Trades and Labour Council; Mr. Colin Meikle from the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draftsmen of Australia; and representing the Public Service are Mr. Hedley Bachmann from the Public Service Board, Mr. Ian Kowalick from the Department of Trade and Industry, and Mr. Brian Shillabeer from the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Cabinet has not yet approved a fee structure for members of the Council on Technological Change, and when this is done I believe that the fees will be similar to those currently paid traditionally by the Public Service Board in regard to such meetings. That would take regard to the policy of the Government that public servants are not paid for any meeting held during normal working hours.

Mr. BECKER: What is the normal fee recommended by the Public Service Board in relation to members on boards?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The fee varies, depending on the status of the person, the amount of representation and the time to be spent. It would be better for me to wait until there is formal approval for some fee structure before giving the honourable member that information, because at this stage it would be inappropriate for me to talk generally about the whole fee structure of the Public Service Board when quite specific fees will apply to the members involved.

Mr. BECKER: It is interesting to hear that the Government has taken a new attitude towards the payment of fees to public servants on boards, and I assume that this will apply to statutory authorities, etc. Will the Minister inform the Committee what is Government policy in regard to the Council on Technological Change, and what are the aims and the objects of the council? I believe that, considering the economic situation in this State at present, we should be examining areas in which we can provide future employment opportunities, and that is no mean task. Perhaps we could try to make South Australia the technological centre of Australia, because of its geographical situation.

I wonder whether this is the long-term view of the department now, and whether that is the policy. It would be interesting to know the aims and objects; what we are trying to do is create additional employment in South Australia, particularly in this field.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The functions of the Council on Technological Change are primarily twofold: first, to ensure that commerce and industry in South Australia are taking on the best possible technologies and so, therefore, gaining from any efficiencies and increased productivity through improved technology; and secondly, to monitor technological change to ensure that, if it has serious employment, training or social consequences, the Government is carefully monitoring those changes and is able to take pre-emptive action wherever possible to minimise the adverse effects of technological change.

A specific term of reference for the committee was set down. It has not yet met. It is having its first informal meeting next week to consider its terms of reference. I believe that the council will come up with its own programme as to how it should act. We are already envisaging three working parties to be established beneath the council—one working party looking specifically at technological change in the public sector, another working party looking specifically at technological change in the manufacturing industry, and the third working party looking at technological change within tertiary or service industries, such as banks, newspapers, and the retail

industry. The membership of the committee has been carefully selected, both on the employer and employee sides, to give that balance. We are also looking at trying to involve research and development institutions in this State and to create a much closer liaison between those institutions and private enterprise.

There is no doubt that, for our inquiry to be viable in the future, it needs the best possible technology both in its methods of producing and in the product it produces. We have selected the membership of the council carefully to include two people from significant research institutes in South Australia, as well as the Chairman. We have a representative from Flinders University in Professor Blandy, Professor Donald Stranks from the University of Adelaide, and Mr. Davis from the Defence Research Centre.

I am also delighted to say that other organisations, such as Amdel, which plays an important role not only in mining but also in industrial research throughout Australia (Amdel is not just Adelaide orientated), have also taken a close interest in the council, and Amdel has promised to co-operate in any way possible.

I will enlarge more specifically later on the part of the question which related to the extent to which we can make South Australia the technology centre of Australia. That can be done when we come to the line under Trade and Industry: it is more appropriate there than under the specific line dealing with employment. My departments, and particularly the Department of Trade and Industry, are taking a number of positive moves to ensure that South Australia is the high technology capital of Australia. That is our objective.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to members that it is not necessary for them to stand, unless they so desire. They may ask questions without standing, as long as they indicate that they wish to have the call. It is probably easier for all concerned if I continue to call one member until he has finished raising all the questions he has on a particular line.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Regarding the line "Senior Project Officer, Project Officer, and Clerical Staff—Government Job Transfer Office", I ask how many staff are employed in that unit, and whether the Minister can estimate the number of weekly-paid employees who will be classified as surplus in this financial year.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Let me deal specifically with the points raised by the Deputy Leader. First, in the Job Transfer Office, the staff for the full year would be a senior project officer, a project officer, and one typist. The functions of this branch are well known. Its purpose is to assist in the transfer of surplus Government employees from one department to another. At the end of July, a total of 399 people had been transferred through the Job Transfer Office. Some of these were external transfers and some internal transfers.

I think the honourable member would agree that that is a significant number, when we consider that the actual mechanism in relation to transfers was not available until the beginning of the year. In the first seven months of the mechanism's being in operation, we have had 399 people transferred. Under the previous arrangement, past experience had shown that, when a vacancy fell due, such as a vacancy for a bus driver in the State Transport Authority, the vacancy was advertised publicly and it was filled from outside. We had the rather ludicrous situation of there being surpluses in certain Government departments, such as Public Buildings Department and Engineering and Water Supply Department, while people were being taken on in other Government departments from outside.

Under the transfer arrangement, first priority is given in filling any position in the Government to an internal employee. The mechanism by which the transfer takes place is that certain guarantees and assurances are laid down in a carefully negotiated agreement with the United Trades and Labour Council. I am pleased to say that, so far, there has been no real dispute between the Government and the United Trades and Labour Council on the way in which those transfers have taken place. I think it is a credit to the Government that there has been no significant complaint at all, even though about 400 transfers have been effected under the proposal. Certainly, it has saved the Government, or it has effectively reduced the numbers in the Government, by 400 in a mere seven months. That, in itself, warrants the expenditure of such an allocation of funds where only three people are employed in the Job Transfer Office.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would dispute some of what the Minister has said, but I do not think this is the appropriate place to do it. I want to know from the Minister the exact formula the Government applies in declaring labour surplus. There was a recent dispute at the courts, of which the Minister would be aware, when the Government, on the one hand, was saying that the labour had been declared surplus, while the A.G.W.A., on the other hand, was saying that it had not been declared surplus and could not be under the terms of the agreement with the Trades and Labour Council. This is a direct question to the Minister, asking him to tell this committee exactly how the Government determines what is surplus labour and whether the practice conforms with the agreement with the Trades and Labour Council.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Deputy Leader should be careful not to confuse the declaration of surplus with the industrial dispute that took place in the Magistrates Court. The procedure for declaring labour surplus is that individuals are sent letters indicating that they are surplus. In addition to that, the Trades and Labour Council is informed, and the appropriate union is informed that so many people in a certain area or a certain department or in a union have been declared surplus.

The point in the Magistrates Court was that people were not being transferred from one department to another, or from one section of a department to another. The people involved were Government cleaners, working in one court, and we asked them, instead of cleaning in that one building, to clean in the building alongside it, the Police Court. I think that was a perfectly reasonable request. The distance between the two buildings was a matter of 50 yards. The pay was exactly the same, there was continuity of service, and they were not to be considered in any way as being transferred.

In that dispute the union imposed a longstanding picket line in front of the building that lasted for about three weeks. We were negotiating for most of the period, on and off, with the union. Finally, we resolved that there was a surplus of cleaning staff in the P.B.D. When we looked at the costs of cleaning those buildings from within the Government and compared them with contract prices we received from outside, in some cases the outside contract price was one-third of the cost of cleaning from within the Government.

We have therefore come to a general agreement with the union involved, the Australian Government Workers Association, to look at not only the courts but also the whole area of cleaning under the P.B.D. A working party has been set up involving members of the union, the Government and the Public Service Board. That working party has the specific terms of reference as agreed by the A.G.W.A. to look at ways in which cleaning within the

Government under the P.B.D., using weekly paid employees, can be on exactly the same or a similar manning basis as is required by a private contractor, so that the costs of cleaning by private contract or by using weekly paid employees would be similar. The Government believes it has an obligation to the public to make sure there is efficiency, whether the work is done by contract or by the weekly paid work force. I am delighted that out of that dispute, which involved only the courts, we have an opportunity to set up a committee to review all Government cleaning under the P.B.D. I would expect that committee to report back to me, as Minister of Public Works, by December this year.

Mr. ABBOTT: Why has the large increase in expenditure in this line for the Government Job Transfer Office been necessary? Will the Minister say what success there has been in the implementing the Government policy of giving more work to private enterprise, combined with its policy of no retrenchment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The large increase is obvious when one realises that this office was not even established until about January this year, and therefore the \$18 700 for last year related only to half a year and to the stage where the office was still being established and manning was still under the limit of three for some of the period. The estimated cost of \$55 000 is to operate that office for a full year with three staff members.

I believe the overall manning policies of the Government have been very successful. First, there is no doubt that by giving our employees an assurance that there will be no retrenchments, we have given them an undertaking which is unique and which I think reflects now a more sensitive, reasonable and up-to-date attitude towards industrial relations in regard to keeping a high level of motivation within the work force. I am sure all the employees in the Government have appreciated that assurance given by the Government and the way in which the Government has stuck to that assurance, despite pressures at times from outside that we should throw aside that undertaking and start retrenching people.

I am sure the member for Spence noticed with some interest the recent report by the Public Accounts Committee which indicated some 900 surplus workers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In his question, the honourable member seems to imply that the reason for the Job Transfer Office is simply because we have given work to the private sector. That is not the case. There was a known declared surplus of people within Government departments before we came into office. The figure for the E. & W.S. Department of 900 was clearly established before the Liberal Party came into office.

The figure for the Public Buildings Department, on my estimate, is about 400 people that we would like to run down over the next couple of years. The success of the job transfers indicates that 400 people have been transferred, and I think that in itself shows the success of the policy, because 400 people is a significant number when looking at the sort of surpluses that I have spoken of. That surplus might increase. Members will have an opportunity to look at the Loan works programme later, and that clearly indicates a reduced demand in certain areas for weekly-paid employees within the Public Buildings Department.

Therefore, the Government has implemented what I think is an innovative policy of early voluntary retirement. It is for those people in the P.B.D. and E. & W.S. Department who are aged 55 years and over, and so far the response has been good, with in the first week, 50 people in the E. & W.S. Department accepting the offer and 26 people accepting it in the P.B.D. I believe the Government's policies have been realistic; they have been

effective and will certainly be much more effective than the policies of the former Government, whereby, for a number of years, despite the known surpluses, there was no substantial run-down at all. I shall quote some figures for the honourable member: in the Public Buildings Department, the real funds available for Loan works under the Public Buildings Department had declined by 43 per cent over a three-year period and, in that same period, the work force diminished by only three per cent. I think that highlights the extent of over-manning within that department.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am at a bit of a loss to follow what is going on. I appreciate, that during what we might call the normal way of handling debate, Ministers get up, grandstand, and make statements which are not correct and which they use as an opportunity to get their message across. I think that the Minister is tending to do that somewhat in some of the statements he is making about the former Government. Will that be the procedure, or will he just answer the questions?

The CHAIRMAN: It is not the responsibility of the Chair to rule on how Ministers answer questions, or on how members frame their questions.

Mr. ABBOTT: Has any examination been made by the Public Service Board and the Department of Industrial Affairs on all possible ways in which the natural attrition rate of weekly-paid employees may be increased?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The responsibility for the work force of the Government, particularly in the weekly-paid area, comes directly under me as Minister. There have been on-going discussions since I came into office among the Director of my department, other officers of that department, various officers of the Public Service Board, and officers involved in the job transfer office. The Government has been looking at a number of initiatives. The first thing was to get the transfer system operating, and that is now operating very effectively. Secondly, we looked at this voluntary early retirement. Thirdly, we are looking at a number of other minor areas whereby we can make sure that people are effectively used but at the same time make sure that the surpluses that exist within the Government departments are run down as quickly as possible.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Minister referred earlier to discussions held with the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia. I ask the Minister specifically whether negotiations, either by himself or his department, are continuing with the United Trades and Labour Council in relation to early retirement and transfers within the Government departments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is "Yes", but before I proceed to clarify that further, I will deal with the honourable member's question whether Government policies have been successful. I would say that they are very successful when one looks at the present attrition rate. In the Public Buildings Department, we now have an attrition rate of 10.3 per cent on an annual basis, based on the figure for July. That is an extremely successful figure.

In the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the annual attrition rate was about 9.4 per cent and both of those attrition rates applied before the early voluntary retirement scheme was introduced, so I would expect that now to be stepped up significantly. The change in the annual attrition rate since we came into Government has been, in the Public Buildings Department, from about 1.3 per cent a year, to over 10 per cent a year. I think that, having regard to the early voluntary retirement scheme, we could soon see figures well over that. That highlights

our success—a ten-fold increase in the attrition rate in the department.

Regarding the on-going discussions and negotiations with the Trades and Labour Council, the Secretary and a number of unions were in to see me last week on the early voluntary retirement scheme. They put six demands to me. I rejected them on four and on one I said that the Government would look at it further, and that was in relation to whether to lift the limit of 26 weeks maximum pay to anyone under the early voluntary retirement scheme. I said I would go back to them on that as soon as possible. The sixth point was in relation to consultation; that is a voluntary matter for the employee involved, but I have made the offer that I would supply to our counsellors a list of the trade union counsellors and make that available to a worker, so that, if he wishes counselling from his trade union, he may receive it. I certainly would not like to see an employee resign without adequate counselling before making such a critical decision. Negotiations are going on in a number of other areas, and I think it inappropriate at this stage, because of the critical nature of those negotiations, to elucidate further on them.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Minister has repeatedly referred to the Public Buildings Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I would like to ask the Minister whether he can indicate what other Government departments, in the Government's opinion, have a surplus of labour?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is not specifically for me as Minister in my own area to comment on other areas. The two critical departments are the E. & W.S. Department and the P.B.D. There have been surpluses at Samcor with which we have dealt effectively, again without retrenchment. A number of white collar people were brought into the Public Service Board and found positions. I think we found jobs for the full 26 people transferred within six weeks, again under somewhat more informal transfer arrangements. The Highways Department has been looking at its employment policies and has taken some action. A number of other Government departments are currently going through the exercise of reviewing their available work force and the extent to which there might be a surplus within their departments.

Mr. HAMILTON: In the procedures for transfer of Government weekly-paid employees, a number of conditions were set down. I refer to the statement about no replacement for weekly-paid employees, and saying that a person who leaves a Government organisation will not be replaced by a person not currently employed by a Government organisation, except with Ministerial approval. I would like to know from the Minister how many transfers have taken place within respective Government departments? What outside applicants have been employed in these departments outside the normal channels?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have already given the figures, but I will repeat them for the member for Albert Park. The total number of transfers is 399 so far, and a large number of exemptions have been granted. I have delegated my right to grant these exemptions to the Job Transfer Office, although in particular cases they come to me still and ask whether or not an exemption should be granted.

For example, when we are looking for a logger for the Woods and Forests Department, there is little point in going to the Public Buildings Department, because a logger is a person who has specific skills and who needs to live in the South-East of the State, so it is more appropriate to advertise in that area. That is the type of case in which an exemption is granted. A number of other

exemptions have also been granted. If we find that a position cannot be filled from within the Government, naturally we go ahead and fill it from outside.

Mr. HAMILTON: Can you give an indication of the number of exemptions?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, I could not. I approved a list of exemptions that were brought to me very early in the piece; there is an ongoing list of exemptions, depending on whether or not the job can be filled from within the Government. There is no point in our holding up Government operations if a position cannot be filled from within the Government. The fact that we have already transferred 400 people indicates the success of the programme.

Mr. HAMILTON: In regard to complaints, at 5.3 in the conditions it is stated that no employee will be unduly disadvantaged by the transfer and in all cases the convenience of the employee should assume major importance in decisions relating to transfers. Will the Minister say how many complaints, if any, he has received and, in regard to relocation of these employees, what sums have been involved and how many relocations have taken place?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There have been no compulsory relocations, because, under the agreement, transfer is not compulsory. If a person wished to apply for a job in another area on a permanent basis, the decision had to be voluntary; the Government would not force people to pull up their home and place of living and shift to another town or location. I cannot give the honourable member exact information; I would like to obtain that information and supply it later.

To my knowledge, the number of relocations has been fairly small. Early in the piece, there was an outcry from the United Trades and Labour Council to the effect that a person was being forced to go to Port Augusta. On checking that claim, I find that the individual involved had made up his own mind and had voluntarily decided to transfer. In fact, he was delighted that the Public Buildings Department granted him one day's leave with pay so that he could go to Port Augusta to see what houses were available. Also, the facilities of the Housing Trust were made available to assist him to find a home.

Mr. HAMILTON: What relocation expenses have been allocated?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The individual relocation expenses are paid for by the department from which the person came; I believe that that is right, but I can check it. The same applies to long service leave and other entitlements that are owed to an individual. A standard procedure is used within the Government to determine which department pays for which expenses. It is a book entry.

Mr. HAMILTON: What type of expenses are involved? I refer specifically to things like curtains and blinds, etc. Are expenses of that kind involved in the relocation expenses for employees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The expenses offered to an employee are exactly the same as those that apply to public servants. There is a form of agreement, and a set of conditions is laid down by the Public Service Board. The honourable member could obtain details of those conditions from the Public Service Board. If he has any difficulty in doing so, I will obtain them for him. The list of conditions is complex, and I believe that it would be inappropriate for me to go through them now.

Mr. OLSEN: Will the Minister indicate the current Government's policy in regard to preference to unionists?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government has withdrawn the instruction that was issued by the Public Service Board

and by various other Government departments that a person is required to join a union within, I think, 14 days of his joining the Government. The United Trades and Labour Council was notified of this fact.

Mr. O'NEILL: In regard to the Council on Technological Change, I point out that, if one applies to the allocation made for the council, the scale of fees applicable to the Motor Fuel Licensing Board, it would appear that the Government, despite its concern in that area, does not intend that the committee will meet very often. Is it intended that a supplementary allowance will be sought later?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Motor Fuel Licensing Board is a *quasi* judicial board set up under an Act of Parliament. As it does not come into the same category as the Council on Technological Change, I think that a different fee structure would apply. The Motor Fuel Licensing Board members receive a guaranteed substantial income, and over and above that they receive a fee for each day of public hearing. I would expect council members to receive only those fees applicable for attending a council meeting. I believe that \$6 000 will cover this allocation but, if it is inadequate, we will ensure that more funds are allocated. It has only nine months of sitting in the remainder of the financial year.

Mr. O'NEILL: In respect of that council, I notice that it is to be broken up into three subcommittees. I did not clearly hear the specifics, but I understand that one subcommittee will cover service and tertiary industry, another subcommittee will cover private commerce and industry, and a third subcommittee will cover the Public Service. Two nominees are to be appointed from the Trades and Labor Council. Will the composition of those subcommittees be flexible and interchangeable so that members of unions will be able to sit on the three subcommittees, or make an input to them, or will they be excluded from one?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I indicated that it was a council, and reporting to the council will be three working parties. That does not mean that they are simply subcommittees of the council; it is just the opposite. The working parties will have a Chairman, probably selected from the council, and members outside of the council will be appointed to these working parties. As an example, I have already told the Public Service Association that I would expect to appoint its President as a member of the working party in the public sector. It is not as if the two union members of that council will be on the working parties. Other members may be selected, or we may find that one of those members also acts on a working party.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Since I was asking the Minister questions about the Job Transfer Office, he has made great play about how well the scheme is working, and has made what I thought were fairly strong political statements, which were picked up by my colleague who questioned him. If that is to be the order of the day, we can play politics as much as we like. I have had strong information from rank-and-file people, as well as from Secretaries and Presidents of unions, that all is not well in certain Government areas. Although the Minister tried to make the point that great motivation and satisfaction existed, I have been told that from the top down there is great dissatisfaction with certain Government policies.

Can the Minister give the percentage of the attrition rate for people leaving Government employment and finding employment elsewhere? I have been informed by Engineering and Water Supply Department and Public Buildings Department employees, as well as by others, that a lack of motivation exists as a result of work being taken away from those departments and given to private

contractors. I have received letters to prove (when dealing with public buildings, I will refer to them) that people are leaving Government departments because of lack of motivation, lack of opportunity, and lack of security related not only to employment but also to the right of people to have some say in their occupation and to know where they may end up. I want to know the percentage rate of people leaving and the attrition rate, which the Minister now says is 10 per cent.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot indicate that sort of detailed breakdown for each department, or even overall. We took out figures on the overall attrition rate. That could be partly through internal transfers within a section or transfers to another Government department: it may be through retirement, perhaps through health reasons, or someone may have resigned, as the Deputy Leader indicated, to take a job elsewhere. That is up to the individuals involved. I believe that we can hold up our figure of the attrition rate and show that certainly Government policies are successful.

I point particularly to the quite unique number of employees aged 55 and over in certain departments. In the Public Buildings Department, for example, about 20 per cent of the work force was aged 55 years and over, while in the Engineering and Water Supply Department about 23 per cent of the work force consisted of people 55 years and over. I think that highlights the extent to which, because of an ongoing Government policy for about four years of no replacements, which applied under the previous Government as well as under this Government, there has been an aging work force, and we have the unfortunate position where few young people have been coming into those departments. I think it is unfortunate in that it does not lead to a well-balanced work force with good experience throughout, nor does it lead to good training. For that reason, the Government would like to get very quickly to a position where it can start taking on new younger people to put some balance back into the work force.

Mr. ASHENDEN: Referring to the Estimates of Resource Allocations, page 161, the third objective stated is as follows:

Monitor the future employment needs of the State and ensure that effective employment, training and retraining schemes are developed.

What is the department doing to overcome the present shortage of skilled tradesmen in South Australia?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer the honourable member to page 168 of the same document, which states in some detail what programmes the Government has to achieve that objective. First, the Government, and especially I, as Minister, were somewhat concerned at the complete lack of real planning to meet manpower requirements in this State, especially in the skilled trades area. For the years 1977, 1978, and 1979, there was about a 27 per cent reduction in the number of new apprentices taken on within South Australia. For the last three or four years, everyone has been forecasting a critical shortage of skilled tradesmen throughout Australia, particularly because of resource development programmes, but little action was taken.

I believe that the numbers were declining for various reasons. The apprenticeship system was proving to be inadequate, for a number of reasons, one being that the number of apprentices taken on has been dictated by the number of new apprentices perceived to be needed by existing employers, and yet much of the resource development would take place under new employers not then in existence. As an example, I refer to the Redcliff petro-chemical plant and Roxby Downs. Those companies would not be training apprentices to meet their needs once

they were established. For that reason, the Act needed to be reviewed. The Liberal Party came out with a specific policy and, since coming into Government, it has released a discussion paper on industrial and commercial training, setting out how it believes the entire system, as established under the Act, should be reviewed.

We propose that there be an Industrial and Commercial Training Act; a discussion paper about it was put out to a large number of organisations, and comment was received back in July this year. Based on that comment, a second discussion paper was put out that was a revision of the first paper. Cabinet has given approval for the preparation of a draft copy of a Bill for further discussion. That will not be introduced into the House until that draft Bill has been widely discussed with the large number of bodies that have an obvious interest in that area. I think that is the first and most important area of all.

Secondly, the Government has attempted to increase the number of apprentices being trained. I am delighted to say that in the first seven months of this year I think there was an 18 per cent increase in the number of apprentices taken on, compared with the first seven months of last year, and the biggest area of increase was in the metal trades, which has the biggest area of shortage. In addition, the Government is currently holding negotiations with the Master Builders Association and the Metal Industries Association to look at the feasibility of establishing group apprenticeship schemes in those areas. A group apprenticeship scheme means that, for instance, the Master Builders Association would sign the indenture rather than an individual employer, and a number of apprentices would be taken on who could work for a number of builders as allocated by the Master Builders Association. They would get experience with a number of employers, rather than being indentured to the one employer for a four-year period. I believe that in itself would significantly increase yet again the number of people being trained.

Also, the Government has tried to bring to the attention of the public, particularly private employers, the critical need for more apprentices to be taken on. The Government itself, quite outside its surplus manpower policies, has decided it needs to continue to train people, irrespective of the surpluses and it has taken on a large number of people. In addition, we are negotiating with the Federal Department of Youth Affairs and Employment to look at how many people could be taken on under what we call GOYA (group one year apprenticeship scheme), and we are making sure that Government facilities next year are used to the maximum capacity to train apprentices. I will come back to the House when I have more definite details of this. I would expect a significant number of apprentices to train under those means. So that we can also plan the overall need for skilled tradesmen, we have established the Manpower Forecasting Unit.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister give some indication of what the future will be for all these people that are now alleged to be needed and whom he says he has plans to train? I came into the engineering field in 1945 as an apprentice and exactly the same principles were being put then. Owing to the shortage of skilled tradesmen caused by the Second World War, schemes were implemented to train more tradesmen. They were called provisional tradesmen. There were arguments between indentured tradesmen and provisional tradesmen for many years thereafter. Finally, most of the provisional tradesmen were fully accepted because of the demands and the boom of the 1950's and 1960's. Throughout all this time the solution has been known. The solution is for private employers to accept some responsibility for continuity of

employment. If they provide a continuity of employment for trained people and pay a decent wage, there will be no shortage of skilled people at all.

Another thing which they should do and which in the main they will not do is to provide in-service training. This has been recognised in Government departments as being desirable and effective in upgrading the skills of people already employed. Year after year for at least three decades now I have heard this argument about the need for skilled tradesmen, and the solutions have been many and varied. Of course, we all know that B.H.P. overcame its problems in the 1950's and 1960's by bringing tradesmen out by the boat load, scalping the training facilities of the United Kingdom and Europe. I would venture to say that the present Federal Government is embarking upon a plan to bring in skilled people from Asia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would suggest the honourable member relate his remarks to the matter before the Committee. I am prepared to accept comment in relation to the activities of the State Government, but I think the honourable member is getting a bit broad when he is starting to refer to the Federal Government which is not in any way related to this Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. With great respect, I do not dispute your ruling, but I think you need to be consistent. I think the Minister was allowed to get away from the subject matter earlier, making and scoring political points. If that is the attitude of the Chairman, I do not object, but that should mean that we can all do that. If the Minister is going to grandstand and use his position to make political points, I believe you ought to be just as lenient to all members. I threw that out a moment ago when I spoke to you. I do not believe my colleague is straying much further from the point than was the Minister. If you want to assert your position and say that he is, I will accept that, but I think you ought to be consistent and everyone must do as you request.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order. I point out to the Deputy Leader that it has been the practice in this House for a long time that Ministers are given more discretion in answering questions than are other members. I do not in any way want to stifle debate or discussion in this Committee, but I have to endeavour to ensure that the comments that are made do relate to the vote that is currently before the Committee. I will allow the member for Florey to continue.

Mr. O'NEILL: I take your point and I may have been a bit obtuse in making my point, but I can assure you that what I am saying has a definite relationship to the point under discussion, namely, the shortage of skilled people in South Australia. That is directly related to the number of skilled people that the Federal Government allows in from overseas. My concern is that the standard of living of tradesmen and therefore other workers in Australia is directly related to the level of payment that exists in the industry. If people with some vestiges of skills are allowed in from the Asian countries to work at rates they are paid in the Philippines, for example, then I think a greater problem will be created in South Australia than will be solved.

Group training schemes are not new. I can recall in the 1950's certainly in the 1960's, the Trades and Labor Council was actively pursuing the idea of group apprenticeship schemes whereby an apprentice could be apprenticed to the Commissioner of Apprentices and that all apprentices could be given a much wider basis of training in their respective trades than applied when apprenticed to only one employer. I know of a case of a

lad employed as a boilermaker-welder who was locked up in a tin shed near the Centennial Park cemetery, making little wire flower pots. I do not know how the employer got away with that because the lad was being trained as a boilermaker. If he had been part of a group training scheme, he would have been able to work in a number of other engineering establishments. The major impediment to that scheme was the fact that the private employers would not have a bar of it; they did not want to be interfered with by the Government.

If the Minister can achieve a break-through with private industry in respect of proper and adequate training with adequate remuneration, then he has certainly made a major break-through because the main impediment to any sort of decent training in this country has been the attitude of private employers. In fact, it is not new; Henry Lawson wrote a poem about it, called "Australasian Engineers" in the 1870's or 1880's.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The point was where these people will find jobs. One company alone has come to the Government and asked whether we can help find 90 boilermakers. Last week another company came forward and asked whether we could help find 50. The position that faces our community at present, with record unemployment, is either that we reject the work totally out of this State and allow the other States to do that work or we get down to start training these people. If the present system is inadequate then we alter the present system to make sure that we are training them, and that is exactly what we are doing. Another option (and I certainly want to put this one as one of the last options) is that we go overseas and try to find skilled tradesmen. I think it would be ludicrous for Australia to import skilled tradesmen from overseas when we have record unemployment. We cannot fool ourselves, as that is exactly what private companies will do if we are not prepared, along with the trade union movement, to review the system of apprenticeship training and make sure that it is more flexible and more adaptable to cope with the present problems.

For that reason we are reviewing the Act, and for that reason (and if the honourable member says it is a major break-through, I accept his praise) that we have sat down with employer associations and negotiated how, under a group apprenticeship scheme, in relation to those two critical areas, involving the Master Builders Association and the Metal Industries Association, a significant number of people could be taken on under a group scheme using Government facilities for the first year at least to make sure that we can significantly increase the number of apprentices being trained.

I can indicate to the Committee that the Government has done a review of the Engineering and Water Supply Department facilities, ETSA, and Department of Further Education facilities, to see what is the maximum number of skilled tradesmen we can take on next year. We are hoping, in co-operation with the Federal Government (and if we can reach agreement with these private employer associations), to use our facilities to the maximum. If we do that I can see that we can train at least an additional 200 skilled tradesmen next year and that will help to overcome our unemployment problems, and also help to meet the urgent need for skilled tradesmen in the years to come.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I note that there is a new allocation of \$45 000 for the Manpower Forecasting Unit. Further to an earlier question from the member for Todd, what action is the Government taking in specific areas to improve the planning of the manpower within the State?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr.

Chairman. I am not sure what we are doing. I am trying to go through in order; I have not jumped any lines but have followed line by line. I also have questions on the Manpower Forecasting Unit, but I thought that currently we were still referring to the Government job transfer office.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: It's the whole section.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That has not previously been the situation. When we get a group of lines within a vote I think it would be best for business if we could finish a particular line and then go on with the next one.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the point of order raised by the Deputy Leader, it has normally been the practice to deal with one line at a time. However, the Chair really is not aware of what questions will be raised by members of the Committee, so the Chair really cannot prevent a member referring to another line in the vote because, as the Deputy Leader will be aware, there are a significant number of lines in a vote. What I did try to do was to call the Deputy Leader, as well as other members, on a number of occasions when I thought that they were referring to a particular line. When I thought that they had completed that particular line of questioning, I called another member.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not objecting to the way that you have called at all; that is not the complaint. The complaint is that we do not seem to be proceeding in any order; we are not completing one line before moving on to another. What that means is that we could start off at the top line and any member not interested could come down to say, "Pay-roll tax". Personally I do not think that is a businesslike way of doing this. We have now been here for 1½ hours and we have not completed the first group. I believe if we systemise the procedure we can proceed more quickly. I make no objection to the honourable member's question about the Manpower Forecasting Unit, as I also want to ask questions about that, but we now seem to be getting all over the place. Unless questioning is systematic it will be hard to get the business of the Committee done, and I ask you to reconsider the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to comment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I understood that the vote formally mentioned at the beginning was "Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$6 124 000". Therefore any items within that specific vote can be debated, and the Manpower Forecasting Unit comes within that specific vote.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct, but I think it is probably easier for all concerned if we systematically deal with each line within that vote. However, I pointed out that it is difficult for the Chair if the Chair is not aware of what questions members are going to raise. I will permit the member for Brighton to finish asking his question, but then I would suggest that members refer to other lines above the one to which the member for Brighton is referring.

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Chairman, as you know, the practice in the past has been to deal with the whole of a vote, irrespective of what is contained therein. It is very difficult to deal with lines specifically as they appear on the paper at the moment because members may want to link other questions, and jump around, as I wish to do in a moment. I think we should keep going as we are. I like the attitude that you have adopted, namely, that a member be allowed to ask a question and then allowed to pursue all the questions on that line. I think that is the best way. A member then completes his line of thought on a particular matter.

The CHAIRMAN: What the honourable member has

said is correct, namely, that any member can raise any matter he likes in relation to the total vote, but it is preferable, if possible, to proceed line by line. I have said that I will permit the member for Brighton to continue asking his question, and then allow other members to raise matters with the Minister on other lines.

I would point out that we are in the first session of this Committee sitting, and obviously we are working on a trial and error basis at this time. I think that the Committee ought not waste a great deal of unnecessary time on procedural matters, unless there is a breach which is really of concern to a member.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think that your rulings have been reasonable and fair. I also think that your idea of trying to bring out the questions of the member who is on his feet is a reasonable one, but I cannot agree that it is now reasonable to move from reference to the Job Transfer Office straight down to the Manpower Forecasting Unit.

I put to you, Mr. Chairman, that you reserve the first call for the honourable member for Brighton when we go on to that area, so that his right is preserved in those circumstances, therefore not taking away from him the right to ask the first question. However, for the moment, to facilitate the business of the House, I suggest that we should proceed on the line we are dealing with presently until we get to the manpower forecasting area. Otherwise, what will happen is that, the honourable member for Brighton having asked his question about manpower planning, our side was to ask questions which were not on this line. It seems to me that is the only way to facilitate the business before the House.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I wish to express a concern if we are to handle the matter in the way the Leader has just suggested. Bearing in mind that we are working to a strict time constraint, the early lines may have a lot of time spent on them, whereas later lines may not be questioned at all. There is that distinct possibility, from what we decided at the beginning of this meeting, of the committee's not allocating any time to each of the three major lines or to any area within each of the three major lines. I express concern that, if we cannot ask questions about the line as a whole, we run a very real risk of not being able to ask questions on some lines at all.

Mr. OLSEN: Mr. Chairman, we note your comments that really we are proceeding on a trial and error basis to start off with, and I think that there was an indication we would be able to take any specific line on which a member wanted to question. I do see some merit in dealing with lines in sequence; that is, in having some uniformity and following through on any particular line. So that the procedures that we should adopt are made quite clear, I suggest that you might rule, Mr. Chairman, that for this particular vote we continue in the manner in which we have started and that, when we proceed to other votes, you call a particular line in sequence, and any member of the Committee who wishes to raise a question in relation to that can do so. It seems to me that that will then allow an opportunity to anybody to raise a question of the Minister on this vote and then, when we proceed on to other lines and other votes, we will follow a sequence through on the particular line. I think that is what the Deputy Leader is basically suggesting, and I think that that would facilitate and, hopefully, speed up the process of discussing that particular vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will consider the suggestion put forward by the member for Rocky River and inform the Committee later. I will ask the member for Brighton to hold his question until I ask other members whether there are any matters that they wish to raise

before we come to the matter which the honourable member for Brighton wished to raise.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I do not wish to prolong the discussion on this point. I asked that question only because I was becoming very confused about the line which we were talking about, because it struck me, from the answers the Minister was giving to specific questions raised by the Opposition, that we were going into the area of the Manpower Forecasting Unit. I was intrigued to know what further action the Government was going to take in relation to this, because, simply, we flowed over from the technological area to the job area. This meant that, if we came down to this point, we would be asking the same question for the third time. Therefore, I was just seeking clarification from the Minister as to the exact action the Government would be taking. However, I accept your ruling.

Mr. Lewis: As a member of this House, though not a member of this Committee, I understood that it was the prerogative of any member of this House to ask questions that they regarded as within the ambit of their responsibility as members of the Chamber. Is that right or not?

The CHAIRMAN: Any member has the right to raise any matter with the Minister through the Chair after the official members have concluded their line of questioning. That opportunity will be given to any members who are in the Chamber at that appropriate time; they can raise any matter contained in any vote which is currently before the Chair.

Mr. Lewis: That would include the situation if I were to come into the Chamber before the Minister of Industrial Affairs left the Chamber, after the Committee had concluded its questioning?

The CHAIRMAN: No. Any member who is not an official member of the Committee would have to be in the Chamber at the particular time, because, once the Minister of Industrial Affairs, or any Minister, has retired from the Committee, the Committee will not be coming back to that matter.

Mr. Lewis: I ask that you, in consultation with the powers responsible for the development of procedures in these two Committees (one here and one in the other place) that are functioning at the present time, make it possible for all members duly elected to this place to have the opportunity of scrutinising the way in which it is proposed by departments and their Ministers to spend money in the public interest, to ensure that questions can be asked by those members of the Minister responsible without it being necessary for me, or any other member, to run to and fro to find out when I have to be somewhere to ask a particular question before that line or that section of lines is passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Mallee that there was no attempt to restrict any member from raising any matter with any Minister. The time tables are, and have been, available for some time. There has been, basically, broad agreement on those time tables and other procedural matters, and I can assure the honourable member, and any other member, that the Chair will endeavour at all times to ensure that, if any member wishes to raise any matter on any line, as long as it is in accordance with Standing Orders, he will be permitted to do so. I suggest that we proceed in the way we are proceeding at the present time, as I do not believe we will be achieving a great deal. I suggest that we return to the matters currently before the Committee.

Mr. O'NEILL: I want to follow up the point on which the Minister closed in relation to additional training. In the Government's proposals, will there be included guaran-

tees to young people signing indentures that they will be protected against cancellation of indentures on economic grounds by employers? One of the very large contributing factors to the shortage of skilled tradesmen is that small companies tend to take on apprentices when they need some cheap labour and then cancel an indenture on economic grounds before the apprentice has completed his training?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The whole purpose of having a group apprenticeship scheme with an association rather than with one individual employer is that it allows far greater flexibility. Therefore, the economic consequences on one employer are largely overcome because, when one employer does not have work available, a person can go off and, still under the same indenture agreement, work for another employer. That is the whole purpose of having a group scheme.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I asked the Minister whether or not he was able to state the percentage in the attrition rate attributable to those people who had resigned their positions straight out from Government departments. I was extremely disappointed that the Minister did not have this sort of information at his disposal. I believe he should have had it. It is reasonable information. I now intend to ask one or all of the officers supporting the Minister (I put the question, I think, to Mr. Bowes, who may be able to give some information)—

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Deputy Leader that all questions must be referred through the Chair to the Minister. The Minister can then determine whether he answers the question or refers it to an officer. That is entirely for the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I accept that ruling, Sir. I believe that this information is available. If it is not readily available to the Minister, I ask that at least (if I am not allowed to direct my question to the public servants in the place) the information be obtained over the lunch break so that we have some idea. I believe it is a very important question, particularly having regard to the attitudes taken by the Minister. In the absence of the information being with the Minister, it suits me if the officers answer it. I would be delighted to hear from Mr. Bowes. I have not heard his voice for a long time.

[Sitting suspended from 12.30 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: Would the Minister of Industrial Affairs like to have the question asked by the Deputy Leader before lunch repeated?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Before we proceed with that, in the light of some questions asked this morning, I indicate that I have some subsequent information, and I wonder whether it is appropriate for me to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a document relating to the travelling and relocation expenses reimbursement procedures of the Public Service Board (which is a three-page document). I think that the member for Albert Park asked for this information.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite in order for the Minister to have that information inserted in *Hansard*. I indicate that, as long as the material relates to information sought earlier in the proceedings, I will allow its insertion.

Reimbursement of Travelling Expenses

4.8 Travelling Expenses Reimbursement—Changing Headquarters—Permanent Heads are informed that approval has been granted to reimburse the cost of travelling expenses incurred when changing permanent headquarters.

4.8.1 Travelling Expenses and Accommodation—Reim-

bursement is to be made on the basis of expenditure actually and necessarily incurred for travelling and accommodation (including meals) for the employee, the employees dependent spouse and dependent children subject to the following conditions

4.8.2 Standard of Accommodation—Accommodation must in all cases be of a standard consistent with the rates specified in Volume 5 of the Management Services Manual at reference 4.6.1 regarding reimbursement of travelling expenses within South Australia

4.8.3 Motor Mileage Reimbursement—Reimbursement of motor mileage may be made to an employee for the distance travelled from the old headquarters to the new headquarters.

Employees using a car with an engine of four cylinders or less—7.5 cents/kilometre; 12.1 cents/mile;

Employees using a car with an engine of more than four cylinder or a rotary engine—8.5 cents/kilometre; 13.6 cents/mile.

Distance travelled by an employee in changing headquarters is not to be regarded for the purpose of Clause 4.4.1 of Volume 5 Management Services Manual as the use of a private motor vehicle for official purposes.

If an employee does not have a motor vehicle and used public transport to move from one location to another the matter should be submitted to the Board with full particulars.

4.8.4 Time Limit—Reimbursement will be limited to a maximum period of 14 days.

4.8.5 Payment—The employee will be required to pay the account in full and submit receipts for all items when claiming reimbursement.

4.8.6 Furniture—Refer to Clause 4.8a.1 of Volume 5 of the Management Services Manual.

4.8a.1 Furniture removal expenses incurred in changing headquarters—Where an employee is moving from one permanent headquarters to another permanent headquarters in the course of his employment, the following provisions apply in respect of furniture removal expense and reimbursement.

4.8a.2 Removal of household furniture and effects

(i) Permanent heads are informed that approval has been granted to pay an allowance for removal of household furniture and effects. The allowance paid is to be equivalent to the lowest of three written quotes obtained from recognised furniture removalists providing however that:

- (a) the department may nominate one of the three removalists from whom a quote is to be obtained;
- (b) the employee may choose which removalist he will engage.

Where an employee chooses to accept a quote which is not the lowest, he will be required to pay the difference between the lowest quote and the quote chosen.

Every effort should be made to ensure that an employee's transfer coincides with the availability of permanent accommodation. However, where it is impossible for an employee to move immediately into permanent accommodation on relocation, the quotes sought should include the cost of storage of furniture. Payment/reimbursement of storage costs will be met by the department, for a maximum period of two weeks together with the cost of subsequent uplift and redelivery to the employee's permanent accommodation.

(ii) The allowance shall not be paid in either of the following circumstances:

- (a) where the employee's headquarters are being changed solely at the employee's request before the employee has been resident at such headquarters for three years;
- (b) where the transfer of location is being made by way of punishment.

Note: In any cases involving redeployment of staff, the allowance shall be paid.

(iii) It is to be noted that C.S.O. Circular No. 1034 has been cancelled as the State Transport Authority no longer handles furniture removals for State Employees.

(iv) Attention is drawn to Premier's Department Circular No. 11 in respect of "in transit" insurance cover on household furniture and effects.

4.8a.3 Allowance for accelerated depreciation of furniture

(i) In addition to the allowance provided for in 2 above, approval has been granted to pay on allowance to weekly paid employees for accelerated depreciation of furniture.

(ii) Where the Permanent Head is satisfied that the value of household furniture necessarily moved by an employee in his department upon such employee's transfer from one locality to another is at least one thousand five hundred and fifty dollars (\$1 550), that employee may be paid an allowance of two hundred and thirty dollars (\$230.00) for accelerated depreciation and extra wear and tear on furniture and effects and necessary replacement and/or alterations to carpets, linoleums, curtains, as a result of such change of residence.

(iii) The allowance shall not be paid any of the following circumstances:

- (a) where the employee is establishing a home for the first time;
- (b) where it is the employee's first appointment to the Government Service;
- (c) where the employee is moving to a position in respect of which a construction camp allowance is payable;
- (d) where the employee's headquarters are being changed solely at the employee's request before the employee has been resident at such headquarters for three years;
- (e) where the transfer of location is being made by way of punishment.

Note: In any cases involving redeployment of staff the exclusion in (iii) (d) above shall not apply.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The member for Albert Park asked how many exemptions had been given for the Job Transfer Office to fill positions. To answer that, we have taken out some very preliminary figures through the Job Transfer Office. It would appear that 217 exemptions have been granted for permanent jobs and 182 exemptions for temporary jobs—the importance lies in the 217 exemptions for permanent jobs. When that is matched with the figure of 400 transfers from within Government departments, it can be seen that the transfer system operated very efficiently.

Perhaps the Deputy Leader could repeat the question that he asked before lunch.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why should I?

The Chairman: It is entirely up to the honourable member.

Mr. Becker: Will the Minister explain how the provision for salaries and wages is calculated? I refer to the line "Deputy Director, Administrative, Project Officers, Clerical and General Staff", for which \$645 843 is proposed. I also refer to all salaries provisions in the Minister's Department. At page 162 of the Provisional Estimates of Resource Allocation, it is stated:

Any comparisons between 1980-81 and 1979-80 should take into account that:

the 1980-81 proposed payments are based on salary and wage rates as at June 30th, 1980.

during 1980-81, the department will call on the round sum allowance provided in the Estimates of Expenditure, for wage increases (\$79 million) and price increases (\$8 million) as the need arises.

Total manpower in 1979-80 was 305, and that proposed for 1980-81 is 308. However, page 106 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1980 states:

Payments for salaries, etc., \$4 520 000 (\$3 998 000), represented 76 per cent (80 per cent) of the total expenditure. The increase of \$522 000 was due mainly to national wage increases and the employment of additional staff to administer new responsibilities.

The number of staff employed at 30 June was 322 (303). Therefore, I assume that the staff has increased by 19 in this financial year, but I cannot tie up those figures with what is stated in the provisional document. I would like to know on what basis the provisions for salary and wages are calculated.

If one takes the estimated average of full-time equivalent staff for the 1980-81 year, one would assume that the salary is ascertained by adding on a certain amount for inflation. This does not seem to be a very satisfactory system. The whole problem is that the Committee does not know what part of the \$79 000 000 has been set aside for the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. I would like to know what that is, because I believe that there must be a basis of calculation somewhere. I would also like to know whether or not it is based purely on the number of people and their salaries. As I see it, that is the system and, while there may be a freeze on the number of public servants, the wage and salaries bill is increasing considerably, even though the Auditor-General's Report shows that there has been a slight difference in the figures that have been provided. I ask the Minister whether he can provide that information.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The figures quoted for employment (page 162 of the Provisional Estimates of Resource Allocation) on a programme basis must be seen as very approximate figures. Precise estimates were taken out for only three departments, and the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment was not one of those three. I believe that the Premier explained that when he tabled the document in the House. The honourable member will find that the figures quoted (305 and 308) on page 162 refer to permanent positions, and include Ministerial appointments.

Regarding the discrepancy between that figure and the figure of 322 from the Auditor-General's Report, I will need to research the exact reasons for this discrepancy. I stress that the figures given in the yellow book are provisional only and are not guaranteed as absolutely correct. I believe that that qualification has already been given by the Premier when he tabled the document.

The honourable member's question also referred to the basis of determining wage increases. He is quite correct in saying that the allocation in the 1980-81 Estimates is based on existing salaries as at 1 July or 30 June 1980. As he indicated, a separate line is allocated in the Budget for wage increases. The honourable member said that the procedure was unsatisfactory, but I point out that any planner or economist, in trying to plan a Budget, does not know what commitments may need to be met during the year. Unfortunately, at this stage we do not know what wage increases will be awarded to the employees involved. Certainly, when drafting the Budget papers, we have no idea what the increases will be, so it is necessary to prepare it on that basis. The honourable member asked what proportion of the \$79 000 000 would be allocated to this department. We do not know. This is one of the uncertainties in trying to work with an indefinite wage determining system, such as we have at present.

Mr. Becker: Frankly, I do not know what to say. We are considering the entire Budget. I am a little

disappointed. I thought that, through the Estimates Committees, we could at long last put our finger on line by line (that is why I advocated such a Committee for a couple of years) as regards growth factors in various departments and the costs of running the various departments and establishments and back-up support of the departments. What is the proposed number of persons to be employed in the department, and have there been any innovations by the Government that would result in an increase in personnel in the department? We should be given the answers.

In the \$79 000 000 allocated for wage and salary increases, there must be some allocation to the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. Someone in that department must have some idea. The current situation is not good enough. If Parliament is going to scrutinise departments, it should start here. If we are going to demonstrate to the taxpayers of this State that we mean what we say and that we will watch the expenditure from the moment it is incurred (not, say, in two years time) we should ascertain what went wrong. There must be a formula or basis somewhere that has been calculated by someone.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The department knows what its staffing proposals are for the year. That evidence is presented to the Committee in the yellow booklet. With an increase of three, the staffing will go from 305 to 308. I have now detected the reason for the discrepancy between that figure and the figure in the Auditor-General's Report. Some judges of the Industrial Court are not included in the 305, but they are included in the number shown in the Auditor-General's Report. It would take a better man than I to decide whether or not judges are employees and over and above the staff ceiling.

Some people were included under the SURS scheme; these were Ministerial appointments outside the normal staffing of the department. They are included in the 322, but they are not included for the current financial year. As the SURS scheme is phased out, there is no need for those people.

The honourable member asked where there has been a change in staffing. I refer to page 165; the Administration Section this year will go from 46 to 44; research will go from 15 to 16; and the Industrial Court and Commission will go from 51 to 48. The reasons are given in the document. Industrial investigations will go from 29 to 31; the Employee Participation Branch from five to four, and the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Section remains constant at 103. Youth activities will go from 22 to 23 positions. Employment opportunities will remain at six. The Industrial Training Section will increase from 27 to 28. The Technological Change Section will increase from one to three. The Manpower Forecasting Unit, to which I have referred, will have two or three people present in it. That has now been increased to three, rather than two as shown in the document.

I stress that the yellow document was produced about two months ago, and some changes have already been made. That is the change in manpower planned for the current year. To be specific about how the \$79 000 000 will be allocated in the current financial year, and as to whether that should be done as accounting procedure, the honourable member should take up that question with the Treasurer when he appears before the Committee. His question is more about how the estimates are prepared than a specific one to me as Minister in charge of a department.

Being the Minister responsible for all wage matters, I indicate to the honourable member that we would expect, across the board, a general wage increase of perhaps 12

per cent or 13 per cent for the current financial year, assuming that there has already been a work value study case settlement of about 5 per cent for most of the Public Service for this year and a six-monthly flow on of 4.5 per cent, taking it up to 9.5 per cent, and there will be one six-monthly period of the c.p.i. to flow on. We do not know what it will be until the c.p.i. has been determined for the period and the matter has come before the commission in the national wage case.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I imagine that this is the correct area in which to raise questions dealing with administration. On page 162 of the booklet, we find that the department is broken up into four sections, namely, departmental support services; industrial relations; protection of physical working conditions and maintenance of safety standards; and work force utilisation and effectiveness. Is the department broken down into four parts and, if so, what are their correct names? If that is not the situation, it is misleading to give them in such a way. Can the Minister clarify the situation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The department is specifically split up, as indicated in the formal Estimates, into the Administration and Research Division, the Industrial Safety Division, the Employment Division, and the Industrial Relations Division. When you are dealing with programme budgeting, you are dealing with programmes rather than any formal structure of the department; hence the reason for moving from a formal structured document, as under the Loan Estimates, to a programmed one, so that we can see what allocation of resources, both revenue and Loan, has been given to a specific programme. In breaking up into those four sections, we have tried to pick like programmes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: So, the information on page 162 of the yellow booklet is not consistent with the actual names of the departments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Why has there been an increase in the numbers of executive officers of the department? I refer particularly to the position of, as I understand it, Assistant Director, a relatively new position. Why was that position necessary; what are the functions of the new Assistant Director; was that position advertised in accordance with the general rules of the Public Service; did Cabinet authorise applications for such a position to be called for and who currently holds that position?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The position of Assistant Director is a temporary position only. It has not been formally advertised or created as a permanent position by the Public Service Board. It has been created on a temporary basis for a number of reasons, the first of which is the Commonwealth inquiry requested by the Premiers' Conference and being conducted by the Ministers of Labour into the industrial relations system in Australia. That inquiry is taking a great deal of time, and there was a commitment by all State Premiers to allocate a specific departmental officer to act on the working party of that inquiry. Mr. Brian Shillabeer, who was Industrial Registrar with the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission, is the officer involved, and he spends a great deal of time on the Commonwealth working party looking into the industrial relations system. The time he does not spend there is devoted largely to the Employment Division area.

If the Deputy Leader looks at the number of programmes the department has taken on in the past 12 months, he will see a significant list. If he considers some of the new initiatives, the Deputy Leader will appreciate the extent to which it has been necessary to have

additional assistance at the top level of the department. The new initiatives include a complete rewrite of the Apprenticeship Act under the name of the Industrial and Commercial Training Bill, a complete review of manpower planning for the State, the introduction of a council on technological change, and a review of certain matters in industrial relations, as well as other new initiatives, especially in the training area, by which we are trying to increase the number of apprentices being taken on using Government facilities. That is the reason for the increase in the number of senior administration officers at Assistant Director level.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I take it from the Minister's reply that, in those circumstances, the position will be abolished at the conclusion of the temporary work required. If that is not so (and I doubt that it will be), what will be the situation? Will applications eventually be called for the job through the Public Service Board rules? If it is finally abolished, what will happen to the officer presently holding that job?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr. Shillabeer would go back to his post as Industrial Registrar if the position was abolished. I cannot give an undertaking on whether or not the position of Assistant Director will be abolished or whether it will be made permanent. It depends on how we see the work load of the department and the priorities to be given in that area. The Government has put great emphasis on employment policies for the department, and will continue to do so. The whole structure of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment is at present a matter for discussion between the Director of the department and the Chairman of the Public Service Board. I understand that, arising from those discussions, there is likely to be some review of the structure of the department.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In answering my first question, the Minister referred to "other industrial matters". Would he care to comment on what are those matters? He raised the possibility of changes to the Apprenticeship Commission area, and he said earlier that he intended to have a Bill drawn up and to get consensus on it. What is the situation in the craft union areas in relation to changes to the Apprenticeship Commission? A document is being circulated indicating that the craft unions, as well as the Trades and Labor Council, object to the Minister's proposals in this area. If no consensus is reached, does the Government intend to proceed with the new Bill, irrespective of whether or not agreement is reached with employer and employee organisations?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The "other industrial matters" were matters such as the Job Transfer Office, early voluntary retirement, and numerous other matters which have come before the department and which have been handled by those officers, including various negotiations with the Trades and Labor Council on matters that previously did not come before our department.

On the matter of whether the United Trades and Labor Council formally objected to the discussion paper released on the proposed Industrial and Commercial Training Bill, the answer is, "No". A deputation from the Trades and Labor Council, including the Secretary, came to see me two weeks ago. The members of the deputation raised a number of questions and points, and certainly did not object to our going ahead with a review of the Act. The apprenticeship scheme, as such, will continue, but there will not be an Apprenticeship Commission, if proposed amendments are brought before the Parliament. Parliament, of course, has the final say and I should not preempt what it might decide, but, from discussions so far, I understand that there is no objection to the concept of an

Industrial and Commercial Training Commission to replace the Apprenticeship Commission. Certain assurances have been sought. Whether or not the Government decides to proceed, and whether or not it gets the agreement of the Trades and Labor Council or any other employer or employee association or outside body is yet to be determined. I think the Government would want to reach as much consensus as possible, and to make sure that any Bill introduced could meet the needs of our community. I have outlined this earlier.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am still pursuing this administration matter. I notice in the Premier's Budget papers that the Industrial Affairs Research Branch has 15 members. If I remember correctly, in my day as Minister it had 10 members. I understand that the Employee Participation Branch is doing its own research, as are the Youth Bureau, the Manpower Forecasting Unit, the Training Branch, and the Technological Change Centre. It seems to me that the Research Branch could be overstaffed. I am not saying that it is, but it seems overloaded as compared with what was occurring when I was Minister. Why is it necessary to have so many staff members? What does the future hold for that branch?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think the number in the research section has probably increased, because we have taken research people out of specialised functions and put them into a general pool of research, under Mr. David Gribble, to give far greater flexibility to the department than existed previously. If all research people are specifically allocated to different units within the department, there is little scope for flexibility to meet changing needs and, once a specific task has been achieved, to go on and achieve the next task. That is why there has been an increase. Research people out of the Employee Participation Branch, for instance, have been put into the research section, and so it has been with other sections.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not think that is sufficiently explicit. I want to know what they are doing. What are their duties? What do we expect from an overloading in this section? It is obvious that this area has been overloaded, at the expense of employee participation. Obviously, the Government has decided that it does not need people in that area, it has had to find somewhere to put them, and so they have been placed in a research area. I am not saying that these officers do not do anything, but I want to know what tasks are involved to necessitate an increase of 50 per cent. What can the State expect from that area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think that the department has already announced a number of policy areas in which the research people are involved. Research people have been involved and will need to be involved to an even greater extent in reviewing the Workers Compensation Act. I announced on Sunday the report of the committee of inquiry into that Act. We have now asked for public comment and these research officers will be responsible for taking that public comment and examining it. The research officers have also been involved in dealing with many of the comments coming in in relation to commercial and industrial training. They have been involved in manpower forecasting, and it will require a great deal of manpower to get a unit, which is operating in an area in which there has been virtually no experience at all, not only here but elsewhere in Australia and overseas, to take on the task and to come up with meaningful manpower forecasts as soon as possible. These are just some of the many areas in which the department is allocating its resources in the research section. Anyone looking at the problems which surround the Government and have

surrounded the Government for many years, would realise that there is a huge task there in which these people can get involved.

Mr. ABBOTT: I think my question would be appropriate at this stage. In accordance with Government policy, I ask the Minister whether the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment conducted any family impact assessments on the estimates of expenditure by the department? The Government has made a big play about its concern for the family, but I think that in the past this has just been an exercise in window dressing. To see whether the Government is fair dinkum about its concern for the family, I ask whether any family impact assessment was undertaken and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I assume that the member for Spence is asking whether family impact statements were made on a number of the initiatives involving expenditure by the department for the current financial year. The answer is "Yes". If I put up a submission for, say, a proposed amendment to the Apprenticeship Act which involves the proposed Industrial and Commercial Training Bill and there is an assessment made on what its impact would be on the family, that is taken into account when Cabinet considers that proposal for a new Bill and considers any allocation of finance and personnel within that submission. For quite a number of these items family impact statements have been considered.

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister say how many departmental officers are involved in these family impact statements and who those departmental officers are?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is up to the research people when they prepare the material. David Gribble and his staff would prepare, along with the assessment, a family impact statement. It depends on the nature of the item being considered how extensive that family impact statement is. Obviously if it is having no impact on the family the statement will be extremely brief.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The allocation for industrial investigations, as referred to on page 166 of the programme papers, was \$486 000 for the last year compared to \$474 000 for this year, whereas last year manpower was allocated \$29 000 and this year it is allocated \$31 000. That shows a decrease in revenue and an increase in manpower. What I want to know is how this comes about and, secondly, are the industrial investigations taking place at the same level as they have in the past and, more exactly, why is there an increase in staff and a decrease in the allocation of money to cover that particular manpower?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is simple. Last year there was an allocation in that programme of \$49 000 to purchase motor vehicles and it is expected this year that that expenditure will be only \$29 800. That largely explains the difference between those two lines. There is also a slight adjustment in the operating expenses, which were \$19 000 last year and \$21 000 this year.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That does not answer my question. I asked whether industrial investigations are taking place at the same rate as in the past. I think it is important to know whether departmental functions are being carried out now as they have been in the past.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is "Yes".

Mr. HAMILTON: In relation to the Manpower Forecasting Unit, will the Minister assure this Committee that he will obtain unemployment figures for each suburb within the respective State electoral boundaries? I, like many other members of the House, have found it extremely difficult to ascertain the unemployment figures in my district. How can the Minister overcome the problems of unemployment when the exact figures of

unemployment in the respective areas are not known?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer to the question is "No." It is not possible to give the honourable member unemployment figures within specific electorates. That information is not available. I am being entirely consistent because when this matter was raised with the previous Minister, now Deputy Leader of the Opposition, he gave exactly the same answer. I do not believe that that information is necessary if we are to make an effective attack on the unemployment problem within our community. What is more appropriate is to create employment. Whether that unemployment exists in the District of Spence or Port Adelaide I think is immaterial because there might be less than a quarter of a mile separating the two areas. The important thing is for the Government to initiate the right moves to make sure that jobs are created.

Mr. HAMILTON: I find it difficult to accept that because surely with the research facilities available the Minister would want to know where those projected industries will be located and the need for public transport, for housing, and so on. I believe that these figures should be made available so that members can probe, question and criticise the Government, if necessary. I ask the Minister to reconsider that aspect of my question.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Commonwealth Employment Service does collect information based on C.E.S. districts. I believe that is a far better basis on which to collect all information than using electoral districts as a basis. After all, in the planning of this State of what significance are the electoral boundaries? Waterfall Gully is cut in half, with one half being in Kavel and the other half being in my own electorate of Davenport. It would be rather false to create a job in the district of Kavel, which is centred on the Barossa Valley, when that person lives in Waterfall Gully, which is closer to Adelaide. I think that shows how artificial electoral boundaries are and certainly I have no intention of using my department's resources on collecting such useless information. Certainly we will continue to monitor the situation, but we will do so on a regional basis.

Mr. O'NEILL: Earlier the Minister spoke with some pride of the annual attrition rate of 10 per cent amongst daily or weekly-paid employees. Does the Government intend to maintain this annual attrition rate and, if so, for how long, and does the Government intend to apply this attrition rate to the Public Service staff classifications as well as to daily or weekly-paid employees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government would like to see its surplus employee problem resolved in the various Government departments as quickly as possible. Once that is done, we can start to lift the freeze that has existed for so long within those Government departments and allow some younger workers to be taken on, thus correcting the imbalance in the age of the work force to which I referred this morning. How long that will take I am unable to say. Certainly, we believe it is a significant achievement to have reached a 10 per cent attrition rate per year, and that will be exceeded now that we have early voluntary retirement.

All I can indicate is that it is the Government's intention to solve that problem as quickly as possible and to put those departments back on to a normal basis of regularly taking on new people. However, that will depend on overcoming the mammoth legacy of surplus employees with which this Government was left, and the magnitude of that problem should not be under-estimated. When the Public Accounts Committee reviewed the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it was estimated that the

number amounted to at least 900, and problems of that magnitude cannot be simply overcome.

Mr. O'NEILL: I guess the surplus to which the Minister referred can be related to the policies of Governments, and as I have said in this House before, there is a very basic difference in the attitude of conservative Parties and the Labor Party in respect of what they see as an ideal society. However, the Minister did not say whether the Government intends to apply a 10 per cent attrition rate to staff classifications in the Public Service; will he reply to that question? Also, the Minister referred earlier to the position of people of 55 years of age and over and to the problems that occurred in the Government work force because of a freeze, and I ask whether the Government has any plans to alleviate the financial and social problems which may accrue to people taking early retirement and then, possibly, becoming mendicants on the State in the long term.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In answer to the last of the three questions asked by the honourable member, I have already clearly answered that in reply to a question from the member for Brighton.

The CHAIRMAN: We do not want repetition, so if the Minister has answered, he need not answer again.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think the answer is already in *Hansard*, and I refer the honourable member to the answer I have given. The main point is that they need to seek counselling. In many cases, these people would like to retire and they are in the financial position to retire early because they are eligible for superannuation. In answer to the question about whether we intend to apply a 10 per cent attrition rate to other Government departments and to other public servants, and not just to weekly-paid employees, the answer is "No". Staff ceilings are imposed on Government departments and they depend very much on the Government's priorities in the different areas involved. Also, I point out to the honourable member that early retirement involving people with superannuation has been offered for some time, in fact since March of this year, to people in the Public Service, and there is some indication that a number of people are now taking up that offer. The Public Service sector of the Government did not suffer the same surplus problem that existed in the weekly-paid area.

The first point that the honourable member made was that he saw significant differences between the philosophies of the two Governments that have operated in this State. I would agree with him; the former Government was totally incapable of coming to grips with the surplus employee problem that existed in Government departments, and I think that was blatantly obvious, and that is the reason why, when the present Government came into office, it had a problem of such magnitude. The surplus of 900 employees in the E. & W.S. Department existed before the present Government came into office and it was not a creation of this Government.

Mr. BECKER: Is it not a fact that in 1975 the then Government was advised to cut back on its weekly-paid employees and that that policy did not come into being until 1978? Had the cut-back commenced in 1975, as recommended, the problem would have been resolved by 1980, but because the former Government started three years late, it is fair to assume that the current Government has inherited the problem that was really began when cut-backs were commenced too late by the former Government.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I believe that that is a correct assumption to make.

Mr. ABBOTT: As a result of the Government's policy of no retrenchments, can the Minister provide any

information as to how many private Government contracts have been terminated with Government departments? To give an example of this, a constituent of mine worked with his own truck under contract with the E. & W.S. Department for some 15 years but, because the department had a surplus of its own drivers, the work of a number of drivers was terminated to make way for departmental drivers. My constituent and the other drivers whose contracts from that department were terminated—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the honourable member sure that this relates to the Minister's department; the E. & W.S. Department is under the administration of the Minister for Water Resources.

Mr. ABBOTT: I appreciate the point you are making, Sir, but this is a follow-up of the previous answer the Minister gave to the member for Florey, and it is in relation to the Government's policy of no retrenchments. Can the Minister say how many of these private contracts have been terminated with the various Government departments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think the honourable member should direct that question to each Minister individually, as I cannot answer for other Ministers. The honourable member refers to contracts terminated, but many of the contracts are on-going contracts and when the Government need ceases, the contract ceases. A classic example of this concerns the cleaning of certain Government facilities, which comes under the Public Buildings Department under me. We cancel some of these if there is no longer a need. Surely the honourable member is not suggesting for a moment that the Government, because it has a contract, should maintain that contract in perpetuity? That is the very sort of inflexible government to which I referred earlier, where by the Government can get itself into all sorts of trouble and find absolute chaos.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that in future I will not allow questions which relate to other Minister's departments.

Mr. O'NEILL: It seems that there are some rhetorical questions being asked by members of the Government. If we are going to talk about this surplus that is alleged to have been apparent in 1975, is it not possible for us to pursue the line that that is directly attributable to the cut-backs that were forced upon the then Federal Government by the anti-social activities of members of the Senate?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot permit that line of questioning. I was going to point out to the member for Hanson, in relation to his question, that I thought he was getting a little broad; I cannot permit that line of questioning.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I would not object to receiving the pay of a Federal Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am ready to move on to the Manpower Forecasting Unit, but the member for Brighton can have the first question, as he spoke on the matter before.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Deputy Leader is indicating that his members have no further questions on that line.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not think so.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: In relation to the Manpower Forecasting Unit, which is a new item of expenditure, what specific action is the Government taking to improve the planning of manpower within this State?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government has appointed a Manpower Forecasting Unit. The staffing of that unit is one senior project officer, a project officer and a clerk, so that the staffing is three. The Manpower Forecasting Unit will have three or four specific tasks in trying to predict manpower forecasting within South Australia, and, for

more detail on the procedures to be applied and the methods to be adopted and how they should be reviewed from time to time, and the methods from which forecasts should be made, I refer the member to the excellent report handed down under the Chairmanship of Professor Dick Blandy some two months ago.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: My question applies not only to this but to several other areas of the expenditure Budget. Further down the list, terminal leave payments and payroll tax are shown as separate items. Where do we cover long service leave allowance for the various sections within the department and their superannuation? Are these lumped together in one area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The long service leave payments are covered generally within the salaries line; superannuation is covered, of course, under a quite separate Act under the Treasurer.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have two questions on the manpower area. As far as I can understand the Budget, there is a \$70 000 allocation. Is that the total allocation, or is any other money hidden somewhere which I cannot detect? Could the Minister say what he hopes that a small force of three will be able to achieve within this manpower development area? I know it is a difficult area, and I have said so before in this House. First, I do not believe that a staff of three is sufficient to be able to manage a section like this, because I believe it is a very important section. I know the Minister does, too. He is concerned about it, and I make no criticism of that. It seems to me that, if you are going to go into this most difficult area, some very good reports are available. The Director of the department made a report about this matter a couple of years ago—the report to which the Minister referred. However, that does not seem to be sufficient action to me. Some physical action seems to be required in this area. I would like to hear from the Minister whether he estimates that he has sufficient staff to do whatever he wants to do in this area, and what are his intentions?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I believe the initial allocation of three staff is adequate in this area, because it is an exploratory area. We are breaking new ground, and I believe it would be wasteful to have a large number of people around trying to break that new ground. I hope that members of the Committee and the House appreciate the extent to which it is exploratory and the extent to which any findings will be initial, and I would certainly criticise anyone who believes that we will be able to make accurate predictions and forecasts for every occupation and trade area. The report clearly indicates that that is not the intention of such a Manpower Forecasting Unit. I said I thought three was a reasonable start; three is better than none, and that is what existed when I took over as Minister.

Covering the points relating to the costs: \$45 000 is allocated for salaries, and \$25 000 is allocated for operating expenses, bringing the total expenditure to about \$70 000 for the year. This is only for a part year, however. First, Cabinet had to review the report of the working party. It did that and announced that it intended to proceed to set up a Manpower Forecasting Unit. It then had to make application, as the Deputy Leader will appreciate, to the Public Service Board to create the positions. Yesterday those positions were approved by Cabinet, and we are now in a position as a department to go ahead and advertise those positions. So it can be seen that, even if the positions there were filled within the next month, those expenses apply for only eight months of the year and not a full year.

Mr. O'NEILL: Is the information, such as it may be, which is gleaned by this unit to be available to the general

public, or is it just for the information of the Minister and the Government?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: When I discussed that with the Chairman, Professor Blandy, his view was that the information should be made public, provided the public and the Parliamentarians were mature enough to understand how that information should be used and were not critical of the fact that exact and precise answers were not given in it. If the public proved to be totally immature in trying to perceive that, I think that puts pressure on the Government and on our advisory committee, which is quite independent of the Government, to say, "We will be very careful as to what we release." We would like to make available all the information and to have it there, but for people to understand how it should be used and, as accurately as possible, to read and interpret that information without jumping to broad headlines and accusing the Government of coming out with sad predictions one way or the other.

I must stress, that, if people try to use this information politically, I think they are simply going to stymie the availability of such information and destroy its whole intent and purpose. Certainly, the Chairman of the working party was very mindful of the dangers involved if people attempted to do that.

Mr. O'NEILL: Who will be the arbiter on the maturity of the general public—the Government, the Minister, or the Chairman of the unit?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Thank you for answering the question—along with the advisory panel, and there are two union members on that advisory panel.

Mr. ABBOTT: I ask the Minister to what extent does the Manpower Forecasting Unit work with other State Governments and the Federal Government? Also, what is the Budget allocation for the promised industrial ombudsman?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Manpower Forecasting Unit that I have proposed here for South Australia, and the techniques that I have outlined that they will use, I believe take us well to the forefront of any techniques used here in Australia by any Government. A certain amount of work has been done by the Western Australian Government, and by the New South Wales Government, mainly on a regional basis. The latter did some manpower forecasts for the Hunter Valley which came up with specific predictions for requirements for skilled trades. Also, one or two specific techniques have been tested by universities throughout Australia; in particular, the Melbourne University has tested one of these. Taken collectively, the techniques proposed will be the most comprehensive so far. The Federal Government has, I think, already appointed a Director and some of the staff of what is called the Bureau of Labour Market Research. We are not yet sure exactly what techniques it will use, but I would expect the information to be on a broad national basis, whereas ours is looking specifically at the requirements within the State, and particularly regional requirements and problems that exist. One could expect a very close co-operation between State and Federal bodies and, in addition to that, close co-operation between the department and the Flinders University unit.

Mr. ABBOTT: Is there an allocation for industrial ombudsman?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There is no allocation in any of the lines for an industrial ombudsman.

Mr. ABBOTT: Regarding family impact statements, how many people in the department have filled in the form and prepared such statement, have they any training in social evaluation, and did they consult with the family unit

of the Department of Community Welfare, which offers help in such consultation, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That sort of information would not be available, because assessment of the family impact statements is carried out on a regular basis by a range of people. In some cases, there has been contact with the Department of Community Welfare, so, if I were the honourable member, I would not worry about the quality of the impact statements, because they are of a high quality. I do not know whether the honourable member is trying to make a big issue of this, but I point out that the Government has taken a bold step and for the first time there will be family impact statements. We have broken new ground, and I would have thought that we would be complimented for this. This system provides a way of thinking which we are trying to instill in the various people involved in the departments when they are initiating new projects.

Mr. ABBOTT: Who knows about the family impact statements? The statements are not released to the public; only the department, the officers and Cabinet know about the assessments made on all major Government decisions. How can the community reflect on those assessments and their value if they know nothing about them?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The family impact statement is part of the background information supplied to Cabinet so that Cabinet can make a decision, and, in the same way as general Cabinet submissions are not made available to the public, the family impact statements are not made available to the public. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that he is missing out on something, but I indicate that the former Government did not make its information available as a general Cabinet submission. The family impact statement is part of a Cabinet submission. If there is any specific important impact in regard to the family, no doubt that will be made part of any public release, as I know my department has done on a number of occasions. In statements put forward, I have talked about the impact on families.

Mr. O'NEILL: Some questions are difficult to categorise; is it possible to ask a question in regard to lines that have previously been referred to, if that becomes relevant later in the discussion?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It is preferable to complete a line, but tolerance will be shown if there is a specific reason why a member wants to go back to a line and ask a question. However, I indicate that it is preferable to proceed as quickly as possible through the lines.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I believe that the Minister said that the Council on Technological Change has a staff of three; is that right?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The council has a staff of four: the Chief Project Officer, two project officers, and one clerk.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does it have a committee of 11?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Ten, I understand.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There are more people on the committee operating in this very important area than are on the staff of the section. That is rather a unique situation. How much money has been allocated in this very important area; how does the centre propose to prepare for or ameliorate the effects of technological change; and is it expected that this centre will serve an advisory or research role or will it take an active role in Government policy?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is given on page 169 of the yellow book; the figure is \$89 000, which is \$89 000 more than was allocated in 1978-79. Will the honourable member repeat the other parts of his question?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will repeat them one at a time so that there is no confusion. How does the centre propose to prepare for or ameliorate the effects of technological change?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The whole purpose of the council, which was outlined to the Committee this morning, is to monitor technological change carefully and try to plan ahead to overcome some of the disadvantages of such change. That is the best way of ameliorating the effects. In fact, I do not believe that "ameliorate" has been used in its correct context, because "ameliorate" means to obliterate completely the effects of technological change, and I do not believe that that would ever be possible.

The point is that, by understanding what changes are taking place, it is possible, to a certain extent, to retrain people and to plan training and manpower policies to overcome the disadvantages that are likely to arise. I refer the honourable member to page 168 of the yellow book, which outlines what is proposed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the sum indicated by the Minister take into account the retraining of people whose jobs will cease because of technological change? I believe that it is quite obvious that, because of technological change, there will be a massive loss of jobs. That has already happened, as the Minister would know. The sum to which the Minister referred as having been allocated for this project would surely not take into account the training costs in regard to people who are displaced. Is that the total sum? What does the Minister intend to do about retraining people who are displaced because of technological change?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Of course that allocation of \$89 000 does not take into account retraining costs. The Department of Industrial Affairs does not have the responsibility for training or retraining; it has the responsibility for the over-view of manpower policies, as I am sure the honourable member knows. Training in that area would take place under the Department of Further Education or some other appropriate Government department. It would not be appropriate to allocate funds for retraining under the line for the Council on Technological Change.

Mr. O'NEILL: The policy of the Government, as announced at the last election, was to encourage the introduction of employee participation on a voluntary basis to ensure improved communications and consultations and to facilitate the redesign of work, etc. Does that come within the ambit of this unit; will this unit be looking at the introduction of employee participation; and, if not, in what area does the Minister intend to follow this undertaking?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This matter does not come under the Council on Technological Change; it comes under the Industrial Relations Division, but under the Employee Participation Branch of the department, which is referred to later. This is clearly spelt out on page 106 of the yellow book. The actual manpower in the Employee Participation Branch is listed there.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am still concerned as to the real intent of the Government in this area. The Minister has quite properly said, in answer to my question, that the \$89 000 would be insufficient for training. Does the Minister believe that the Government is making a genuine attempt to overcome the hazards of technological change? I do not know how hard the Minister fought in Cabinet for the allocation. He may have asked for more; it depends on what his department recommended to him. Is he serious in trying to tell the Committee that \$89 000 is sufficient to overcome the hazards in this area? I believe that it will

merely scratch the surface. Surely there should be a larger allocation. If the Minister wants retraining to go to the Minister of Education, that is his decision. The recommendation for an increase should come from his area. There is insufficient staff and an inadequate allocation. The Minister probably thinks that this allocation is too small.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I pointed out earlier that I announced the appointment of that committee only yesterday. I point out to this Committee that the \$89 000 allocation is not for a full year, but only for part of the year. It is a new initiative, and I find the line of questioning from the honourable member somewhat surprising (I do not wish to criticise him). This is the first time that this department, which has been under my control for a year (it was previously under the Deputy Leader's control), has appointed such a council or that there is any specific Budget allocation for that, except for the year just finished, when there was a small allocation. I believe that the funds are sufficient to start with. We will need to decide, once we have allowed the council to meet and make recommendations, what further commitment needs to be made in this area. I would not want to preempt any report of the council, but I would think that the Committee would appreciate the significance of this new initiative being taken by the Government.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister has continually tried to score political points regarding what was and was not done under the previous Government. There were certain matters that I could have answered but, not wishing to precipitate an argument in the Committee, I let them go. The Minister is not telling the truth in his most recent statement. He would no doubt have checked the dockets of previous Ministers and been aware that more than 18 months ago I made a strong submission to Cabinet of the day to set up such a unit. It was going to be set up when the early election was called, and it was part of the then Premier's policy speech at the time. It is no good the Minister's saying that this did not happen, or had to wait until his Government came to office to happen. He knew that it would have happened, under his Government or our Government. The submission had been agreed by Cabinet.

What was the effect of the increase in terminal leave payments? If my calculations are correct, it means that there has been a 22 per cent increase in terminal leave payments. Does this reflect normal staffing, or what is the situation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It simply reflects the age of the people involved. By chance, five officers intend retiring and therefore terminal leave payments will be required. That allocation fluctuates from year to year, depending on the number who reach retiring age.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The allocation is large, compared to previous years.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot comment on that, but it fluctuates from year to year.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What positive action has been taken by the Industrial Safety Division to ensure that the latest trends in industrial safety are being observed and implemented wherever appropriate?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can give that assurance.

Mr. O'NEILL: At page 162, the yellow book indicates that an increase of \$10 000 has been allocated for industrial safety. What steps does the Government propose to take to ensure the protection of physical working conditions in the environment in industries related to radioactive material? Is it proposed to set up a special department to deal with this matter and to provide effective monitoring equipment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That comes under the Minister of Health and the Health Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Have any programmes been implemented in other areas to reduce the risk of major accidents similar to that which occurred at Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in September 1980?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The department constantly reviews its safety standards in the light of experience. Everyone who has investigated the accident at B.H.P. would acknowledge that it was a unique accident. The cause appears to be quite unique. Lessons have no doubt been learnt, not only here in South Australia, but throughout the developed world. An officer has been appointed by the department on a contract basis whose specific task is occupational safety. The department is conscious of its role in this area, not just to examine accidents when they occur but, if at all possible, to avoid the occurrence of industrial accidents.

Mr. O'NEILL: As the Government has announced that it is allocating more and more work to private companies, do the departmental inspectors and safety officers require the same stringent safety precautions that were observed by Government departments in carrying out those jobs before they were given to private enterprise?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Of course, the same standards apply, whether it is work with the Government or the private sector.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Have there been staff cuts in relation to industrial safety, health and welfare? It seems that the staff has been reduced by one. In what area are district officers operating? Are they still under industrial safety, health and welfare?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer the honourable member to page 167 of the programme papers, which indicates that the staff has remained constant at 103. District officers are still in that division.

Mr. HAMILTON: I refer the Minister to an article in the *Advertiser* of 25 September in relation to Professor Booth, an international authority on occupational safety, who told a meeting of the Safety Institute of Australia in Adelaide that employers spend heavily on training workers to be safety conscious, and then blame them when accidents happen. He said the money would be better spent training the right people to create safer conditions in the factory. Has the Minister's attention been drawn to this report? If so, what action does his department intend to take in relation to better educated safety officers and a recognition of their role in worker health and safety?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have already indicated that the Government has taken on a contract officer to deal with occupational safety as one of his important tasks. It is the on-going task of the Government to help educate people, particularly employers, about the need to maintain the highest possible safety standards within the work place.

Mr. HAMILTON: More specifically, I refer to the introduction of a system of testing equipment introduced into the work place. I believe that equipment should be product tested before it is brought into operation on the work floor because, in many instances, equipment has flaws which result in injuries to workers employed to use it. Has this aspect been considered? If not, why not, and will the Minister look at it?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Equipment sold within Australia must be tested under and comply with Australian standards. If it does not comply, it cannot be sold. I think the Australian standards system is the appropriate means to maintain the standard of equipment sold within this country. We rely heavily on the Australian standards, and under the "Miscellaneous" vote there is an increased allocation for this purpose.

Mr. HAMILTON: In relation to the mutagenic clinic and the controversy raised over that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think that is covered in this vote, and I must ask the honourable member to refrain from commenting on that unit.

Mr. HAMILTON: It relates to industrial safety, but I bow to your views, Sir. What action will be taken by the department in testing materials that give off gases or similar carcinogenic products causing injuries to workers?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That matter is the province of the Minister of Health. The Occupational Health Branch is part of the Health Commission, and is not part of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr. HAMILTON: I believe that it is part of industrial safety.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question should be referred to the Minister of Health when that matter is before the appropriate Committee. I do not wish to interpret the orders in a narrow way, but, if I allow a question of the Minister in relation to an area that does not concern him, I think the Committee will be in some difficulty. Therefore, I ask the honourable member to raise this matter with the appropriate Minister.

Mr. ABBOTT: The youth worker training programme is now under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. How much is being proposed for youth worker training?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: An allocation of \$7 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What is the state of the staff of the Industrial Court? It seems that the number has been cut by four. If that is so, what is the reason?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: My Director points out that the state of the staff of the Industrial Commission is one of excellent health. To be more specific, there is a minor reduction because an industrial magistrate has been made an Acting Assistant Director of the department, and there have been one or two other minor adjustments. No doubt the Deputy Leader is aware that we recently appointed an additional judge to that court, which will mean an increase in the staffing. That staffing has not been included in the allocation in the programme papers, because the additional allocation of a judge with an appropriate staff member was made after the document was prepared. Salaries of four commissioners are included, as well as three industrial magistrates and two part-time industrial magistrates (Messrs. Stokes and Mills). Mr. Hardy is acting while Mr. DeFazio is away on leave without pay, having sought six months leave without pay.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The allocation for employee participation schemes appears to have been cut from \$164 000 to \$134 000. There may be good reason for that because of the way the Budget was framed last year. Is there any planned level of activity so far as the Government is concerned with its employee participation policy? What are staff doing in these areas at the moment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The allocation has been reduced because, when I came in as Minister, there was a substantial department, the Unit for Industrial Democracy, with a staff of 16. The number of staff is four for the current year and that is why the allocation has been reduced. Some of their tasks in the research area have been taken over by the Research Branch. Their responsibility is to carry on the initiatives outlined in the Liberal Party policy, and that has been clearly enunciated. If a company requests advice on employee participation, or if a Government department asks for such advice, then, with the consent and the knowledge of the union involved, advice is given.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: How many such companies asked for and obtained advice in the last 12 months?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not have that information available.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Would you make it available for me?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, I will try to get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. ABBOTT: I refer to "Administration Expenses, Minor Equipment and Sundries". Can the Minister explain how the Youth Worker Training Programme applies? Are unemployed youths eligible, and is any study involved? The Department of Social Security has said that people getting the dole are permitted a maximum of only eight contract hours of study a week.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The programme is to train people as youth workers, and that is done by the Youth Bureau. They are not unemployed people; they are people who are receiving training. I think the honourable member is under the false impression that this is a scheme for unemployed persons; it is not. It is a scheme to train people as youth workers.

Mr. ABBOTT: You cannot be training too many people if the allocation is only \$7 000.

Mr. O'NEILL: Has any finance been allocated for the establishment of a compulsory dispute solving procedure for essential services, as indicated in the Liberal Party policy?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No.

Mr. O'NEILL: Has the Government allocated any funds for the establishment of an industrial code of conduct? Also, what is an industrial code of conduct?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No funds have been allocated. I cannot imagine why funds would be needed for that particular task and, as no funds have been allocated, it is inappropriate to comment further.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I refer to the provision under "Employment Division" for "Assistant Director, Senior Project Officer, Project Officers and Clerical Staff". The allocation last year was \$216 000, and the actual expenditure was \$123 563; yet the amount proposed for 1981 is \$242 000. Why was only slightly more than half of the amount voted last year actually used, and why is it necessary almost to double the amount used for the forthcoming year? It seems rather irregular.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The allocation of \$216 000 last year was an inappropriate allocation and a mistake was made. The sum of \$242 000 for this year includes a number of items that were previously shown under the "Miscellaneous" lines.

Mr. HAMILTON: Does the Minister intend to introduce legislation requiring secret ballots on strike issues?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to be restrictive, but I think the honourable member may be straying somewhat from the purposes of a Committee discussion.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can indicate to the honourable member that that is under consideration.

Mr. HAMILTON: I asked that question because of the reported statement in the *Australian* on 13 March 1980 that the Prime Minister ruled out secret ballots as a solution to industrial unrest in this country. I asked that question because I believe that statement will have an effect upon the policies of the State Government.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Under "Employment Division" is a provision for "Chief Training Services Officer, Training Development Officers and Clerical Staff". The sum voted last year was \$114 000 and the actual expenditure was \$130 772, the proposed amount for this year being \$103 000. Does the Government intend to reduce the training staff? I would have thought that it was most important at this stage, with an economic downturn

such as is occurring in this country at the moment, that this line should be increased rather than decreased. It is mystifying to me, when there was an over-expenditure last year of about \$16 000, to find a reduction of \$27 000 this year compared to the amount spent last year.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think the Deputy Leader should be careful about trying to take one specific line at a time. As I have already indicated to the House, the Government's policy is to introduce a broad Bill to cover industrial and commercial training instead of the present apprenticeship scheme and the separate industrial training that had taken place previously. One position that has an allocation under that line has not yet been filled, and it will not be filled until the Government has been able to introduce new legislation and to decide what form the new initiatives should take. I have clearly indicated to the House what we have already done in that area. I think it is appropriate to look at the overall line, in which there has been an increase for industrial and commercial training. It is dangerous to take one specific line and try to make too much of an issue about it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That leads to the next question. Exactly how much has been allocated for the scheme on industrial and commercial training? The Minister has explained that the allocation has been moved from one area to another. He ought to be able to tell the Committee exactly what amount was taken away and the exact amount that will be used for the industrial and commercial training scheme.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The total expenditure on industrial training on a programme basis last year was \$689 000, and it is expected to be \$705 000 this year. Page 169 of the yellow book shows that there has been an increase in allocation. That is why I say it is dangerous to take individual lines under the old line system, because we are moving from one form of industrial training to a broader form of industrial training. I think it is necessary to lump them all together.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I do not object to that except to say that, if the allocation has been broken up, surely at least the Minister ought to be in a position to say exactly how much he has allocated for the industrial and commercial training scheme. This was an election pledge. The Minister has said today that the Government intends to go on with the Bill, I hope after a consensus has been received. I am glad the Minister said that, because I believe this legislation will cause major difficulties with certain people in the community. But that is not the argument at the moment. What is the allocation for that scheme? That is all I am asking now.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The actual work of developing the scheme is being done by the Research Branch of the department and is therefore recovered under a different line. The only specific allocation for that new Bill would be for the Industrial Training Council, for which \$1 000 has been allocated if a training council was appointed and if legislation was passed through this House before the end of this financial year. It will take some time to take what has been a discussion paper and produce not only a draft Bill but final legislation to be presented to this Parliament. It would be inappropriate to allocate any finance in large sums until that legislation is passed. I would not expect that legislation to go through until next year.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The Minister must have some forward thinking plans in this area if he has reached the stage of recommending that a Bill be drawn up. Is he able to tell the Committee whether or not more people will be employed under this provision than are employed under the present apprenticeship provision? He must have some idea of whether or not the thing will grow or be minimised.

It seems to me that it has taken a fair amount of ground in this area. The name industrial and commercial training seems to imply that it is going much wider than the old apprenticeship system. If he cannot tell me how much will be allocated, can he tell me whether the staff will be increased or decreased?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There will be an increase, particularly compared to the present apprenticeship position, because there are already people in the Industrial Training Section of the department, which will be incorporated under the new section. Until legislation is drawn up and passed through this Parliament, it is not possible to say specifically what the staffing requirements will be, but there are approximately 28 or 29 people already in that overall section of the department. I think it is more appropriate to see whether that is adequate before coming along and asking for an additional allocation of funds to take on additional staff, particularly as it will not be until next year before that legislation is before Parliament.

Mr. O'NEILL: Who will the Chief Training Services Officer and the training development officers be training? The Minister referred earlier to the role of the Department of Further Education; who will these people be training, and what will the Government be training them for?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: They are the officers who have been there for a number of years and who are already carrying out functions within the department as spelt out in the annual report of the department. If the honourable member requires more detail on that, I refer him to the annual report that was tabled in this Parliament only about a month ago.

Trade and Industry, \$1 258 000

Chairman:

Mr. G. M. Gunn.

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
 Mr. E. S. Ashenden
 Mr. H. Becker
 Mr. R. E. Glazbrook
 Mr. K. C. Hamilton
 Mr. J. W. Olsen
 Mr. H. H. O'Neill
 The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. L. B. Bowes, Director, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr. G. Jones, Senior Administration Officer, Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr. L. G. Rowe, Director of Industrial Development, Department of Trade and Industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions in relation to expenditure?

Mr. BECKER: Are we going to proceed step by step with this vote or are we going to go through the entire vote as a whole?

The CHAIRMAN: It would probably be easier if we did. It is not absolutely essential, but I think it would be easier for everyone concerned if members related their questioning to each individual line. However, as members would be aware, the only matter which is drawn to

members' attention when the discussion is concluded is the total allocation.

Mr. BECKER: The provision for the Office of Director-General is \$134 000, a reduction of some \$29 000. What is being done as an incentive to industry and the establishment of industry in this State? This morning I referred to technological change, and I suggested that perhaps we ought to be looking at making South Australia the technological centre of Australia, whether that is possible, and whether this section is working on it or could work on it or be involved in it?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Perhaps if I could begin by making some general comments about the whole organisation of the department, and if members take particular note I think it will answer many of the individual questions that they may have on separate lines. As members are probably aware, the Department of Trade and Industry has undergone a fairly significant change in senior personnel within the last two or three months. The former Director-General of Trade and Industry, Mr. Bakewell, took up the position of Ombudsman in this State at the end of June and, therefore, his former position is nominally vacant, and it has been taken over, for reasons of administration under the Public Service Act, by Mr. Bowes.

The position of Director-General for Trade Promotion, which was Mr. Bill Davies's position, is now vacated. Mr. Davies had a five-year contract with the Government. That contract finished on Wednesday of last week, and Mr. Davies was offered a renewal of that contract. Because of other interests that he wished to take up at this stage, he decided not to ask for a renewal. That immediately would explain why, for instance, there is a significantly reduced allocation for that line.

The other point I raise is that the Budget Estimates as presented to this Committee are based on what was the old structure of that department. The old department had a Director-General, or permanent head, immediately beneath him a Director-General of Trade Promotions, and then six divisions, those divisions being the Development Division, the Economics Division, the Operations Division, the Research and Planning Division and the Statutory Corporations Division, and I think there was an Administration Division. That structure has now been changed.

One of the reasons why it is important not to get too concerned about the actual allocation under each individual line there is that, as we move now into the new financial year 1980-81, and since the Budget documents were prepared, a new structure has been proposed for that department. It is still being discussed with the Public Service Board, and there needs to be some realisation by Committee members of the fluid position that exists.

What we are proposing is to have a Director-General of the department, or a Director of the department, and then to have two functional divisions beneath that Director-General, one dealing with financial incentives and the other dealing with development projects, industry research and industrial liaison and promotion. Under the financial incentives section, or services and assistance division, we would have two sub-branches (one management services and incentives and the other industry services and finance). What we therefore have is an operational section within the department dealing specifically with applications for financial assistance. Then we have another broad section of the department dealing with development and, in particular, industrial promotion, development projects and industrial research.

I believe that it was important that we review the structure of the department with a change in senior

personnel, and I am sure Committee members appreciate that, when you have both the Director-General, or permanent head, and No. 2 in that department move out and new personnel move in, it is important to review the structure and the functions of the department. We have reviewed the relationship between the Department of Trade and Industry and the other Government departments that exist, and particularly the relationship between Trade and Industry and State Development. There has been some confusion in the past as to the different roles of those two departments and I think it is important that I clarify now the difference between the roles for these two departments.

This State in its Public Service structure has a number of operating departments, and when I say "operating departments" I mean that they are departments that carry out specific responsibilities within difficult industries. I will name a number of them: the Department of Mines and Energy, which obviously deals with the mining sector; the Department of Agriculture, which deals with agricultural industry; the Tourism Department, which deals with matters of tourism; the Department of Trade and Industry, which, in the same operational sense, deals with secondary industry (manufacturing industry), tertiary industry, with the exclusion of those other operating departments. Another department, the Department of Marine and Harbors, obviously deals with transport matters on the sea; then there is the Department of Transport, which deals with land transport matters.

As an overview to all of those operating departments, we have the State Development Division headed by Mr. Nat Tiddy, directly reporting to the Premier. That division quite rightly has the role of co-ordinating all of the activities of the operating departments, of the overview, and particularly of developing a corporate strategy for the Government as to where its overall initiative should be. That format has worked extremely well. We now have regular meetings between the Department of Trade and Industry and Mr. Tiddy, so that we can liaise and make sure there is proper co-ordination.

There were some initial problems when we developed this structure, but I believe that those problems have now been overcome. The honourable member asked why the allocation for the office of the Director-General was reduced. The reason is the change in structure and the fact that certain key personnel have left the department. The honourable member also asked what initiatives the department is taking to make Adelaide the technology centre of Australia. I am delighted to say that this has been one of the main thrusts of the department in a number of areas, which include the setting up of the Council on Technological Change, which has a responsibility, under the area that I call industrial affairs and employment, to consider the employment and training aspects. The council also has the responsibility to ensure that South Australian industry takes on the best possible technology, and that will come under this Department of Trade and Industry.

One officer, Mr. Ian Kowalick, is one of the best departmental officers to be found anywhere in Australia in this area. Mr. Kowalick came from private industry and has experience in a number of high technology industries; he will make a very valuable contribution to that department and to the council. He is a member of the Council on Technological Change. I suppose that one of the most important things is to have the right personnel. Further, I stress the attributes of the person who is the functional head of the department on a day-to-day basis—Mr. Lincoln Rowe, Director of Industrial Development. Mr. Rowe was an engineer with considerable experience in private industry; he gives the overall

leadership to the department on a day-to-day basis and backs up in this specialised area.

The department has also established the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Committee, with Mr. Lincoln Rowe as Chairman and Mr. Ian Kowalick and Mr. Bob Manning as officers of that committee, as well as people from outside and from other departments, including Mr. Tiddy. That committee has played a unique role for Government in the past. So often people look to Government for financial assistance and nothing else, but this committee has given leadership to the motor industry in a period of tremendous change and uncertainty, which has been brought about by the proposed import-export complementation scheme and also by the world's changing energy situation. Therefore, this is an industry that is under real threat and change at present. One only needs to look at the motor industry in a number of countries to see what the consequences of that change could be.

The Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Committee has set out to consider what new technologies will be needed in the motor industry over the next 10 to 15 years and to ensure that the large number of component manufacturers in South Australia are aware of that new technology and that they take it on board, so that they can produce not only for a small domestic market but so that they can produce component parts for the world car. Already, 110 component manufacturers have been visited; there has been discussion about the existing technologies and the products that those companies produce, and advice has been given, where possible, in regard to new areas that companies should consider. One of the miscellaneous lines involves finance given through the Department of Trade and Industry to those companies to take on new technologies. This is a unique way in which a Government department, rather than by regulating, legislating, or handing out finance, has, with perhaps the minimum of interference, given a positive lead to an industry. I have been very heartened by the excellent response received from private companies in regard to what they consider as a unique and new role of the South Australian Government.

Further, in April this year I announced that the Department of Trade and Industry would set up a feasibility study into the establishment of what is described as the technology development estate in South Australia. I have been heartened by the initial investigation, and I believe that there is considerable interest in the possibility of establishing such an estate. I can assure the Committee that this Government will proceed as quickly as possible to finish any such feasibility study.

The Government, through its financial incentives, has also directed as much finance as possible to encourage companies to take on new technologies, which will allow a rapid expansion of the industry in this State. We have also tried to promote some of the local companies that have high technology so that they can expand. For example, Codan has unique technology that could be employed if a satellite was used for communication purposes over Australia. The Federal Government has recently announced that it will proceed with the projected communication satellite and we, as a State Government, have tried to promote companies like Codan to participate in that type of project. In addition, we see scope, through increased defence expenditure, for increased local participation in that high technology area. This coming Thursday, Mr. Lincoln Rowe and I will visit defence people in Canberra in an attempt to ensure that our local industry can participate in high technology defence contracts.

I have mentioned only some of the different areas in

which we have taken an initiative. I am confident that Adelaide, because of its unique location, background and urban life style, can become the technology centre for Australian industry, but this will require a great deal of time, effort and resources. I believe that a concerted effort is needed over a 10 to 15-year period so that that end can be achieved. Certainly, we have the basis and we now need to build on that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Minister advise whether the allocation for departmental expenditure includes the allowance of about \$42 000 for the position of Permanent Head? I know that the Minister has outlined the procedures occurring at present, but he did not say (or if he did, I did not understand him to say) what will happen in the future. I know that there is an acting head at present. When will the position be filled?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government intends to fill that position. There is an allocation under the Director-General of Trade and Industry of \$43 066.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The position has been vacant for quite some time, in fact, to the best of my knowledge, since April, when a person was compulsorily transferred to the Ombudsman position (or it certainly looked like that). When will this position be filled? I know the Minister said that the Government intends to fill the position, but I point out that it has been vacant for some months and, to my knowledge, no advertisement has appeared in this regard.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr. Bakewell was not compulsorily transferred, and it is quite improper that the Deputy Leader makes such a suggestion, because he knows only too well, as a former Minister, that compulsory transfer under the Public Service Act requires a specific procedure. Mr. Bakewell took the job of his own volition; he is delighted with his new position and he looks forward to the challenge that confronts him. The former position has been vacant for only three months. It has not been advertised for a very specific reason: the former long-standing Permanent Head of that department initiated his own structure and policies, and we want to reassess the structure and the policies. We believe that it would be inappropriate to advertise for a Permanent Head until that review has been done. The review is being undertaken and I assure the honourable member that, when it is finished, the position will be publicly advertised.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I take the Minister's point that there are ways and means of transferring people under the Public Service Act, but why was Mr. Bakewell removed from the position he held to the Ombudsman position?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr. Bakewell was not removed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not convinced that Mr. Bakewell was not compulsorily transferred. I certainly believe that he was, and I feel sorry for his having to put up with that position. The Minister said that the position had been vacant for three months and that it was not the intention at present to advertise that position. Is it the intention to transfer that department into the Premier's Department under the directorship of Mr. Tiddy?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, it is not the Government's intention to transfer the Department of Trade and Industry under the Department of State Development. I have already clearly spelt out the quite different roles, namely, the operating role of the Department of Trade and Industry and the corporate strategy and co-ordinating role of the division of the Premier's Department, under Mr. Tiddy. It fascinates me that certain Opposition members during Question Time tried to spread rumour and speculation about the amalgamation of those departments.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In those circumstances, do I have it on record and guaranteed that the Department of Trade and Industry will stay as it is now for the future?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Department of Trade and Industry will continue to operate as a separate department.

Mr. O'NEILL: I gather from the plethora of information that the Minister disgorged a moment ago that technology plays an important part in this area, and he referred to a certain officer who has had considerable experience. Is the department pursuing any investigations in respect of research and technology in the area of the manufacture of gas centrifuges for uranium treatment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, the department is not specifically in the area of research. It has a representative on the Uranium Enrichment Committee; that is the only participation by the department in that area.

Mr. O'NEILL: Who is the representative?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr. Lincoln Rowe.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Which new industries have been attracted to South Australia during the past 12 months, and what prospects are there for the current financial year? One of the functions of the Department of Trade and Industry that has been listed is to locate and, wherever possible, develop viable markets for South Australian products. In the light of the failure of the Government's pay-roll tax incentive scheme for youth employment, under which only \$129 000 of the \$2 000 000 has been taken up, what new incentives has the department developed to stimulate the development of existing industries hence employment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I point out to the Deputy Leader that youth employment schemes do not come under this line. They come under "Miscellaneous" and should be dealt with there. The industries have received significant assistance over the past 12 months, and I have been heartened by the new industries that have been attracted to this State. I bring to the Deputy Leader's attention a new booklet which has been produced by the Department of Trade and Industry and which is called *Investment Profile*. The booklet received applause overseas from Australian trade officers and Australian embassies throughout Europe, and from a number of overseas visitors who have come to my department (we have a constant stream of them). They regard it as probably the best investment information booklet they have ever seen issued by a Government department. The booklet lists South Australia for investors in industry, the development and investment team, and outlines the role of State development and the Department of Trade and Industry. It lists South Australian Government incentives, and the Federal Government's incentives briefly. It gives a summary of South Australia's comparative advantages as a manufacturing area or industrial base. It lists the cost factors of the State, including industrial wage costs and other costs. It gives the quality of life advantages that this State has, and gives an industrial profile.

I refer members to the booklet to see the incentives offered and administered by the Department of Trade and Industry. In dealing with a specific list of companies that have come to the Government for assistance, and in listing these, I point out that the basis on which they have obtained assistance is that they are actually expanding or are new operations in South Australia. Under the establishment payments scheme (one of the numerous schemes that have been developed), 12 companies have received approval in the past 12 months and have received an estimated payment of \$486 600. In addition, four companies have come to the State seeking housing improvement—in other words, industrial premises under

the Housing Trust scheme—and they have received assistance to the value of \$4 830 000. There have been applications to the South Australian Development Corporation, although I do not have all the figures with me. The honourable member can get the details and the assistance offered by looking at the Auditor-General's Report for the last financial year. In addition, the Treasurer has issued guarantees valued at \$13 900 000 that have come before the Industries Development Committee. There have been applications before that committee since last November, with Government guarantees of \$1 035 000 and a grant of \$100 000.

I will list just some of the companies involved (it is a long list), such as William Angliss, Barossa Ceramics, which took over the old brick company at Nuriootpa, Contract Constructions, Disposable Products, and Grundfos Pumps.

Others include Pak Pacific Corporation, Quentron Optics, Kentish Potato Company, Taminga Furniture, and Mount Schank Meat Company. Bonaire has expanded its operations, John Shearer has considerably expanded its operations, with a proposed increase in employment of about 200 persons and a capital investment. G.M.H. has announced the establishment of a new plastics division of its corporation in South Australia, a project obtained by South Australia, bidding against three other locations. Castalloy Limited has received assistance to considerably expand its alloy castings for the world car, and likewise Rubery Owen Holdings, a significant company in South Australia. The Simpson Pope organisation announced earlier this year a proposal to build a dishwashing factory in South Australia, again a significant proposal, because, although the company had an existing factory in Victoria that could have been used, it decided to build a new factory in South Australia which would employ about 250 people.

Those are some of the companies that have received financial assistance and have been able to expand under the State Government's financial incentives. I think the overall effect has been significant. As Minister, I continue to be extremely optimistic about the improved confidence on the part of the private sector in this State as a place in which to establish industry, especially manufacturing industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Are the industries listed new industries, or extensions of present industries? How many industries have been re-established here from other States in the past 12 months?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Some are new industries, such as Grundfos Pumps, while others are not. Many represent significant expansions of existing companies. Some are new divisions and new operations. Simpson Pope is a new operation, and the G.M.H. proposal is an entirely new operation, not an extension of an existing operation. The John Shearer proposal represents a transfer and relocation of an existing manufacturing facility from Queensland to Adelaide.

We are negotiating with a company for a most significant relocation from New South Wales to South Australia, but it would not be appropriate for me to give details so that the New South Wales Government could try to prevent that relocation. As an indication of the confidence of the automotive industry in South Australia, let me remind the Deputy Leader that the Pagewood assembly plant was closed and many of its operations were transferred to South Australia. The list is a mixture of new businesses and extensions, and, without going through it, I cannot specify which is a new company and which is an expanded operation.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Considerable concern has been

expressed over the past few years about the increasing incidence of bankruptcy and voluntary liquidation in small businesses. Many times, this has been through a fault of some irregularity or unintentional illegality on the part of the small businessman. What area can the Minister indicate as benefiting small to medium businesses, and encouraging the people concerned to avail themselves of Government help with assistance in management expertise, marketing, and probably industrial relations, without feeling reticent, feeling that big brother is looking over their shoulder, that perhaps they could be found out in some unintentional irregularity, and without being scared of repercussions in the event of their speaking to departmental officers? There seems to be a feeling among small business people that they need to have some examples of success and some protection with product marketing of certain goods against competitors in similar fields. What is the scope of the department in that area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Small Business Advisory Section of the Department of Trade and Industry is totally inadequate, and that position is not of the making of this Government or of me, as Minister. It was totally inadequate when the Government took office. We have spent the intervening period reviewing the role of the unit and what functions we, as a Government, should carry on in that area, and how best to assist small industry.

Last year's allocation was \$69 000, and the allocation this year has been stepped up, I think significantly, to \$106 000. When I took over the old Department of Economic Development, 1½ officers were trying to answer the many queries of small businesses. They were completely run-down and demoralised, and they had no specific task to try to rectify the big problem confronting them. Some of the activities, I think, were directed in the wrong way. The most important assistance the Government can give to small businesses is to make sure that people have proper education and information before setting up in business. Once a small business is in financial straits, invariably it is too late to try to rescue it. To do so is like trying to block up a leaking dam.

Of the small businesses that fail, 70 per cent fail within the first two years, indicating clearly that they have failed because of insufficient planning and thought before their establishment. Therefore, the best role for a Government is to advise and educate people before they start in business, rather than acting as a corporate or small business doctor in trying to retrieve the situation.

A departmental officer went to Western Australia. I and a departmental officer went to the small business statutory authority in Victoria, and someone from the department has visited the University of New England and the New South Wales unit to assess what other States are doing, and therefore what role we should take here. We are in the final position now of analysing each of the functions in different States and deciding the best structure for any advisory unit to be adopted here, and trying to assess what staffing and finance will be required to restructure and revitalise the whole section. As Minister, I desire to get going with this as quickly as possible. This is one of the new initiatives taken since Mr. Lincoln Rowe took over the functional leadership of the department on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. HAMILTON: Has the Minister had any discussions with General Motors Holden in relation to a run-down of its activities at Woodville? Rumours are abroad in the north-western area on this matter. Has the Minister had discussions with Carr Fasteners, at Hendon, in relation to the effects of the car complementation scheme on its business?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Motor Vehicle Industries

Assistance Committee has an ongoing communication with the various sections of the motor industry. I have just spoken to the Chairman of that committee, Mr. Rowe, who indicated that there had not been recent discussions with G.M.H. Certainly, I was involved, along with other committee members and departmental officers, in detailed discussions with G.M.H. some months ago. In those discussions G.M.H. certainly said it intended to keep Woodville going. It has been the practice of G.M.H. to have discussions with the Government if there is likely to be a significant change in its operations in the State, and it has certainly not indicated anything to us about a closure.

You may recall about four or six weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition trying to create some false speculation in the community about the closure of Woodville. I am not sure where he picked up the rumour, whether from the gutter or from his own imagination, but certainly from all of our checks with G.M.H. (and we did check them) there was absolutely no basis whatsoever for the speculation that occurred. It appeared to me that certain people were simply trying to play on the fear of the closure at the Pagewood plant at Sydney and to spread that fear to South Australia.

There is no doubt that G.M.H. is suffering along with the rest of the automotive industry in Australia. Total sales of automobiles have been about 70 000 units down this year compared to the projected figures given by the I.A.C. Furthermore, there is no doubt that some companies have lost their market share, and that has caused problems. G.M.H., as I have indicated, has great confidence in South Australia. Since the beginning of this year it has transferred some of the assembly and production of Commodores to South Australia, it has introduced the new Statesman, which will be produced wholly within South Australia, and it has announced its intention to establish a plastics division.

I think that, if we look at the G.M.H. proposals of operations throughout Australia, this State has benefited most of all. I do not deny for one moment that its work force has decreased, but that is the experience being undergone by even very successful motor manufacturers which have been actually expanding their sales. In other words, there has been an increase in productivity in the motor industry and the number of manhours required to produce a motor vehicle now is significantly down on what it was several years ago.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister and the secretary of the relevant committee state categorically that they have no knowledge of any plans by G.M.H. to close a section of the plant at Woodville? In asking that question I make it quite clear, in respect of the remark the Minister made, that the Leader of the Opposition is not in the habit of getting down in the gutter to get information or make allegations, and, contrary to what one might infer from the actions of some members of the other side last week, a strong rumour was going around amongst quite respectable members of trade unions, that, because of the activities taking place in G.M.H. at Woodville, and based on previous activities, despite categorical assurances from the company that nothing was going to happen, there was a considerable rundown in production, and therefore the proposition the Leader put a while ago was firmly based on previous experience. Can the Minister state categorically that he has no knowledge of any move to shut down a section of G.M.H. at Woodville?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If the Leader of the Opposition was so concerned about the future of certain operations at Woodville for G.M.H., before making any accusations or statements publicly he ought to have checked with G.M.H. senior management to see their reaction. If he

had done that he would not have created a false scare amongst the community with absolutely no basis for making that accusation.

Mr. O'NEILL: The Minister is engaging in debate, but I asked a simple question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Six weeks ago I made contact, through my department, with the managing director of G.M.H. for the whole of Australia, and he gave a personal assurance that there was no intention of closing down any section of Woodville. To answer the question specifically: "No", the chairman of the Motor Vehicles Industries Assistance Committee, Mr. Lincoln Rowe, has no such knowledge of any proposed closure.

Mr. O'NEILL: You said you asked six weeks ago—have you any reason to believe that circumstances might have changed in the interim?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, none whatever. I referred to six weeks ago because that was when the rumour was spread by the Leader of the Opposition without bothering to check on the factuality of it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I take exception to the attitude of the Minister. All day he has been attempting to score points and criticise Opposition members, and now he has accused the Leader of getting his information from the gutter. I can assure the Minister that the Leader did not get his information from the gutter; he got it from a high source indeed. I remind the Minister that the New South Wales Government was so assured by G.M.H. four weeks before G.M.H. closed down the plant in New South Wales. I am not suggesting that G.M.H. is playing the same game here, but I am saying that the information the Leader received on that occasion was reliable, and it was responsible information. He did not get it out of the gutter. I remind the Minister that he ought to keep checking with G.M.H., because clearly the Minister in New South Wales was deceived; he was told that the plant was not going to be closed, but it was.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I give an undertaking that the chairman of that committee, Mr. Lincoln Rowe, will check with G.M.H. immediately to seek an assurance again that it has no intention of closing any of the sections at Woodville. I point out that the New South Wales Minister of Industrial Relations, Mr. Pat Hills, would dispute the statement by the deputy Leader that his Government did not have prior knowledge of the closure. He in fact says that he was told.

Mr. ABBOTT: No amount has been allocated for insurance premiums. Will the Minister explain why that is so?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The insurance premiums were for Mr. Bill Davies's superannuation scheme. As he has now left the department, there is no need to make any further provision for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If there are not, we will dispose of the Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr. BECKER: There seems to be confusion. You are now putting to the Committee the vote of \$1 258 000?

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Then we will go to "Miscellaneous".

Mr. HAMILTON: The allocation for payments to consultants for services has been increased by \$15 000. What specific areas are covered by that increase?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Part of that allocation is for the consultancy which I have spoken of concerning the technology development estate and which is currently proceeding. It also covers a number of other areas. As a department we found the best way of assisting industry often is not just to hand out money but rather to assist the

company to seek the advice of a consultant, particularly where a new technology is involved. I believe it is better for us to assist companies to take on consultants with some specific purpose in mind, rather than hand out finance, almost as the banker of last resort. We have had a rather bitter experience in a number of areas, including Riverland Fruit Products, Golden Breed and others. The Government feels that the policies of a Government simply acting as a banker of last resort are unsuccessful and, if one is not careful, one is propping up the next company which is about to fail and which will probably fail irrespective of how much finance is pumped into it. It is better to get companies that are viable to start taking on new technology and to encourage them to expand. The Government has consultancy grants for that means as well as for specific purposes to allow the Government to take further advice. Also, we had the use of a number of consultants in the motor vehicles industry area to assist in a review of 110 component companies in that area that I have spoken of already. There are fixed commitments already allocated in the first three months of this year under that line.

Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$8 158 000

Chairman:

Mr. G. M. Gunn

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott.
Mr. E. S. Ashenden.
Mr. H. Becker.
Mr. R. E. Glazbrook.
Mr. K. C. Hamilton.
Mr. J. W. Olsen.
Mr. H. H. O'Neill.
The Hon. J. D. Wright.

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Departmental Adviser:

Mr. L. G. Rowe, Director of Industrial Development, Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the line "Community Improvement through Youth Programme", and note that there has been a reduction from \$269 183 to \$145 000. I have the greatest admiration and respect for Mr. Turner, who is the head of this organisation, and I think his intentions and ideas are excellent. I know of his concern for work in the area of handicapped children, and I have known him personally when he was involved with Minda Home. I was absolutely disgusted when I saw the condition of the office of CITY on the second floor of I.M.F.C. House. I would like to know how much it cost to refurbish that office when the organisation moved, I think into the railway station building. I believe this ought to be brought to the attention of the Committee, because I would expect better use of Government buildings, particularly if we have to pay the rent and pay for the re-establishment of offices. I am wondering what is being done to ensure that it does not happen at the new premises.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: First, I assure the honourable member that there has been no reduction in the line. Although the actual allocation last year was \$269 000 and the allocation this year is \$145 000, the reason for that has

already been explained; the staff lines which were previously shown under "Miscellaneous" are now covered under different staffing lines and Budget lines of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. The amount of \$145 000 is for specific projects, and it is exactly the same amount as was allocated last year for CITY.

The honourable member mentioned previous accommodation of the CITY programme in I.M.F.C. House. It was not so much a reflection on the people involved in CITY, but unfortunately a reflection on the people who came in to attend CITY and the way that they somewhat abused that accommodation. It concerned me, too, when I had a complaint that somebody at 8 o'clock in the morning was sitting on the second floor of I.M.F.C. House cooking chops, sausages and fried eggs on a primus situated in the foyer immediately outside the lifts. That person was not a CITY person but a member of the public who had come in and was waiting for the office to open. It was therefore appropriate that the office be transferred, and it is now located in the railway station building, which I think is more suitable accommodation for its purposes.

Mr. BECKER: How much did it cost to refurbish I.M.F.C. House?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot give that detail; it probably comes under the Public Buildings line, but I shall obtain the details for him and make them available. The biggest complaint was about the smell of the cooking; no damage was done.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister explain the reduction in the grant to the Waite Institute?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, I can. Previously the grant was for the resilient cone thresher, which was quite an innovative development out there. I think an officer was taken on for a period of three years, and that three-year contract terminates in September at about this time. Therefore, the financial allocation for this year is \$7 000, which covers the period up to now. There have been discussions with the gentleman involved and with the company involved; I am concerned that, if possible, that innovation continue to be developed commercially. That is being undertaken in a joint venture between the gentleman involved and Hannaford Machinery.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I refer to the amount for the home handyman scheme, which I understand, initially, was divisible by the 35 councils and country area councils, and this worked out to \$10 000 per council for the home handyman scheme. In the event of councils not taking up their allocation, I seek an assurance that this money will be used for home handyman schemes in other areas.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The allocation to each council area was not simply a division of the 35 councils into the total amount, making \$10 000 a council. There are many more council areas than that throughout the State. Allocation is being made to all council areas for the first time, whereas previously it has been restricted mainly to the metropolitan area. From memory, it was allocated on a per capita basis, and certain councils did not apply for it and therefore did not receive funds. The amount varied between \$1 000 and \$2 000 for the very small councils up to \$10 000 for the large councils. I can assure the honourable member that, although the full \$350 000 has not been allocated, once we take in administrative expenses and contingencies the amount will be allocated during this year.

Mr. BECKER: Administrative expenses come out of the \$350 000?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am sorry; apparently it is just for grants to councils, but occasionally some over-runs occur which we must cover.

Mr. HAMILTON: Do I take it from the inference of the

member for Brighton that some councils have been allocated money and have not used it up?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, that is certainly not the case. I have no knowledge of councils that have been allocated funds that have not used them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The two schemes about which the Liberal members were seeking information were the CITY scheme and the home handyman scheme and were both inaugurated by the Labor Government. They were both excellent schemes. I have a two-pronged question at the moment concerning the establishment payments scheme. How many applications were received during the past 12 months for assistance under this scheme; how many applications were approved and how many were rejected; and, if rejected, why were they rejected?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Applications approved, 30; applications recommended, one; applications being assessed, 15; applications to be assessed, five; and non-current applications, 63. This gives a total of 114. I think they cover the whole period for the establishment payments scheme, since it was first commenced in about July 1968. The honourable member should appreciate that it is very difficult to pin applications down to a particular financial year. A person makes an application, it is assessed (which takes some time) and the company then goes ahead and expands its employment, and payment is finally made, often 12 months or two years or more after that approval has been given. Approval is not given unless it is given before the scheme is developed or the work is proceeded with. Therefore, you need to be very careful in trying to equate approvals given with moneys actually spent, committed and paid out in that year.

Approvals given in 1979-80 are 12 firms, with an estimated payment of \$486 000. Payments were made to eight firms, at a cost of \$244 943. Commitments as at 30 June 1980 were to 17 firms for a total commitment of \$933 600. For the first three months of the financial year 1980-81, approvals to 30 September are to seven firms with an estimated payment, if they are proceeded with, of \$321 900, which indicates that approvals have been stepped up in the first three months of this year, compared to the position last year. The actual allocation for expenditure last year under the scheme was \$825 000. The actual allocation this year under the same line is for \$1 000 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What incentive or financial assistance has been given to South Australian firms during the past 12 months through the South Australian Development Corporation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The South Australian Development Corporation does not come under my responsibility. The Industries Development Act specifically allocates that to the Treasurer. The details are in the Auditor-General's Report and any questions should be directed to the Treasurer.

Mr. BECKER: Is this scheme working? Last financial year 12 firms were successful in being allocated payments. I wonder what employment that created, and whether the recipient firms were large or small. Did these firms still make pay-roll tax payments or were they small firms that did not make pay-roll tax payments? Could this be a reward for inefficiency or perhaps a means of a company's being able to use taxpayers' money to keep them in South Australia or keep them afloat. I am just wondering whether this scheme is really working in the interests of employment and development opportunities in this State.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think the scheme is worth it. I had been somewhat critical of it when I came into the Ministry. I think after 12 months my assessment is that it is

a worthwhile scheme but it needs revision, and we are currently revising it at the specific request of the Industries Development Committee in relation to the guidelines or the terms of reference for the operation of the establishment payments scheme. It would appear that the emphasis is in the wrong areas, and certainly there is emphasis for, for instance, regional significance which is less important now that we have our very generous land tax and pay-roll tax rebates for decentralised industry, and I believe that insufficient emphasis is given to employment creation under the scheme.

The figures since the creation of the scheme are rather confusing, because the previous Government had allocated financial incentives and included in its list of approved schemes Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative. There it had listed 200 jobs and an allocation of over \$300 000. When you look at that scheme and realise that that is unlikely to meet its objectives, you have to depreciate significantly the claims made by the previous Government about its success under the scheme. Despite some limitations to the scheme, there is no doubt that the most attractive industrial incentive that can be offered to any company is what we have described as payment up front. In other words, we make the financial assistance at the beginning rather than make it an on-going assistance.

The Government's industrial premises policy under the Housing Trust is an extremely attractive policy because it allocates a factory and allows that company to write off annual leasing or rental charges for that factory, so that the company is not required to find \$2 000 000 to \$3 000 000 to construct a factory and, furthermore, instead of having to receive the rather meagre tax deductions under depreciation for a normal factory, under our lease purchase scheme based on 17 years it can write off the entire cost of the lease each year, so in effect it gets a factory first, without having to put up any capital and is able to write off the entire purchase cost of that factory as a tax deduction.

In discussions we have had with a number of companies that have come to the Government and asked what incentives we offer, the Housing Trust industrial premises incentive, the establishment payments scheme, and the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Committee incentives have been by far the most attractive, and they constitute the reason why we have been reasonably successful. It is interesting to see other State Governments starting to follow the example set down by the South Australian Government in offering incentives.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have a series of questions that I would like to follow through in relation to the motor vehicle industry assistance scheme. The Minister will recall that he announced some time earlier this year (I think in February) that an amount of \$750 000 was to be spent over the next five months to help South Australia restructure its car industry. How much money has been spent by the car industry this year, or last year up to 30 June?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The sum actually spent in 1979-80 was \$503 000, but there was a commitment under that scheme for a further \$400 000 and, because the company had not reached the objectives of that commitment (which we expect to occur this year), that money was not paid last financial year. It is fair to say that, in the whole of last financial year, the commitment given was for \$903 000, which was almost the entire Budget allocation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I wish to ask the Minister a series of five questions, either in bulk or separately, as the Minister prefers. First, what benefit has come from the expenditure?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will answer separately. The benefit overall has been that a number of component companies in South Australia have been realistic in

reassessing where they are heading in regard to their production, and I believe that this has been one of the most successful programmes implemented by the State Government, certainly on a cost effectiveness basis. I have been amazed to find that large companies, which were almost locked into production component cars for an existing motor industry, were prepared to send representatives overseas to look at the new component parts. The benefit has been outstanding. I could obtain detailed information for the Deputy Leader or I could make a statement to the House when it resumes, giving more specific information for each allocation of finance.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is entirely in the Minister's hands. Which companies have received funds; what have they spent the funds on; has any money been spent on labour replacing technology; and is any of the money used for retraining workers? In all probability, the Minister may want to obtain a report in this regard.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot answer all of the questions now and I may not be able to answer some of the questions at all because, in many cases, commercial private information is involved. If that information was revealed, competitors of these companies would be aware of their position, and the last thing I want is to allow interstate rivals of these companies to know what we are doing for the companies. Neither do I want other companies to pre-empt what may happen here. I can indicate that certain companies have received assistance. I believe it is inappropriate to spell out what the companies have received. It may be best if I obtain more detailed information for the honourable member.

I want to be very careful that I do not give information that will allow competitive companies to know what is going on in the companies that have received assistance. I will make available the name of the company involved, but I will not divulge the individual amounts given to the company, nor say what the money has been spent on, because I believe that that is inappropriate. However, I can indicate whether the money was spent on consultancy or on new technology.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Is the Government satisfied that it is receiving itemised accounts for the money that has been allocated and spent by whatever companies have received it, and is the Government satisfied that those companies are spending the money in the areas for what it was allocated?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government is satisfied, and I can also assure the Deputy Leader that some of the allocated money has been spent to allow retraining of people in regard to new technologies.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister, in a press statement in February, announced the setting up of the Motor Vehicle Industry Assistance Committee, headed by Mr. Lincoln Rowe. Who are the other members of the committee; who chose the members; and what remuneration do the members get, if any?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I announced a committee, to which I have referred during these proceedings. The Chairman of that committee is Mr. Lincoln Rowe; the departmental officers are Mr. Kowalick and Mr. Manning, and Mr. Tiddy, Director of State Development, is involved. Two private industry people are also involved, and I believe that I clearly indicated at the time of the announcement that Mr. Arthur, formerly Managing Director of Tecalemit, and Mr. Carlier, former Supply Manager, and Director of Ford Australia, who is now residing in Adelaide, are also members of that committee. I understand that the two outside members, Mr. Arthur and Mr. Carlier, receive \$55 for every half day of sitting of that committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I realise that some information should not be made public, but I ask the Minister to say how many of the 110 component companies have taken up the opportunity to use this money to improve their business acumen, and whether all of the component companies in South Australia have been contacted and given the opportunity to do this if they require?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: To our knowledge, all of the 110 major companies have been contacted. I stress that some very small component companies, which employ one or two people, might not have been contacted, but the 110 significant companies of which we know have been contacted and departmental officers, or consultants on behalf of the Government, have assessed their present manufacturing strategies. I am not prepared to say what companies approached the Government, and I must stress that it was not envisaged that all 110 companies would ask for assistance.

We believe that the role of the committee is to encourage companies to be realistic about the future and, in many cases, consultancy with the companies has had the most beneficial effect. It is like someone sitting down and saying, "Do you appreciate that things are changing; we can assist you in your discussions with Ford, G.M.H., Mitsubishi or a major assembler, and we can help you work through your problems, without giving you financial assistance." This is the uniqueness of the scheme: it does not involve only the Government's giving out money but it involves someone sitting down with members of these companies in a positive way to help them to assess what they are producing in an automotive world that is changing rapidly. I urge the Deputy Leader not to criticise companies for not asking for financial assistance, because the scheme is designed to go well beyond that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I want to make my position very clear; I made no attempt to be critical. Some of the companies, on principle, do not believe that the scheme is a proper scheme, and I do not criticise those companies. They must decide the proper course to take, and I am referring to the world car scheme. I am delighted about the fact that the Minister has spoken extremely well about this scheme. He has said how well it works, and I am delighted to hear that. He has said that companies are taking the opportunity to involve themselves in the scheme, and this is helping the car industry. I am delighted about that, because I believe that it should be placed on record that the Labor Government started that scheme. The initial concept was put forward by Des Corcoran as Premier; the scheme was implemented by the Labor Government.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have previously indicated that Des Corcoran announced the allocation of \$1 000 000 almost 12 months ago, in June or July 1979. I have also indicated my support for the scheme and I congratulated the then Premier. I point out to the honourable member that our Government has substantially changed the composition of the committee.

The previous committee felt that it was inadequate to carry out the task given to it. So, we reviewed the membership and the functions of that committee, and substantially increased its role. The Government sent two officers overseas earlier this year. They have prepared a report, and we will probably be making copies of the report available to each of the component companies in this State. The significance of that is that they went overseas and assessed what changes had taken place in automobile design and structure and they suggested what should be done for it here in South Australia.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Olsen): Could the Minister indicate that in obtaining a report for incorporation in *Hansard* it will be reasonably brief and suitable for such incorporation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Certainly. I can now point out to the member for Hanson the cost of repairing any damage done to the I.M.F.C. building because of CITY accommodation. It has been estimated by the Public Buildings Department that it was between \$1 500 and \$2 000, which is rather minimal.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister give more detail of the schemes operating in the Riverland, and what industries are involved?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think that the honourable member is referring to the Riverland Development Fund. The previous Government had allocated a rebate of pay-roll tax for co-operatives within the Riverland. It was not a payment direct to the company. They took the pay-roll tax paid by the co-operatives, put it into a fund, and made some of those moneys available for restructuring of the co-operatives. The first example of that was the amalgamation of the co-operative from Loxton and Renmark into one co-operative. I understand also that there was some rebate to the Riverland Fruit Products cannery.

The Government has discontinued that proposal for two reasons: many of the companies eligible under the old Riverland Development Fund are now eligible for full pay-roll and land tax rebates under our new decentralisation policies. I stress in this case that this money goes direct back to the company, and not into a general fund. The co-operatives benefit far more under our proposal than they did under the previous fund arrangement. Any company which was not covered by the new scheme but which was receiving a rebate under the old scheme will continue to receive a rebate, but it will go directly back to that co-operative.

Mr. ABBOTT: What sum has been allocated to the schemes in the Riverland?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There is no allocation this year. The allocation last year was \$540 000, all of which has been included under the rebates on pay-roll and land tax for decentralised industry. The total allocation for that line is \$3 000 000 this year. That highlights the significant financial incentives now being offered by the Government. The honourable member must appreciate that the \$3 000 000 will apply only for the six months during which the scheme operated. It commenced on 1 January 1980 and, after 1 July, the companies will receive rebates on pay-roll tax and land tax. The payment of \$3 000 000 will cover the period from January to June of the 1979-80 financial year; that \$3 000 000 includes any payment still made from the Riverland Development Fund. I stress that, in a full year, we would expect the decentralisation grants to be about \$6 000 000.

Mr. ABBOTT: What funds were spent under the country industry pay-roll tax incentive scheme in 1979-80, and what is the allocation for 1980-81? Can the Minister say how many country jobs have been saved or provided as a result of that scheme?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I just answered that very question. There was an allocation in 1979-80, but no money was spent, because of the way in which the scheme operated. If the honourable member wants an explanation as to why, in 1979-80, \$6 000 000 was allocated under this total line, but only \$2 500 000 was spent, it was because the Budget was introduced shortly after we came to office and before the actual administrative details of the pay-roll tax rebate were spelt out. We allocated \$3 000 000, knowing that it was the approximate cost for half a year of

operation of that scheme. When the scheme was finally approved and announced by Cabinet, it was decided to make the rebate after 1 July; so, there was no need for payments in 1979-80, even though \$3 000 000 had been allocated. That is the reason for the big discrepancy, and it can be simply explained away by the decentralisation pay-roll and land tax rebates.

I know that some people have jumped up and down with joy and have almost split their sides thinking that the Government's policies were not working. That does not indicate that. It means that the scheme, as administered, put the \$3 000 000 in this financial year rather than in the last financial year. The \$3 000 000 is a significant allocation in not only encouraging new employment in the country but also ensuring that existing employment opportunities are stabilising. If you look at this State's record, you will see that there has been a drift of employment opportunities to the metropolitan area for at least the past 15 years. The best way of preventing that drift is to remove some of the disadvantages and disabilities faced by decentralised industry when trying to compete against industries in the metropolitan area. A decentralised industry is forced to pay increased telephone charges and increased transport costs, and face the inconvenience of not having door-to-door deliveries with capital cities and companies elsewhere.

That is why it is important that the Government give some financial incentive to those industries outside of Adelaide. If we did not do that, the other option would be to find existing Government public utilities in country towns being under-utilised, so that we would be forced to invest millions of dollars in Adelaide simply to allow the metropolitan area to expand further. South Australia is already the most centralised of all of the Australian States, with about 72 per cent of our total population living in Adelaide. It is because of the lack of those decentralisation incentives that this State has been put into that predicament. We, as a State, found that we could not compete against Victoria and New South Wales, which offered that sort of financial incentive to decentralised industry. New operations have been developed in the country, probably as a direct result of those rebates.

I give as an example that, early next year, I hope to be opening the new sleeper production for Omark, at Whyalla, and I am pleased to announce to the Committee some of the details. Omark is installing capital equipment from July to December 1980; pilot production will commence in January 1981; and full production, with two shifts, is expected in April 1981. It is expected that initially between 12 and 15 people will be employed when the plant is commissioned in January 1981, and that, by the time it has reached full operating capacity in two or three years, employment will grow to between 30 and 40 people.

The Omark organisation estimates that the establishment of the facility will represent a \$2 000 000 investment at Whyalla. This is the first time the details have been given. It is a significant new development for Whyalla, and one we should be proud of, especially as the decentralisation incentives have helped.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I take it that we are dealing with the pay-roll tax rebate scheme for youth workers. Is that the scheme which the Premier said would provide some 7 000 to 10 000 jobs? If so, can the Minister say why only \$129 000 was spent out of the \$2 000 000 allocated for the last nine months of the last financial year? How far does \$129 000 go towards creating 7 000 jobs?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The expenditure on pay-roll tax for people under the age of 20 years for 1979-80 was \$129 000. One of the reasons why that figure may appear low is the way in which the scheme is administered.

Payments are not made until three months after the person is taken on, and therefore the actual allocation of finance has been for a six-month effective period, because the scheme was first implemented on 1 October 1979. Payments are not made until three months later, referring to the payment of \$600 for the first employee and \$1 800 for two additional employees.

The Honourable member asks specifically whether that was the scheme under which the Premier claimed that 6 000 or 7 000 new jobs would be created. The Premier's announcement was that the Liberal Party believed that, over a three-year period, it could create 7 000 new jobs in this State. It offered a number of incentives and policies to achieve that.

Turning to specific details, let me say that there are three parts to the scheme. The first part was to lift the base exemption on pay-roll tax. This is administered by State Taxation, and no pay-roll tax was collected for that. We do not know how many jobs have been created, because there were no refunds involved to the Government. The second part of the scheme allowed an exemption from pay-roll tax for all additional employees taken on. As at the end of June, after only 10 months of the operation of the scheme, 1 982 people had been employed under it—almost 2 000 people in the first 10 months.

I believe this is a significant achievement, and I cannot see how the Deputy leader can claim that the scheme has not worked. We talked of a three-part proposal, and in 10 months we have created 2 000 jobs under the scheme. Under the third part of the proposal, involving a specific rebate to companies, the figures to 29 September showed that rebates had been paid to employers for employing 731 additional young people.

The part we were referring to in our policy referred specifically to total jobs created, and applications for 2 000 additional employees have been made under the scheme. The cost of that is not covered in the \$129 000. It is covered in pay-roll tax forgone by State Treasury and so that cost is not included in the figures. The allocation for the current financial year is \$1 000 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not accept and I never have accepted that 1 982 people have been employed under the scheme. I have suggested previously to the Minister and to the Premier that the majority of those people would have been employed in any case. I do not suggest that there were no new jobs, but that there have not been as many new jobs as the Minister would have us believe.

Will the Minister provide the Committee with a list of the names of the employers and employees to whom this scheme has applied, showing how many of them are still on the pay-roll of the employer at this moment, so that we can judge for ourselves the real position? I am never convinced that incentive schemes are 100 per cent effective, and I do not see how this one could possibly work. In fairness to the Minister and his assertions, I am prepared to accept some proof if he is prepared to provide it.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is "No", for two reasons. The Pay-roll Tax Act specifically excludes my releasing confidential information on companies. The honourable member has asked the question in the full knowledge that, under the Act, I am legally prohibited from releasing the information for which he has asked. He knows, from when he was Minister, the contents of the Act, and he cannot put up such a performance and ask for that information.

The second reason is that the administrative work load to list 2 000 individual employees employed under the scheme would be a nightmare, and I do not think it

appropriate. However, even if I wished to, I am excluded under the Act from doing so.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Minister say why \$1 000 000 has been allocated for pay-roll tax incentive schemes this year when only \$129 000 was taken up last year, following massive publicity? Does he expect the scheme to be more effective in 1981 than in 1979-80? A good mathematician would be able to work out the result of \$129 000 in 1984. It is not a large sum of money, as the Minister must concede. There is an allocation of \$1 000 000, as opposed to \$2 000 000 allocated last year with an expenditure of only \$129 000. Is it being kept there for publicity purposes, or is the Minister convinced that the \$1 000 000 allocated will be spent this year? The figures here, in comparison with those for last year, do not add up.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Deputy Leader knows that the real cost to the Government is substantially more than \$129 000. There are three quite separate parts of the pay-roll tax incentive scheme for youth employment. The first was the lifting of the base exemption, and that is a hidden cost in the State Budget. The second part was a rebate, or forgoing pay-roll tax for additional employees taken on. That comes under the Treasury vote, and not under this one.

The third part of the scheme relates to the specific rebate for an additional one or two employees taken on. That is only part of the scheme—that covers only the 731 additional employees, and that is the \$139 000. Again, it shows the extent to which, rather than rationally look at the figures in the new scheme, it would appear that someone is trying to create a political impression that the scheme has failed. I would have thought that 2 000 new jobs under this scheme in 10 months was a fairly good achievement—one that needed some publicising because it is a success that we can talk about after 12 months.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will give the Minister an opportunity to publicise it. First, I want to say that I think probably more money has been paid in wages to staff supervising the scheme than has been paid out in incentives. I put it to the Minister that if I were in his position as Minister I would have had an evaluation done about this scheme, what it has going for it, whether it is working, and what it needs to give it some impetus. I do not know whether the Minister has taken out an evaluation of the scheme or not, but if he has and if it is so successful, I ask the Minister to table that report. If he has not taken out an evaluation of the scheme, will the Minister consider having a proper evaluation of the scheme made and then let us know whether it is working or not?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The administrative costs come nowhere near the repayment to employers of \$139 000. If we took all three sections of the scheme into consideration, the administrative costs would be a fraction of the financial incentive offered back to employers. We must not forget that we are offering to those employers 5 per cent of the income for 2 000 employees: if they have an average income of \$8 000 (because they are younger people), that is 5 per cent of 2 000 times \$8 000, and that is a significant amount to any employer. Five per cent of \$16 000 000 is almost \$1 000 000. If the honourable member is going to talk about total costs of this matter to the Government, he would have to take into account the almost \$1 000 000 under that part of the scheme and add it to the \$139 000 here.

I go back to the answer I gave in the House only last week that, if one looks at the permanent employment created under this pay-roll tax scheme in terms of cost effectiveness and the number of permanent jobs given, it

can be seen that it has been clearly more successful than the SURS scheme, to which the sum of \$54 000 000 was spent to create permanent employment on about the same scale as we have achieved with just \$1 000 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What about the evaluation scheme I asked about? Has an evaluation of the scheme been done?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government evaluates schemes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister make public the evaluation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We do not make public all the information we collect in the department. It is quite inappropriate. If we decide to alter it, we will alter it and announce it publicly.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You will not make it public because you know it is crook.

Mr. HAMILTON: What abuses of this incentive scheme have been brought to the attention of the Minister, and can he give us the details of those abuses?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not know of any major abuses of the scheme. I think when one looks back over the operation of other schemes that have been implemented, for instance, the SURS scheme in which there was outrage in the Riverland because unemployed people on the SURS scheme were receiving \$180 or \$190 a week when regular council workers who were employed full time were receiving only \$160 a week, and when one looks at the abuse of other schemes, one must admit that the last 12 months has been remarkably free of any public criticism of the incentive scheme.

Mr. HAMILTON: The Minister may not be aware of any abuse, but are his officers aware of any abuses, and if so, what are they? The Minister said that no major abuses have been brought to his attention, but does he know of any minor ones?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, I do not know of any abuses. I am sure that if there was any abuse the Opposition members would be the first to raise the matter and bring it forward publicly. I cannot recall any such action by members of the Opposition. However, I will check with my officers to see whether there have been any abuses of the scheme. I think it is a credit to the people who put the time and effort into this scheme to make sure that it was watertight from the beginning. Any scheme will have some abuses, but they must be kept to a minimum.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister give any indication of the number of people who have retained their jobs as a result of this scheme? The Minister seems to have picked up the direction of the questioning wrongly. Committee members have been trying to get an assessment of the actual long-term benefits to young people. I am sure that it is what the Government wanted to do. However, we are aware of, and I am sure the Minister is aware of, some of the things that went on with some of the Federal Government's schemes where young people were taken on by an employer who gained some financial benefit from taking them on and then, after a period of time, dismissed them, took on more people, gained further benefit, and so it went on *ad infinitum*, and it may still be going on now. What I am trying to elicit from the Minister is whether it is clear from the information available to him that persons who have been taken on have in fact finished up with permanent jobs, or is there any indication that people have been taken on, the employer has gained an advantage, dumped them, and then sought to gain a subsequent advantage by taking on another individual?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There is no evidence that that has occurred, and this is exactly why we designed the scheme in the way it has been designed. If for some reason

someone is dumped, to use the words of the member for Florey, immediately the incentive is stopped, and the employer receives no benefit whatsoever. It is an incentive paid for increasing employment, and new bench marks will be set and the requirement is that employers must keep increasing their employment beyond those new bench marks in order to keep receiving the benefit. For instance, if an employer took on someone for six months or 12 months and at the end received a benefit of \$600, and then dismissed the person at the end of that time and took on someone else the employer's overall employment has not been increased and therefore he would not receive any additional benefit. The scheme is truly a scheme for rewarding those companies that take on additional permanent employment. The day they stop doing that they stop receiving any benefit under the scheme.

Mr. ABBOTT: A total of \$7 150 000 is to be provided for Government incentives to industry, and this is an increase over the allocation last year. However, the actual expenditure last year was well below the budgeted allocation, and surely this was due to the lack of success of Government employment schemes. Would the Minister care to comment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer the member for Spence to the answer I have already given in which I said that an allocation of \$3 000 000 was made for the decentralised industry rebates under the scheme as proposed. There was no actual payment of money last financial year and, if one is to make a comparison between what was allocated and what was spent, one would have to take that \$3 000 000 into account. The member for Spence is coming up with the same routine, monotonous argument that the Opposition members have used for the past six months with no thought to what the situation is. I have spelt the details out this afternoon and I am disappointed that the honourable member has not listened to what has been said. The sooner members sit down and listen to what has been said the sooner they may stop using the same monotonous argument that I am getting sick of.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On 10 November 1979, the Minister announced decentralisation incentives, pay-roll tax and land tax rebates with the total cost expected to be \$4 000 000 a year and the scheme to operate from 1 January 1980. The Auditor-General's Report at page 163 shows that no payments under these schemes were made during 1979-80. I want to know why; is it purely administrative and, if so, does the increase in this line cover what was voted last year or does it really only amount to a late payment?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I know I sounded stropy a few moments ago when I said that I only wished that the Opposition members would listen to what I have said already, but I have already gone through this twice. I indicated that the scheme as devised meant that the payment was made after 1 July. The first of July occurred in the financial year of 1980-81, not in the financial year of 1979-80. The commitment is there for the last six months, under the old financial year. I have indicated that for the first six months of this year the anticipated expenditure will be \$3 000 000. In a full year that scheme will cost approximately \$6 000 000. There was no payment last year because of the way in which the scheme was administered, but the scheme did operate from 1 January. I have already given approval to a large number of those applications for repayment.

Only this morning I had yet another list presented to me for refunds. The list presented to me this morning was for a rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax, valued at \$730 000 for a range of companies, and that now brings the total approvals for repayment to companies to \$1 800 000. This

is for payments for the period from 1 January to 30 June. This amount went to 124 companies and we estimate that there are 247 companies eligible to claim; we are still processing them as quickly as possible. Before Opposition members again make a statement on this, I ask them to read what has been said this afternoon.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not made any statements about it; I am sorry to make the Minister stropy as I know how it affects him, and then affects his staff. I am not trying to upset the Minister; it could well be that I was out of the House when the Minister made that statement as I do not recall having heard him make it. In any case I want to pursue the matter, and if the Minister has answered the questions then he should just say so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the Deputy Leader that repetition is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not repeating myself. I am asking the Minister, what are the guidelines for the scheme? Also, are the large employers, such as B.H.A.S. and B.H.P. eligible for rebates, who designed the boundaries of the 150 per cent rebate; and how many companies have decentralised their operations so as to benefit from the scheme?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The guidelines are freely available, and I refer the Deputy Leader to the booklet that is available to which I referred earlier. It applies to processing and manufacturing companies outside of the designated zone. There is a zone where a 50 per cent rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax applies. Can I specifically refer the Deputy Leader to the answer I gave to the member for Florey following a series of questions he asked in this House in August of this year in which I spelt out some of these details.

If the honourable member wants any help, I refer him to my departmental officers, who would be only too willing to assist. In section 4(f) of this booklet, the criteria include the location, the activity (whether the company is a manufacturing or a processing company), and exclusions. Companies that are excluded are those companies that come under an Indenture Act. B.H.P. comes under an Indenture Act with the State Government, as do a number of other companies. These companies were excluded because they already receive financial and other incentives under that Indenture Act and that is, if you like, a contract between the Government and that company.

We believed that it was inappropriate to alter that contract with a pay-roll tax rebate and, if it was to be altered, I made an offer to the companies involved that we would be prepared to consider a rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax, provided that the indenture agreement came up for review as part of that payment. I have also spelt out the scale of assistance. There is an upper limit of \$250 000 to any company as pay-roll tax rebate and, if the company pays pay-roll tax beyond that, it receives only \$250 000. That is a very generous incentive offered by the Government.

As I said, the cost will be \$6 000 000 in a full year. I believe that I said that the cost would be \$4 000 000 when I made a press announcement 12 months ago, but more accurate information suggests that the cost will be \$6 000 000, which shows more than ever the emphasis the Government has given to decentralised industry. If the honourable member would like more information, I make available my officers of the Department of Trade and Industry, who would be only too glad to assist and help any company with any problems that it may have in regard to the scheme.

Mr. ABBOTT: In regard to "Overseas trade promotions," I ask the Minister whether there has been a reduction in the allocation for trade and industrial

representation in ASEAN markets and, if so, what factors have led the Government to make such a decision?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is "No." Overseas trade officers now operate under the Premier's Department. The honourable member may recall the announcement that was made in April this year. Two officers, who were formerly under the Department of Trade and Industry, are now attached to the Agent-General's Office in London. For administrative reasons, it was believed better that they come under the Agent-General in London and paid from the one account. Therefore, they have been transferred to the Premier's line.

I also add that such trade officers cover the broad approach of Government, not just one department; they cover the departments of mines and energy, tourism, agriculture, and other associated departments. The situation is exactly the same in regard to South-East Asia. Any trade representation in that region now comes under the Premier's Department rather than under the Department of Trade and Industry. The actual allocation for overseas trade promotions is the same this year as it was previously.

Mr. O'NEILL: Is the Government monitoring the ownership and control of South Australian business and, if so, what is the nature of this activity? Is it preventative, or does it commence only when a local firm is subject to take-over threat? What success has the Government had with this activity, and does the Government plan to invest in businesses to fend off take-overs?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It has been suggested that the honourable member should ask some of his members on the Committee this question. That is not the role of the Industries Development Committee. The committee has statutory responsibilities, which largely involve the approval of Government guarantees and loans and does not include a monitoring of local ownership of industry. That function is carried on under the Department of Trade and Industry under a line that has already been covered.

I assure the honourable member that the Government monitors local ownership. We believe that it is important that South Australia own as much of this State as possible and that we are not under complete foreign control, whether interstate or overseas. The Department of Trade and Industry has specific expertise in this area. For instance, the department is the appropriate department to deal with all submissions made, that affect South Australia, to the Foreign Investment Review Board. The honourable member asked about significant achievements, and what better achievement could I cite than the proposed take-over of Fauldings by Glaxo that was stopped by State Government intervention, as a result of my intervention and a submission made through the Department of Trade and Industry to the Foreign Investment Review Board.

Other applications have come forward, some of which have been approved. In particular, we approved the take-over of Chrysler Australia by Mitsubishi, because we believed that it was in the interests of this State that such a take-over take place. We will continue to monitor any such proposed take-overs and, if we believe that a take-over would be of benefit to the State, we will have no objection whatsoever to any company taking over another company, even if a foreign company is involved. I am sure that the honourable member would agree that, despite the fact that Mitsubishi is 100 per cent foreign-owned as compared to Chrysler Australia being 85 per cent foreign-owned, such a take-over is in the long-term interests of this State and in the interests of preserving jobs. We will continue to monitor through the Department of Trade and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Regarding "First year apprenticeship scheme", I notice that \$200 000 was voted last year, of which \$137 519 was spent, and there was no allocation this year. I imagine that this sum will be spent under the pay-roll tax incentive scheme, or does it appear somewhere else?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The scheme of pay-roll tax rebates for first year apprentices has been discontinued; it applied only for 1979. I know of one company in particular that received significant advantages, because it took on a large number of additional employees and received the pay-roll tax rebate under the scheme for youth workers. I point out that, if companies take on additional apprentices or employees, they will still get that rebate. The scheme was discontinued because there was some duplication and overlapping of the two schemes.

Mr. ABBOTT: Under "Self Employment and group business venture", I would like to state that earlier this year the Federal Government made a grant of \$1 800 000 to the South Australian Government to help students leaving school to go to work and others who opt for further education. I understand that \$29 450 was made available for projects carried out by the department, while \$70 000 may have been spent on joint projects in South Australia under the 1980 transition programme. Will the Minister say what programmes were carried out under that grant by his department and whether the scheme was successful?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not believe that that is relevant to this line.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Minister say whether, as only \$19 000 was spent out of an allocation of \$180 000, it means that the number of small business proposals referred to the Small Business Unit was fewer than expected? Small business is in dire distress in this State at present, and the Government has some responsibility in this area to pursue the policies that it inherited in regard to small businesses which, at present, need assistance. It is apparent from the allocation and the spending either that small business does not have the confidence of the Government or that the Government is not going out of its way to help small business.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This line is for consultancies for small business, as proposed by the Small Business Advisory Unit in the department. I do not know whether the Deputy Leader was absent from the Chamber when I was talking about this matter, but I made a statement, and I agree with his assessment that the advisory unit is inadequate, and it has been in that condition for a number of years. There is an obvious need to review the unit, and the Government is doing that. It also reflects the fact that small businesses often do not understand and appreciate the need for consultants. This is partly because of the way in which the department has operated in the past, namely, it has been there trying to put out the bush fires, by which I mean propping up small businesses that were already in trouble, and employing consultants at that stage is too late. If the unit takes on the role that I believe it should take on, it will be one of planning and of educating people about to commence a small business, and there will be a significant role for consultants in that area. Certainly, the money has not been spent in the past, because there was not the need to spend it. Under the existing role of the advisory unit, small businesses have not seen the need to take on consultants.

Mr. O'NEILL: Could the Minister supply a list of the names of consultants and the services that they supply?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Which consultants?

Mr. O'NEILL: The Small Business Advisory Unit reimburses consultants who supply the service. Who are they, and what services do they provide?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We call tenders for people to supply consultancy services to a certain small business. Although I can indicate the basis on which we operate, I do not think it appropriate that we disclose confidential details of which consultant has been working for which firm. I will obtain policy details for the honourable member and make them available to him.

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Minister provide details of which companies were successful in tendering, and what sort of services they supply?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON: For "Special assistance—Whyalla industries", there is a reduction of \$80 000. Can the Minister explain?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Whyalla working party, which I think is referred to elsewhere, had finished its operations previously, and it spent only \$33 in the past year. That special assistance was for a number of one-off financial incentives offered by the previous Government to certain companies, because of recommendations and financial incentives offered to companies in trouble in Whyalla. These are a carry-over of commitments made previously. The honourable member can see that \$150 000 was allocated in 1979-80, and \$121 496 was spent.

Mr. O'NEILL: Was that for "Special assistance—Whyalla industries"?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The two are somewhat related. The previous Government allocated special assistance as to individual companies. In one case, a transport subsidy grant was paid to a company—a one-off thing. I do not support that policy. If financial assistance is available, it should be across the board. There were one or two isolated cases, and there might have been sound merit in offering a specialised incentive at the time. Those incentives were provided, and these are simply commitments made under that previous line. If the honourable member wants to see how it has been replaced, it has been replaced with our general pay-roll tax rebate for decentralised industry. Therefore, it could be seen that the replacement for that small insignificant line is now in the \$3 000 000 range.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Mallee may raise any question in relation to "Miscellaneous".

Mr. Lewis: Can the Minister explain the purpose for the \$30 000 allocation to the Institute of Labour Studies?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, because it has not been raised previously. He can see that, previously, we have allocated only \$7 000 to the institute, which has had financing troubles for some time. As a State Government, we made an offer that we would, for every \$2 provided by private industry, contribute \$1 to the running of the Institute of Labour Studies, at Flinders University. This is the unit which has Professor Dick Blandy as its departmental head. I have a high regard for him and for the work he has done. He has assisted the Government in the manpower forecasting report, and he is also on our Council on Technological Change. The Government believes that, because of the role that could be carried on by this institute, it is appropriate to subsidise it. It is on a subsidy basis of one Government dollar for every \$2 raised outside. Whether or not we spend that \$30 000 depends on how much money they raise. The purpose of that special assistance was to allow a full-time director to be employed. I understand that Professor Blandy is likely to be that full-time director, if the finance is raised. Previously, there has

been only a part-time director at that institute.

Mr. Lewis: Believing that it is desirable for Government to be doing this, I ask whether, in addition to assisting with those kinds of studies at Flinders University, the Government is prepared to look favourably on assisting similar sorts of initiatives in the Commerce Department of the Economics Faculty at the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That would depend on what specific programme it had in mind. We would look at supporting such a proposal only if it were practical and would have obvious benefits to the State, and if the State Government was benefiting in some way from it. Although it is not indicated here, we have allocated \$7 000 to the Elton Mayo School of Management, so that it can carry on a special summer course this year in which it will look at new industrial inventions to see whether they have commercial application. I think it is being called a course in entrepreneurship, encouraging young people to understand the importance of being an entrepreneur. The \$7 000 will be matched by an \$8 000 grant from the Commonwealth Government, and we will be carefully monitoring the benefit of what can be considered a pilot scheme.

Mr. Lewis: I take it that the Government sees the means by which people get their living as being more than simply seeking an employer when they leave school, or leave any educational institution, whether tertiary or secondary.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Very much so. I refer the honourable member to the line which relates specifically to self-employment and group business ventures, for which the Government has allocated \$62 000. This is under the Youth Bureau, and we are encouraging people not just to look to established employers for a job but to create their own demand and to work for themselves through that means.

Mr. Lewis: In relation to "Regional economic studies of the South-East", what is the purpose for which the \$22 000 will be applied, as a matter of principle?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: A significant study was carried out by the Department of Trade and Industry, for which I released the reports earlier this year. It was a general study of the South-East, and looked at economic development opportunities that existed, highlighting a number of specific areas where further studies should be undertaken to develop some sort of new industry or expand existing industry. For example, one matter studied was the potential of the Mount Schank area as a tourist attraction. At least two tourist attractions were looked at, and we wanted consultancy work carried out to assess the potential for further development.

Those studies have been completed, and about three weeks ago I released three separate reports, one on Mount Schank, one on another tourist attraction, and one on potential industrial development, from memory, in Mount Gambier. I have referred those reports to the Minister of Tourism. They have been released publicly in the South-East. If the honourable member would like more details of those reports, I will make them available to him. The reports refer specifically to what was a joint study between the South Australian and Victorian Governments on the Green Triangle in the South-East. I understand that more work is to be done, as this was part of an on-going programme. The main reports, which I released earlier this year, listed a whole range of further studies that should be undertaken to ensure that the full potential of the South-East was realised.

Mr. Lewis: Are they things such as the greater development of Robe's tourist facilities, as a historic town, and, say, the development of a herbs and spices industry, which prior feasibility studies done early in the 1970's

indicate is viable and apparently worth several million dollars in terms of balance of payments contributions to imports (it might be possible to produce those things in Australia, in particular in South Australia) and the development of a native floricultural industry, say, on the banksia species, such as has been used in Western Australia, and now exported to South-East Asia and other tourist centres?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot specifically recall all the recommendations of the initial reports. Certainly, Robe was one of them, and its tourist potential was dealt with in one of the subsequent reports now finished and released several weeks ago. It would be best for the honourable member, because of his own local interest, to ask my department to send to him both the initial studies and the subsequent studies carried out. I think the initial studies clearly indicate what future action will be taken.

Mr. Lewis: What is involved in the amount of \$70 000 for the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The \$70 000 is for the School of Mechanical Engineering at Adelaide University. The State Government, for a number of years, has made this allocation of finance to encourage research into noise in industry problems. Dr. Bies at that school, and a number of his colleagues, have been carrying out various research projects, particularly looking, for instance, at how to reduce the noise of impact in a mechanical workshop, how to quieten air-conditioners, and a number of other projects.

When the International Acoustics Conference was held in Sydney about two months ago, the work of the Adelaide University was regarded as so significant that it warranted a pre-congress conference to be held in Adelaide, and that was sponsored, and most of the time was spent discussing the work done at Adelaide University.

The work is specifically orientated to solving practical problems in industry. Any companies with problems that need research, provided they are of general application, should come to the Government, which will refer them to the Adelaide University. It is a specific grant to encourage more research in this important area, especially because workers' compensation costs for hearing loss are very substantial.

I think I am right in saying that this grant to Adelaide University was made following a Select Committee on noise control, which met in 1976. Because of the nature and extent of the problem that existed in industry, the then Government saw fit to make an allocation, and the present Government has seen fit to continue an allocation for research work.

Mr. Lewis: Would the Government be prepared to look at a proposal, say, for the development of a market plan for the department further to extend information about the services available to small business through the Small Business Advisory Unit, a market plan to ensure that small business men know of the existence of the service before they get into trouble, providing to small business what the Department of Agriculture provides to farmers in the way of extension services?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Earlier today, I spelt out what I thought the role of the Government should be in the small business advisory area, indicating that I believe that the appropriate action is that small business men need to be educated before they start a small business, rather than being rescued once they get into financial trouble about two years after they have started.

Obviously, if a small business advisory unit was restructured to take on that role, it would be an important part to market that to the outside community so that people would know of the existence of the Small Business

Advisory Unit and could seek its assistance before setting up a small business.

Mr. Lewis: With regard to the line concerning the Waite Institute, I noted with interest the explanation the Minister gave which indicated the Government's interest and concern in the development of specialised equipment. Would the Government consider a similar approach from, say, Roseworthy Agricultural College, which for almost 100 years now has provided that kind of assistance to rural industries on a very broad spectrum, including specific engineering problems? Is the Government interested to hear of any proposals that the college may have for that kind of work?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think what the Government is specifically interested in is taking in a research development that has already been largely refined, and helping that development to be applied commercially with both employment and financial benefit to this State. The Government does not see itself in the role of simply helping to finance inventors to come up with whatever inventions they like. Rather, if there is a very prominent invention already made that we think has excellent commercial potential, the Government is prepared to assist that with either a consultancy grant (it may be a marketing consultancy grant or some other assistance) to allow it to realise its full potential. For example, recently Amdel, the scientific research laboratory here in Adelaide, came to the Government with an application in relation to its development of a component for a scientific instrument which in its view had world-wide marketing potential and which could have brought revenue worth several million dollars into this State if it was successful. So, we have assisted Amdel in financing a marketing consultancy so that it can carefully assess the full potential of that product before finance is committed in an effort to market it.

Mr. Lewis: With regard to marketing in the context of overseas trade promotions, I asked the Premier last year about the importance that the Government was placing on the development of trade in the South-East Asian and South-West Pacific areas. For what purpose is the \$40 000 presently sought to be applied during the ensuing financial year?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: When I began the line on trade and industry, I pointed out that the entire role of the department and its structure were being reviewed. Last Wednesday, Mr. Bill Davies's five-year contract ceased. Previously, Mr. Davies has been responsible for this area of overseas trade promotion. Because of his pending retirement, no specific plans have been put down for the allocation of that finance for the current year. The reason for this is that it would be most inappropriate for Mr. Davies to decide how the money should be spent, then leave, leaving it up to someone else to try to develop those ideas. It is part of the overall review of the department and its commitments, and some proposals have already been put before me as Minister by the acting permanent head, Mr. Lincoln Rowe. We are now making an assessment of how that overseas promotion should take place.

Mr. Peterson: As I came in late because of the split function of the two Committees, I may ask questions that have already been answered, in which case I shall obtain the details from *Hansard*. I notice that there has been a huge reduction in the CITY programme. Has that been explained previously?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, it has been explained; it is not an actual reduction, but the line has been split and the salaries for people are covered elsewhere.

Mr. Peterson: Has the reduction in money for the Waite

Institute been explained?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, it has.

Mr. Peterson: The section relating to incentives to industry states "including", so obviously it does not cover the full range of what is covered by incentives to industry. In looking through the yellow book, I notice that the programme is laid out fairly well for fostering and looking after industry and for the incentives to help industry in this State. However, will there be any provision for adult training? Lately the point about the lack of tradesmen in industry generally has been made. Will there be any provision for training in relation to skills?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the member for Semaphore to be very general, but I think the matter has been fairly well canvassed. However, I will allow the Minister to reply.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, there is no specific allocation here for that purpose. However, I refer the honourable member to the debate this morning on the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment vote wherein I think the training of skilled tradesmen was adequately covered.

Mr. Peterson: Can the Minister give a little more detail as to where the \$40 000 for overseas trade promotion will be spent? It is an increase of only \$22 000, but where would it be applied?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have partly covered that matter, but I can now be more specific than I was in answering the member for Mallee. Some of that \$40 000 has already been committed to advertisements and supplements in Japanese newspapers. Part of it is being spent on producing a booklet called *South Australian Investment Profile*, which I cannot exhibit in the House but to which I refer the honourable member. Part of that sum has been used to produce an audio-visual programme which we use as a department and which is also used by State development to promote South Australia. The audio-visual programme is based on the three screen production, using slides and a synchronised sound track. It is very effective; it is about a 12-minute tape which we produced in April of this year as a general promotion for South Australia as a place in which to invest. We adapted that for the recent visit of the Minister of Industry from France, and it was interesting to see the impact of that audio-visual programme on the French Minister and his party.

I am told that, because of the superb French in which it was produced and the personalised manner in which the slides were produced (with francs instead of dollars), it had a very significant impact. The Minister commented on the fact that it was such a superb production. These productions are made available and we intend to use them not only here but overseas when it is appropriate to try to create the sort of atmosphere that is found in South Australia, and an audio-visual production like this is by far the best way of doing this.

Mr. ABBOTT: I do not know whether the Minister is prepared to talk about the report of the working party on youth housing, which was conducted by the Youth Bureau under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. However, since the Government has placed a very high priority on this important issue, I ask the Minister under which line the Government has made any provision for the anticipated recommendations of the working party report in regard to youth homelessness?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can assure the honourable member that there is no line in regard to the construction of housing under the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and I believe that any such allocation would obviously come under another Minister, such as the Minister of Housing or

the Minister of Community Welfare. It would be quite inappropriate for any allocation to be made in the "Miscellaneous" line of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is not my intention, despite what some people may hear as rumours, to put up a housing project under these lines. The short answer is that it would not be appropriate and, there is no allocation under these lines.

Mr. ABBOTT: The report is under your department.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The report is being produced by the Youth Bureau, but because the Youth Bureau is involved in preparing that report for me as Minister responsible for the bureau does not mean that there will be any allocation under these lines to solve those problems. It is a multi-departmental submission; it affects other departments. From my recollection, from some of the material going into the report, there is a representative from the Department of Community Welfare, from local government and the Housing Trust, and I believe that one should look to other Ministerial lines for an allocation.

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

Public Buildings, \$56 131 000

Chairman:

Mr. G. M. Gunn

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
 Mr. E. S. Ashenden
 Mr. H. Becker
 Mr. R. E. Glazbrook
 Mr. K. C. Hamilton
 Mr. J. W. Olsen
 Mr. H. H. O'Neill
 The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. H. E. Roeger, Director-General, Public Buildings Department.

Mr. N. R. Norsworthy, Manager, Programming and Budgeting Services, Public Buildings Department.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I ask a general question, regarding retrenchments through natural attrition and job transfer. I am led to believe that in some areas there has been a trade shortage of qualified personnel, and those people who remain in supervising capacities have refrained from applying for other positions because they have no qualifications. Thus, some trade sections of the Public Buildings Department lack expertise, because those who remain are unqualified. What action is being taken to ensure through rationalisation that we do not reach a stage where all experienced tradesmen have gone from the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That is a general question and certainly relates to any of the opening lines. The Government has been concerned to ensure that, with a natural attrition rate of about 10 per cent a year, we do not end up with the predicament cited by the honourable member. I would be the first to admit that problems always develop in such a situation. Of course, there will be certain trade imbalances. Occasionally, a very experienced supervisor will retire, resign, or take a job elsewhere, as

can be done under the transfer system; his leaving leaves a great gap in the department's personnel and it is necessary for the Government, one way or the other, to fill that gap. That is why some flexibility is necessary in administering the department.

I know of one area, to which the honourable member has referred previously, that has been investigated in this regard and, if any problems arise and if members hear about those problems, they should let me know and we will certainly carry out investigation. I would not for a moment deny that such problems exist already and will continue to exist, because they obviously will. But, as far as possible, we are trying to overcome those problems within the staffing arrangements.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: To what extent does the cut in the allocation to the Construction Division represent a reduction in the number of scheduled projects?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Construction Division is certainly not doing the same amount of work as it was doing previously. That is reflected in the reduction in the allocation for this year. Some wages are included under the line "Construction Division". That reflects a reduced role for that division. The most significant part of that reduction is in the Demac Unit. As at 30 June, the Demac Unit ceased to operate except for maintenance purposes. I point out that wages for many of the weekly-paid workers come under the "Wages" line and not under the line "Construction Division". I think that the line "Construction Division" refers only to senior management and salaried persons and not to weekly-paid personnel. Weekly-paid personnel come under the line "Wages", which is allocated \$25 900 000 for 1980-81. That is recharged to the Loan works programme as "Less—Charged to other accounts". The honourable member needs to appreciate that it is not just that one line that reflects the Construction Division position; much would come out of the "Wages" line.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: By how many will the staff of the Construction Division be reduced this year? Can the Minister break up that figure into categories and tell me by how many weekly-paid workers and supervisors or clerical workers the staff will be reduced?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is difficult to assess at this stage because we are still finalising the programme for the Construction Division for this year. I believe it is almost finalised. A reduction of 50 to 60 weekly-paid workers is expected in the Construction Division during this financial year and a reduction in the salaried area of about five or six people.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In the event of a reduction of 50 or 60 workers, would it be right to assume that work that would have been done by them will be now done by the private contract system?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, that is a fair assumption. However, one needs to appreciate that that is the very area in which, until 12 months ago, there had been virtually no reduction at all. I pointed out to the House earlier that, although there had been a significant run-down in the Loan works programme, there had been only a 3 per cent decline in manpower in the Public Buildings Department over about a three-year period. Because of the run-down in the Construction Division, it is not fair to say that those projects will now be done by the private sector. One can say that there will be less work done by the Construction Division because of that reduction in the work force.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Under the line "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries" a reduction is shown. What areas are affected by the reduction?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The main reason for the

reduction in that line is an accounting change. Whereas previously those expenses were incurred under that line, they are now being incurred under specific project lines, so, overall, there is not such a significant change in expenditure but more a change in the accounting procedure.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What were the projects not proceeded with, and why were they not proceeded with in relation to the line "Preliminary investigations on projects not proceeded with"?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There are always a number of projects that are not proceeded with, as the Deputy Leader knows. I had the nasty job of having to deal with a substantial number of projects into which investigations had been carried out but for which no funds had been allocated under the previous Minister, now the Deputy Leader. I made a significant and detailed Ministerial statement to the House as to how I am proceeding with that. The most significant item under that line was the Thebarton Community College in 1979-80. The allocation for this current financial year is only \$300 000. That is a fairly normal sort of allocation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Why is it expected that double the amount of professional services will be required during 1980-81? What professional services will be required, and why will they be required? Who are the professionals to be employed for this purpose?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The biggest commitment of all under this line, "Professional services", is for the organisational review. I would not have thought that the Deputy Leader would be critical of the Government for proceeding with that review.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am critical only of the guidelines.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: They are basically the same as those established by the previous Minister. I do not see what the Deputy Leader is objecting to there. He established the internal inquiry. I put one extra person on it, and continued it in that form.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You changed the guidelines.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I did not; no guidelines were set down by the previous Minister. The committee drew up its terms of reference. It is interesting that the previous Minister set up an organisational review, but did not set down terms of reference for that review.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You know that is not true.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Of course it is true. I will read out the detail. The cost of general professional research projects, departmental participation in the provision of services to external committees such as the National Public Works Conference, the discipline responsibility of the principal engineers in regard to engineering services provided by the department, the departmental people involved in the programme, and the department's organisational review. They are the specific programmes that require these professional services. A greater commitment to research projects along with the increased use of consultants and the commencement of the departmental organisational review were the reasons for the 1979-80 allocation being overspent. The provision sought for 1980-81 provides for the continuance of the departmental organisational review and the greater use of consultants.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Regarding writing off obsolete stocks, \$20 000 was voted last year, whereas \$422 642 was spent. How did that discrepancy occur?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The sum of \$404 000 of the \$422 000 was for the writing off of Samcon store stocks. Samcon was the obsolete transportable classroom developed by the Public Buildings Department; it was the

forerunner to the Demac unit and, for accounting procedures, it was deemed to be appropriate to write off that stock that was largely not going to be used.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I disagree with the example given by the Minister in calling Samcon transportable. Surely that was not transportable; it was a permanent-type unit. Nevertheless, we are not going to argue about that now. We see a huge cut in "Maintenance, minor additions, etc." How is it expected that school buildings and equipment and other Government buildings will be maintained at a high standard if expenditure is to be reduced?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: First, this sum does not include wages, which are included in the \$25 900 000 allocation. In terms of specific allocations for maintenance, the allocation for the Education Department's buildings has been reduced from \$12 600 000 to \$12 200 000. The Department of Further Education allocation has been increased from \$605 000 to \$670 000, and the allocation for other Government buildings has been reduced from \$7 300 000 to \$6 990 000, a marginal reduction. The allocation for the Health Commission, which would still come under the Public Buildings Department, despite the fact that the Loan works programme for health comes under the Minister of Health, has been increased significantly from \$7 900 000 to \$8 600 000; and for other clients' buildings, there is a marginal increase from \$696 000 to \$750 000. That is the detailed break-down of that maintenance work.

I point out to the Deputy Leader that the department allocated additional finance last year for the maintenance of schools. We did this to ensure that weekly-paid employees in the Public Buildings Department were fully utilised. I have heard much feedback from schools as to the extent to which they appreciated that increased maintenance expenditure by the Public Buildings Department last year. I forget the exact financial allocation for that. It was significant, and I know that members have complimented the Government on that initiative. I forget the exact financial allocation for that. It needs to be seen that that other work has been done, in addition to the allocation here. There is also a special allocation for school maintenance of \$1 500 000 under the Loan works programme; that is for civil works maintenance. Most of that money has already been committed by way of contracts.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The West Terrace cemetery is dear to my heart, because it is in my district. How does the Government intend to proceed with the stated intention to restore the cemetery to an area of major historical significance, without the expenditure of additional funds? The sum of \$29 000 was voted last year, and actual payments were for \$39 000; yet, there is a proposed allocation of only \$35 000. Can the Minister explain?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The proposed renovation of the cemetery comes under the Loan works programme. We are dealing here with revenue, and this sum is simply the revenue allocation, excluding wages. The honourable member needs to appreciate that it is a revenue allocation that excludes wages and the upgrading, which is part of the Loan works programme. Perhaps the Deputy Leader will take up this matter when we reach the Loan works programme. In 1979-80 (and I am referring to the total administration of maintenance allocation for the cemetery), \$237 000-worth of revenue was allocated, together with \$28 000 of Loan funds. This year, the revenue allocation is \$247 000, or an increase of \$10 000, and the Loan funds allocation is \$366 000, a substantial increase of almost \$338 000. I think that that clearly indicates whence the funds are coming.

In manpower last year, two salaried officers were involved, and this year there will be three. The weekly-paid manpower force will remain at 18.

Mr. BECKER: At page 148 of his report for the financial year ended 30 June 1980, under the heading "Expenditure in Excess of Approvals", the Auditor-General states:

Improvements in procedures resulted in a reduction of expenditure in excess of approvals to \$386 000 (\$4 997 000). Attention was drawn to some inadequacies in the control of expenditure in the Construction Division and corrective action was taken.

Three or four years ago the Auditor-General commented that expenditure exceeded approvals by \$12 000 000 or \$15 000 000 in one year alone. I understand that there are certain reasons for this. It is pleasing to note that, in the last financial year, the amount was only \$386 000, a significant improvement over the figure of almost \$5 000 000 in the previous financial year. Can the Minister say what inadequacies were brought to his attention by the Auditor-General during his audit, and what corrective action was taken?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have previously outlined what action we were taking in relation to expenditure without approval, expenditure before seeking retrospective Ministerial approval, or expenditure exceeding the approved amount. I think the present position is a tribute to what the department has done in the past 12 months in cleaning up what was really a cupboard of dirty linen that needed to be cleaned up quickly. The amounts involved ran into millions of dollars, and anyone, especially the Auditor-General and members of this Parliament, would be rightly concerned to see such substantial amounts of money spent either without Ministerial approval or in excess of Ministerial approval.

In the next sentence of his report, the Auditor-General referred to the accounting procedure applied for the first time in 1979-80 by the Construction Division. It applied for the first time a fixed price contract for projects undertaken. Because it was the first time this technique had been applied in coming up with a firm price and sticking to it, there were some teething problems, but they have been overcome, and the accounting procedures have been rectified accordingly.

I pay a tribute to the people of the Construction Division and the senior management of the department for their efforts to make sure that the Construction Division operates on the same basis as a private contractor would need to operate in meeting a fixed price. It is a tribute to what they have achieved in the past 12 months.

Mr. BECKER: That is a fair enough explanation, working to a fixed price, but is that what the Auditor-General picked up? Did he pick up any other problems? He would have to find something, or he would not have written it in his report.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As far as the Director-General is aware, that is the matter to which the Auditor-General referred. Perhaps we can check it out and, if it is not so, I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. BECKER: What happens if there are problems where the department's tenderer, through no fault of the department—say, the cost of materials—may be forced to exceed the fixed price?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Director-General has offered to supply information as to the accuracy of that procedure. He has not got it here. It is about a 3 per cent variation in a total volume of work undertaken of about \$5 000 000, and I think anyone would agree that it is an excellent job in terms of accurate budgeting and sticking to

the budget. That is why I have paid a tribute to the department for what it has achieved.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does that mean that the department was incompetent in the past? The department would have been making the allocations and the estimates of costs. If work proceeded without Ministerial approval being sought (and it did), surely if the department is now able to do it, and the Minister says it is to be congratulated for properly estimating the costs, it should be condemned for not having estimated them accurately on previous occasions.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have somewhat condemned the department previously in statements on some of the accounting procedures. The Director-General, since he took office in 1978, has concentrated on improving the cost control measures and the accounting procedures within the department. I pay a tribute to him and his officers for what they have achieved. It goes back over attempts being made for two years. The accusation by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quite correct. Previously, there were inadequate accounting procedures and inadequate cost controls within the department, and that is why some of the problems have arisen.

Mr. BECKER: Would that not be the fault of the Minister?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Ultimately, of course, it must lie with the Minister, but basically it is an accounting procedure within the department.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I understand that, in the costing of maintenance work carried out within the Public Buildings Department, the tradesmen doing the job submit a docket indicating the time and the cost of the job, to which is added the job supervisor's time, the workshop supervisor's time, and probably other departmental time. Has provision been made to rectify this costly practice by a method similar to that adopted in private industry?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am somewhat surprised that the honourable member would suggest that the present procedure should be altered. Basically, we are a service department servicing client departments, and we should charge them a realistic price. Surely, that should include overhead costs. I would be critical if we were charging client departments an unrealistically low figure so that they had a false impression of the cost of getting the Public Buildings Department to do the work as compared with an outside contractor, if that was done. As a department, we need to continue to be realistic, and that should include ensuring that overhead costs, such as the cost of supervisors, and so on, are included in estimates.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: In many instances, there are cases where the actual cost as measured by the Public Buildings Department to do a job is sometimes two or three times more than the cost through private industry whereas, if more rationale were taken into account, it would be more in line with it. I am looking at the saving in cost factor of work with so many people tied into the costing of one job.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Let us not bury our heads in the sand. We must be careful not to set up an administrative bureaucratic system that becomes very expensive to run, but the system must have sufficient controls and realities to make sure that any estimate of maintenance costs is a real reflection of the actual cost to the department.

We are not a charitable organisation, and if, for instance, it was costing client departments an unrealistically low amount because we did not write in our overheads, I am sure private industry would be the first to complain that we were competing unfairly against it, and I am sure that the Treasurer would equally complain that we were not charging client departments the true amounts that we should be charging.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: With regard to maintenance, has any action been taken to ensure that work supervisors who are qualified in the trade which they oversee take precedence over unqualified applicants? I ask this question because I have had brought to my attention instances of waste due to unqualified decisions being made in regard to replacements and job specifications and new parts being ordered, whereas qualified technicians could repair rather than replace or buy new equipment.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: One or two allegations have been made that supervisors are inadequately trained and do not have appropriate qualifications. In all of those cases referred to me where such an allegation has been made, I have yet to substantiate that that allegation is correct. We would be required, particularly as apprentices have been trained, to make sure that any supervisor is suitably trained and holds suitable qualifications. If there are any specific cases that the honourable member brings to my attention, I will certainly have them investigated. So far I have not been able to reveal any such cases.

As Minister involved in the employment area, I have been concerned at what I have described as the inadequacy of general training for supervisors. I think the Government needs to spend much more time and effort in making sure that its supervisors are adequately equipped as individuals to take on the very important role of supervisor. Too often we simply take a competent person, an ordinary tradesman, and suddenly promote him to the position of supervisor without training him for the new position. I am sure that everyone realises that the role of supervisor can be one of the most difficult roles of all. I have asked the Public Service Board and other departments to give some thought to how they could better train supervisors.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: With regard to the lines "Terminal leave payments" and "Wages", can the Minister indicate whether allocations have been made to cover the provisions of the voluntary retirement scheme that he has introduced into the P.B.D.?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, there has been no allocation there for voluntary early retirement, because the "terminal leave payments" line specifically refers to salaried officers, and voluntary early retirement applies only to weekly paid officers. The other point is that the voluntary early retirement scheme was announced on about 5 September, after the Budget papers had already been presented to Parliament. There is no doubt that in the Supplementary Estimates, which will come before the House probably in February next year, it will be necessary to make a special line to cover that. There is no reason why that cannot be part of the allocation for wages, or be taken out of the wages line, because in effect it would amount to money paid in lieu of wages, and I would expect the wages line to be appropriately reduced. It is not as though there is likely to be any substantial increase in actual commitment over and above what would already be committed as wages. In most cases over a full 12-month period it is likely to lead to savings. Certainly, after the first 12 months have passed the Government will start to benefit considerably from not having to pay those wages.

Mr. O'NEILL: Further to the Minister's reply to a point raised by the member for Hanson, surely, if the money that was referred to was spent without Ministerial approval, the only thing of which the Minister would be guilty would be the subsequent authorisation of payment for work already done. I do not know what the alternative would be, unless it is to say to the people who have done the work, "You are not going to get paid." If work was

done without Ministerial approval, and if it is so serious, does the Minister intend to follow up the matter and take action against the public servants responsible for carrying out the work without Ministerial approval, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer the honourable member to the Ministerial statement I made in the House in November of last year on this subject, in which I detailed the extent of that work carried out without Ministerial approval, or work which involved an expenditure which exceeded approved expenditure. Of course, the Minister must ultimately take responsibility for that under the Westminster style of Parliament, and the Minister is accountable for all procedures applied within his department. If there is misappropriation of money, which is not the case here, or if there is poor administration, the Minister must stand up and account for that. It is not appropriate to say that we should make sure that people are not paid.

In many cases, weekly paid people did the job, were paid, and then the system found out afterwards that there was never any formal Ministerial approval for the work to be done. As a former Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council, I am sure the honourable member would be the first to object if I went out as Minister and asked those weekly paid people to pay back the money simply because they were victims of poor administration. That is not possible, but I assure the honourable member that it is something to which I gave attention when I came into office, and I think we have the problem rectified.

Mr. O'NEILL: Given that there is Ministerial responsibility (and I outlined at the beginning of my previous question the situation in which I saw the Minister), I ask again what action the Minister intends to take against the people who were responsible for spending money without Ministerial approval.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As some of that money was expended up to five or six years ago, I do not think it is appropriate to carry out a witch hunt. That is when most of the money was spent; it is not as though it was spent during the last two or three years—very little of the money was spent after 1978. I think it would be most inappropriate for the Government to instigate a witch hunt on that. The important thing is that suitable procedures have been adopted within the department to make sure that, hopefully, it does not occur again. I am sure that it will never occur again on the same scale as it occurred previously. Some of the people who one might assume could be held responsible have left the department, for various reasons, including retirement.

Mr. O'NEILL: Does the Minister not think that it is a little bit incongruous to make such a song and dance about something that he does not intend to do anything about, other than talk about?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think it is a serious matter. The point that I have raised is that it is a matter that needed careful handling so that this Parliament understood the seriousness of the problem. If the honourable member disagrees with the procedure that I laid down (and I point out that the Auditor-General thought that the procedure that I laid down was quite suitable), I think he should take up the matter with the Auditor-General. If you want me to carry out a witch hunt, the ultimate people in relation to whom I would carry out the witch hunt happen to be the Ministers of Works in the period from 1970 onwards. I just do not think that that is appropriate.

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

Public Buildings Department, \$67 200 000

Chairman:

Mr. G. M. Gunn

Members:

Mr. E. S. Ashenden
Mr. H. Becker
Mr. R. E. Glazbrook
Mr. K. C. Hamilton
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
Mr. J. W. Olsen
Mr. J. P. Trainer
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. H. E. Roeger, Director-General, Public Buildings Department.

Mr. N. R. Norsworthy, Manager, Programming and Budgeting Services, Public Buildings Department.

Mr. R. W. Johns, Acting Executive Director and Acting Director-General, Public Buildings Department.

Mr. J. P. McManus, Superintendent, Educational Facilities, Education Department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My first question is somewhat procedural, and I hope that it will be allowed. It follows on from a matter raised by the Deputy Leader when this Committee began its deliberations this morning, and it is in relation to the Minister's competence, in the sense of responsibility, to answer questions in relation to decisions leading up to the building of schools in particular places, and matters like that.

The point is that, as I understand it, the Minister, through his department, services the needs of the Education Department and the Department of Further Education, and they do not tell, say, the Education Department, that a primary school should be built at, say, Lake Wangarry before there is a redevelopment of, say, Hesso rural school. That decision is taken by the Education Department rather than the Public Buildings Department. As I am sure other members of the Committee would want to ask questions of the Minister in relation to decisions about the allocation of resources, I wonder whether the Minister will be able to give the information required.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Olsen): As the member for Baudin indicated, this question was raised earlier and, as the Minister responded in accord with page 11 of the Estimates, under the heading "Public Buildings Department", which is the Minister's portfolio these items are listed and, therefore, the Minister is responsible and competent to answer the questions in those subject areas.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I promised this morning that an appropriate departmental adviser would be present, and that adviser is Mr. McManus. I point out to the honourable member that, of course, the Minister of Public Works is competent and the only person who can ultimately answer questions in this regard, because he allocates the finance. This is done on certain advice from the appropriate client departments, but the Minister makes the ultimate decision. I believe that our receiving certain advice from the client departments justifies the fact

that representatives of those departments should be present. A Minister must take the ultimate responsibility. The Loan works finance is dedicated to the Minister of Public Works and, therefore, he is the appropriate person to answer questions.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am learning one or two things about this Government. I am sure that the Deputy Leader and I did not have this relationship when we were in Government. I refer to school buildings, and I understand that members may ask questions about any aspect of this line, but I hope that, in the first part of our deliberations, we will consider primary and secondary schools. I seek information from the Minister as to the Government's attitude towards the current state of the Education Department's capital stock.

In particular, since the question is very broad, I will ask the Minister to comment on three matters: first, old schools in need of refurbishing, as I believe that his Party made one or two comments about that matter in its election policy last year; secondly, demountable buildings, and in particular the number of schools containing many demountable buildings, at which it may be desirable to replace those with a more permanent construction; and, thirdly, what I call inappropriate buildings, by which I mean that the Liberal Party last year made some noise about what it called open space construction, which I believe opened up in the minds of some people either the hope or the fear, according to their attitude to these things, that there would be some whole scale redesigning of the existing units in line with Liberal Party philosophy.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Could the member for Baudin be more specific? He has simply made a general comment on these subjects. The honourable member referred to policy statements but, if he wants to ask questions in regard to a Loan works programme, he should ask specific questions, rather than saying that he would like me to comment on three different areas. I would like to know what aspect the member wants me to comment on. After all, this is a period in which he should raise questions in relation to Loan allocations and in regard to specific allocations of finance. I think he should be specific in asking questions.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If sessional Orders allowed, I could keep this Committee here until 4 o'clock in the morning by asking specific questions about particular schools. I want to know from the Minister what sort of task the Government believes it has before it in this area. Has it inherited a situation in which a lot of money must be spent on the capital stock of the Education Department because of run-down buildings, because there are lots of demountable buildings around the place, or because the Government is philosophically committed to redesigning the interior of certain buildings that it calls open space, or does the Government believe, on the other hand, that the situation is pretty well in hand? That of course, is related to the appropriateness of the size of the vote we are considering.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I thank the honourable member for that clarity; certainly, I know now what we are talking about. I think it is obvious that, because of the now declining number of pupils in schools, the total allocation of finance to school buildings and the nature of the work have changed significantly. I am sure that the honourable member knows (it is only 12 months ago that he was Minister of Education) that much of the programme now is being directed towards upgrading existing schools, particularly those in the country that are old. I have seen the design work and have spoken to many of the people involved in that upgrading programme, and I complement them on what they are doing. There will be a continued

balanced programme, having regard to the need to ensure that, where necessary, old schools that need upgrading will be upgraded. The Liberal Party's policy will be applied, particularly with reference to open-school units, etc., where a new school is erected. It is not envisaged that we will pull down new open-school units and erect alternative accommodation. Provided that the existing accommodation is suitable and new, it obviously will not need attention.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Since I assume that, in effect, the Minister is saying that there are considerable needs still applying in regard to school buildings, will he comment on the under-spending last year of about \$4 000 000? The Loan papers make clear that, in addition to the considerable reduction in this line from what was allocated last year to what is being allocated this year, there was a significant under-spending. I hardly need to remind the Minister that that probably amounts to the equivalent of three primary schools or one high school of reasonable size. One would have thought that, if the needs are as the Minister seems to suggest they are, that money could well have been put to good effect.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: One obvious area that accounts for some of that are projects such as the Thebarton Community Centre. Substantial delays occurred during the approval stages of the Mount Barker project; so that was underspent. There was a delay in the commencement of the Christies Beach School, together with the lower tender price, which is the reason for the under-expenditure there. The Budget provision for the Meningie Area School was based on an incorrect estimate that overstated the funds required for that project to the extent that \$740 000 was allocated, whereas only \$471 000 was spent. I highlight, for instance, projects such as the Mount Barker school's new major additions and upgrading, for which \$5 800 000 was allocated, whereas only \$4 700 000 was spent.

The Ceduna Area School was underspent because of a delay in commencing the activity hall. The over-expenditure was caused by the introduction of the Leigh Creek South Area School. A series of school projects is involved. It is a combination of delays for various reasons, and also because the allocation was an over-statement of the funds actually required to the extent, in one case, that some 80 per cent further allocation was made.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is the Minister really telling us that the total before us is really a sum total of particular projects, or what the Cabinet was prepared to vote for this provision? It seems to me that what has happened, from the evidence in the papers before us, is that the Education Department is being penalised because of its underspending. People are saying, "It was able to get by with significantly less than the Parliament was prepared to vote last year. So, it can get by with roughly the same again in the coming year." Is the Minister so inflexible that he has no other projects to wheel in when the situation arises? My colleagues and I, if we have the time, can supply lists of schools which are on some programme in the department and which need upgrading in certain areas. With a little flexibility, some of those schools needs could have been satisfied in the last financial year.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer to the honourable member's specific question is "No", the Education Department is not being penalised because it did not spend its full allocation last year. To think that that would be the case would be stupid. For the honourable member even to suggest it, I think suggests that he is not applying the obvious knowledge he would have picked up as Minister of Education. As he realises, there are Loan works programmes and commitments in other areas. The

commitment made here reflects the overall need seen in all areas by the Government. It reflects, for instance, the need seen and taken up by the Opposition in the House in other areas, particularly in the area of other Government buildings (and we will come to that shortly), especially correctional services. The Government, in looking at its entire Loan works programme, has come up with what it sees as its prime responsibilities. This is not the first year in which there has been a reduction in the Loan works programme. The honourable member presided over an Education Department that had that same problem for a number of years.

Mr. TRAINER: I find it difficult to decide to whom to direct questions regarding priorities for school buildings. The Minister assures us that he is responsible, because he is responsible for their construction; yet, it is the Minister of Education who is presumably responsible for the allocation of priorities. Are there any plans for the relocation of the Correspondence School, which does not seem to rate a mention here? This is a part of the department that requires urgent relocation in accommodation more suitable than that provided in the old Cudmore mansion at 64 Pennington Terrace, North Adelaide. The school tends to be overlooked, because its students are scattered all over the State. There are 1 067 students, which is roughly equivalent to the student body served in a large high school yet, because they are scattered across the State, they do not receive consideration, because there is no organised parent body to press on their behalf, as you have in the average rural or metropolitan school. The member for Baudin and I visited the Correspondence School recently, and the working conditions of the people there can only be described as Dickensian; it is barbaric. One room has 21 teachers in it. They have to use tape recorders, which interfere with each other. They cannot concentrate on their work, because each may be recording a tape for communicating with students. Eight teachers in a room have to use the one reverse-charge telephone. When students ring for any help, if it is one of the other seven teachers who does not have the phone on his desk, he has to lean over the teacher who does have the phone on his desk in order to talk to the students.

I am particularly interested in any priority being given to relocating this in another place, such as possibly the Kingston C.A.E. campus, in North Adelaide, which is being vacated.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government is fully aware of the accounting problems faced by the Correspondence School, and is looking at alternative accommodation, with a particular site in mind. Until that is finalised it is inappropriate to announce it, but the Government is aware of the problem and is turning its attention to solving it as quickly as possible.

Officers of the Minister of Education, my officers, and officers of another department (because it affects another department) have examined in person that alternative accommodation, so I can assure the staff of the Correspondence School that the Government is looking at its problems and will find it suitable accommodation as soon as possible. I was somewhat concerned by the extent to which some people tried to stir up a bit of political flak out of these problems. It is unfortunate that politics should enter into such a proposal, especially as the former Minister would know that the school resided in that accommodation, under him, for a number of years.

The member for Baudin has raised the point that we have this year a declining Loan works programme. There was a significant decline between 1978-79 and 1979-80, and he did prepare the latter Budget. He presided over a period in which there were diminishing Loan funds for

primary and secondary schools. I am not sure how he can make great play of it now, if the same situation applied under him.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I want to ask questions about so-called holding schools, and I will tell the Minister where they are, if he needs that information. It is true that the Budget last year, which this Government introduced—not the Government of which I was a part—provided for Loan funds of \$37 500 000. Even if he could establish that I was totally responsible for that—and I do not think he can—I do not think he can establish that that effective reduction in expenditure compares with what is happening this year when we take into account what was not spent in the last financial year, although it was voted by the Parliament, and the reduction for this financial year.

The holding schools are schools built of demountable buildings on the understanding with the school community in the areas that they will be replaced in solid construction as soon as enrolments firm up at those places. The Minister of Education would be able to brief the Minister on this, because he was in the House when I raised the matter some time ago. I am concerned, in view of the trend in the Loan programme, whether the commitments implied, and in fact made explicit when I was Minister of Education, to replace these holding schools with solid construction schools will be honoured. It does not seem to me that, with the trend of the Loan programme, that will be financially possible for the Government.

I seek information from the Minister—and I appreciate that he will not be able to give me the totality of this information at this stage—on what will be the total cost of replacing these schools with solid construction at, say, June 1980 prices. What is the trend of enrolments for each school? When will these replacements be necessary? Will such replacements be possible in view of the trend of the Loan programme? I know of at least four schools—Yetto East, at Morphett Vale, Moana, Salisbury West, and Salisbury Heights.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There are the schools mentioned and the Munno Para school. I am sure the honourable member is aware that the proposal is that it is not possible to go ahead with solid construction at a holding school until enrolments have firmed and until the community has had a say in the nature of the schools. There are firm proposals for solid construction schools to be erected at each of those sites three to five years after the erection of the holding school.

The honourable member has asked specific costs, such as the cost of putting up schools immediately in those locations. I will get some rough estimates, if he would like them, and make them available.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The capital assistance scheme was introduced in the last days of the former Government, and replaced an earlier subsidy scheme. It provides for a dollop of Loan works being made available to schools on a regional basis. As I recall, when the scheme was introduced there was some feeling that it should be possible for at least one major scheme of the order of, say, a reasonable size school gymnasium, to be built in each of the regions in any one financial year. According to the papers in front of us, \$100 000 is to be committed for this capital assistance scheme, which means that, for example, the Central Western Region may get something and no-one else will. There is not enough finance there to do more than assist one project in one region.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Reverting to the holding schools, an activity hall in solid construction for the Munno Para school is at present before the Public Works Committee. There is a move by the Government to start

with solid construction of the holding schools. Regarding the capital assistance scheme, there are 26 specific projects presently before the Public Buildings Department. I have already issued contracts or called for the registration of an interest in contracts for six of these. The member for Mitchell saw me about his own school, and I was pleased to indicate to him within a week that contracts had been called for that school. Six have been called now and I expect the other 20 to be called shortly. That work is proceeding quickly.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Could the Minister outline what sort of projects he is talking about? I clearly recall that this whole concept was centred around activity halls, indoor sporting complexes, and so on. Surely, we could not get anything cheaper than about \$80 000 for such a project, and the Government is asking us to vote \$100 000 for the whole of the State. The money we are being asked to vote and the number of projects do not line up, unless it relates to new toilets, or something of that sort.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The nature of the projects is mainly sports halls and various additions to schools, swimming pools, and so on. The six tenders which have been called already are specifically for sports halls. The further 20 projects are for activities halls and sports halls. The \$100 000 allocated is for the interest payments or repayments. It is only \$100 000, so we are looking at a total allocation of \$1 000 000 that could be spent in that area. The \$100 000 is the repayment for the last financial year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is from Loan?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Has there been a change in policy in relation to this matter? Has, in fact, this allocation always been from Loan, because it seems to me that what we are doing here is servicing a Loan commitment by borrowing money.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, the Government contribution has always been from Loan funds.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I refer to the provision for major additions and upgrading. First, I refer to the construction of school additions where the aesthetics of the area have been taken into account. As an example, I cite the Hallett school, which I believe is between 90 to 100 years old, and the new additions there have certainly been added to blend in with the existing building. I want to congratulate those responsible for that work. I would like to seek some assurance that this practice will continue rather than having unsightly buildings added to schools that do not blend in with the local environment.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Some time ago I indicated that I had seen a number of plans for upgrading existing schools, and I have been extremely impressed with the job done. I have actually inspected a number of these schools. The Burra school is a classic example of an old school (it is very much like the old school in which I was educated in at Belair) at which those involved have taken the old red brick building with its high ceilings and little air-conditioning vents up on top in which the birds used to sit, and turned it into schools which appear to have lower ceilings and which appear to be more in keeping with modern design. The rooms have had insulation added, and have been turned into attractive buildings. I certainly compliment the professional staff in relation to what they have done.

The total estimated cost of upgrading at the Hallett school is \$281 000, \$21 000 of which was spent up to the last financial year. The allocation for this financial year is \$255 000, and the project is due to be completed in November of this year. The type of construction is stone,

and the alterations comprise the conversion of the existing building to provide a library resource area, an administration area, and staff facilities. An existing wet area will be retained to which will be added three general learning areas, an additional wet area, and a withdrawal area.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I refer to the upgrading of some of the Demac units. In particular, I recently visited Ceduna, and it struck me quite forcibly that there is a need to improve some of the Demac units, and this applies particularly in the country, in relation to the light facilities and air-conditioning facilities. Obviously, some of the Demacs in the city area and areas not subjected to as much heat are suitable, but in areas such as Ceduna there obviously needs to be some upgrading of the facilities of these Demacs, particularly in relation to air-conditioning and the noise which emanates from them.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr. Chairman, you may be able to answer this question or correct the answer yourself. I am not aware of a specific air-conditioning problem at Ceduna. If there is a problem, I am sure that the local member, because of the excellent manner in which he represents his area, will bring it to my attention. Certainly, some of the early Demac units leave a little to be desired and some upgrading is proceeding, but generally, unless there are specific examples, I cannot comment in detail.

Mr. TRAINER: I refer to a question of general standards and whether or not there are any particular difficulties in attaining those standards. I refer to standards in relation to work space for teachers in the staff room. I am fairly sure that there must exist minimum standards in relation to the square metreage of desk space and space around desks to allow ingress and egress. Can the Minister say what the standards are, and in what percentage of staff rooms in the schools of the State would those minimum standards be met?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: To my knowledge there are no specific standards laid down anywhere for the allocation of space for staff rooms. I am not sure what sort of standard the honourable member is referring to. He referred generally to an industrial standard; it is not under an industrial award and it is not under a building code that I am aware of. I think the honourable member would need to be specific as to what sort of standards he is referring to. I cannot answer the second part of the question until it can be established what standards he is referring to.

Mr. TRAINER: From time to time (and I say this as a former teacher), I have heard colleagues mention that a figure of about 150 square feet of desk space and surrounding area was the accepted figure in offices where people engage in clerical occupations, and surely a somewhat similar figure must apply for the sort of clerical work done in schools, involving marking, lesson preparation and the like. If there is no standard, why is there no standard?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We understand the general figure to be about 20 square feet per staff member. However, I can obtain more specific information for the honourable member. The information is not here. Generally, the staff rooms are designed to cope with what would be seen as the projected long-term enrolment in that school. If there is a short term peak, then the space per teacher might fall below that 20 square feet per teacher, or the accepted brief laid down by the department. Generally, the objective is that the staff room be adequately based on that brief, but I shall obtain the exact details of what that brief is.

Mr. ASHENDEN: Has money been allocated towards the air-conditioning of schools (which I grant were erected

by the former Government), and I refer to a number of open-space schools which have extremely poor ventilation and which are most uncomfortable for students, particularly in hot weather? One of the schools to which I refer is in my electorate, namely, the Tea Tree Gully Primary School. It is one of the early open space schools erected, and there are very real problems at that school. I have experienced these during the summer months, and I have requested that air-conditioning for the school be considered. Has money been allocated for air-conditioning for that school?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I hope that Committee members appreciate that we are asking for specific details, and that I am trying to give as much information as possible, so it is necessary to refer to departmental advisers from both departments. The answer to the question is "Yes"; there is an allocation of \$150 000 for "air-conditioning, library resource centres", and there is a specific programme for air-conditioning schools. I understand that the Tea Tree Gully School is one of those schools to be air-conditioned. I will check the programme to ascertain when that is proposed.

Mr. HAMILTON: I understand that there was, some time ago, a proposal in relation to a primary school to be built on Delfin Island in the West Lakes area. Could the Minister state the current position in regard to the erection or deferment of that school?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No school is proposed at present for Delfin Island; no need has yet been established for that school.

Mr. HAMILTON: Was it intended that a school be built in that area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As occurs in a number of areas, a site is available. It is not unique that there is a site available with no proposal for the erection of a school. Members may remember that the Education Department owns, or has the right to acquire, nine acres of the Penfolds winery land at Wattle Park. The vineyards in that area grow grapes for some of the best wine in this State and, hopefully, that land will never be required for a school. However, the Education Department, in its forward planning, based largely on population projections of the late 1960's, which changed at the end of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's, purchased sites in a number of areas, and perhaps the need to establish schools on those sites no longer exists, unless there is a substantial change in the population growth rate.

Mr. HAMILTON: So that land is set aside.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Forestry planting is taking place on it, so there will be a timber industry there shortly.

Mr. BECKER: In regard to the item "Preliminary Investigations and Design", the amount last year was \$187 464, but this year only \$50 000 is proposed. Will the Minister say what stage the plans in regard to Miltaburra school have reached? I understand that plans were approved by the Public Works Committee some years ago and shelved by the Hon. Mr. Hudson when he was Minister of Education. Have those plans been revived? What is happening in relation to Miltaburra School?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Under the item "Preliminary Investigations and Design", I presume that the honourable member has asked this question on behalf of that active member of Parliament; I commend him on what he does. Preliminary designs started in July 1980. The site work is due to start in October 1981, and the school is expected to be available for occupation in February 1983. That excellent honourable member may like to refer that information to his constituents.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I hope I am in order at this

stage in asking a question about Further Education; I am concerned that we may run out of time.

The CHAIRMAN: I will permit that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I believe that it is inappropriate for members to ask questions in regard to further education before we have finished in relation to education.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I presume that the Chairman's allowing me to ask a question about further education in no way suggests that we have finished the education items, and it would be quite competent for members of the Committee to continue asking questions about primary and high schools once I have asked my questions. I am concerned that we may not reach further education.

The CHAIRMAN: The situation is that we are considering one vote. We have been proceeding on the basis of considering each individual item, and not going back to it, so, if members indicate whether they would like to raise any other matters before we come to further education, that would assist the Minister and his advisers.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I introduce Mr. John Kent, Superintendent of Buildings, Department of Further Education, who is now joining us.

Mr. BECKER: My question relates to upgrading of schools, and particularly to cyclic painting. Can the Minister tell me why provision is not being made for the painting of Plympton High School, which must be well overdue for painting. I am concerned about the estimated cost of the project. Has the Minister information about the estimated cost of repainting Plympton High School, and will he say why that painting is not currently being carried out?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That reason is an obvious one. Cyclic painting of schools comes under the maintenance programme, not under the Loan works programme. I understand that the cost is approximately \$150 000. I will have to ascertain whether or not there has been a specific allocation this year in the Revenue Estimates under "maintenance" for this project.

Mr. BECKER: Looking at the redevelopment of primary schools, particularly Plympton Primary School, which has reached stage three, I see that the estimated total cost is \$290 000 and that the proposed expenditure for 1980-81 is \$110 000. The planned date of commencement is February 1981, and completion date is August 1981. What does the \$290 000 entail?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is proposed to modify and upgrade an existing building to provide an art-craft area and six class teaching units. The work is estimated to start in February 1981 and to be completed in August 1981 at a total cost of \$290 000. The proposed expenditure for the current financial year is \$110 000.

Mr. BECKER: Is this the building known as the original school?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: Is that to be upgraded and preserved?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: My next question relates to Freeling Primary School. The estimated cost of upgrading is \$445 000. What is proposed to be done?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is proposed to redevelop Freeling Primary School as part of the small schools programme. It involves converting an existing classroom into a teachers preparation area, staff room and toilets, and the conversion of two other classrooms to form a flexible, two-teacher space with wet and withdrawal areas. Planned additions will provide a library resource area, audio visual store, activity room, administration area, and three general learning areas. The type of construction is

block work.

Total estimated cost of the project is \$445 000. Expenditure last year was \$32 000. An amount of \$370 000 is to be spent this year. The work is due to start in September 1980, which means it probably started today. It is due to be completed in March 1981. I can indicate that tenders have already closed. Work has not started on the site.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I would like to question the Minister as to allocation for further education buildings. The documents we have before us show that the total expenditure of \$12 764 000 for last year will be reduced to \$12 000 000 this year.

Once one subtracts from the Commonwealth component, one gets a somewhat alarming result. Whereas the Schools Commission reduced its capital allocation to the State in the school buildings area, the Commonwealth, through the TAFE Commission, increased its vote, according to the papers before us, from \$7 140 000 to \$10 900 000. So, the residual State component of those two was a movement from \$5 624 000 down to \$1 100 000. If those figures are correct, that suggests a deplorable effort on this Government's part from its own resources for Department of Further Education buildings. It is not so very long ago that by far the bulk of the effort in this area was coming from the State, and I, in common with all State Ministers, was complaining at the way in which the Government was shirking its responsibilities. In terms of the figures in front of us, if my calculations are correct, it is the State which is shirking its responsibility currently, not the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I understood the honourable member to say that the Government would contribute only \$1 100 000 and the answer to that question is "No"; he is incorrect, because the State is not contributing that sum. Regarding the overall allocation of finance for Department of Further Education buildings, again this is taken into account when making an assessment as to what the overall Government commitment is, and the Government has appreciated the fact that there has been a heavy commitment by both State and Federal Governments in recent years in upgrading those facilities. Some of the facilities are excellent. I refer the honourable member to the Gilles Plains D.F.E. establishment, and to Noarlunga, which is being built at present, and to other projects. A substantial commitment has been made in those areas.

One need only look at the D.F.E. establishments to realise the commitment that has been made, and I think that it is a tribute, particularly to the Federal Government, for the way in which it began to upgrade the D.F.E. establishments, three of four years ago. It did so to ensure that facilities were available for the upgrading of training, particularly skilled tradesmen, but, unfortunately, for a while there was not the number of people in the State to justify that expenditure. I hope that in the next couple of years intakes of apprentices will be substantially increased.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Did the Minister imply that my mathematics were wrong and, if so, can he tell me what funds from the State resources, exclusive of what funds come from the TAFE Commission, will be spent on D.F.E. buildings this year?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, the honourable member's calculation was wrong. I calculate it to be \$2 500 000.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: How does the Minister obtain that figure because, from the briefing document we received from the Premier and Treasurer, it was shown as \$12 000 000. What does the estimated repayment of \$10 900 000 mean? Does that not mean that it is the Commonwealth component?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Some of the confusion is because, as I understand it, the State allocates its finance for the Department of Further Education on a financial year basis, and the Commonwealth allocates finance on a calendar year basis. Certain carry-over problems exist. The allocation that we have here, which we have taken into account in determining this figure, is \$2 500 000 from the State and \$9 500 000 from the Commonwealth Government, a total of \$12 000 000.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It would appear that these figures have been drawn up in such a way as to be somewhat misleading. On page 225 of the yellow document, there is a figure which would suggest that the \$10 900 000 is a Commonwealth repayment.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Commonwealth did not come up with the full amount last year. The Premier clearly indicated when tabling this provisional yellow document that it is not to be taken as absolutely accurate except in relation to three Government departments—Agriculture, Mines and Energy, and the Premier's Department. Because of the work load imposed, one needs to be very careful in trying to take figures out of the yellow document and equate them to the accurate figures in the Loan Estimates or in the Revenue or Expenditure Estimates. The Premier made clear that they are an indication, and one needs to use them as a guide rather than as an accurate assessment of expenditure.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: When figures in the yellow document agree completely with what the Minister has called the absolutely correct figures in the Loan Estimates document—the \$10 900 000 on page 6 of that document—I think I can be forgiven for assuming that the figures are what they purport to be. In terms of the relative effort of the two Governments, the State is doing badly by the D.F.E., whereas there was a time when the State took up the lion's share of the effort. I would like the Minister to get information for me as to where these meagre figures will leave several projects. The first relates to the Port Pirie College of Advanced Education. I have inspected the college, and I am aware of the problems faced there in terms of capital provision.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Port Pirie project is on the design list and is part of the triennial submission made already to Canberra, that is 1982-84.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The second relates to Port Adelaide Community College. For many years there has been a good deal of debate about what should happen in relation to the provision of future capital facilities for the college.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: For the Port Adelaide Community College, the old Steamship Building has been purchased. The project is likely to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee before the end of the year, and work is likely to proceed next year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The South Coast College of Further Education was promised certain things through the South-Coast Notional Educational Development Plan, which was aborted by this Government soon after it came to office in favour of a limited upgrading of the Victor Harbor High School. I think that has left the D.F.E. on the South Coast out on a limb.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The South Coast position is under review at present.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I refer to another matter which perhaps we can deal with fairly quickly, namely the Department of Further Education's Seaton property which was purchased some years ago. Is that now regarded as surplus to requirements, or is there likely to be some

development on the Seaton property?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As the honourable member would know, as a former Minister, the Seaton property is one of several properties purchased by the Department of Further Education, and is one of those properties under review at present.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I refer to the future of the O'Halloran Hill College of Further Education. The Minister may be aware, and no doubt he will be aware of it through his advisers, that there is some concern about the future of O'Halloran Hill with the development of Noarlunga Centre and the community college in that centre. O'Halloran Hill has two other colleges of further education to its immediate north, namely, Brighton and Panorama, and there is unlikely to be any immediate development of residential areas in the vicinity of O'Halloran Hill, first, because the C.S.I.R.O. is on the southern boundary, and secondly, because the hills face zone is on its northern side. It is felt that it may have an uneasy future in view of the Noarlunga development.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am not sure on what basis the member for Baudin raises the fact that there is some concern about the future of the O'Halloran Hill College. Unfortunately, this often happens; it is easy to say that something is a matter of concern, but what specifically is his source? The proposal by the Department of Further Education is that the O'Halloran Hill college will certainly not be closed; it will operate in tandem with the new Noarlunga college. After the Noarlunga College has been built, it is proposed to upgrade the O'Halloran Hill College. I point out to the honourable member, as he no doubt realises from the growth of his electorate, that the college is in the heart of one of the most rapidly growing areas of Adelaide, and certainly the demand is seen to be there on a population basis.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall yield after this point, Sir. I am happy to hear the information which the Minister has given to me; of course, the concern is among the staff and students at that college, and I have reasonable contact with those people because some of them are my constituents. Although on a regional basis there is population growth, it is not occurring in the immediate vicinity of the college, nor is it likely to occur for some considerable time in the future. Therefore, my remarks are based on a combination of these two things, and I am not making this up.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The college has survived despite the lack of growth; the C.S.I.R.O. has been there indefinitely.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: But there was no Noarlunga.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: However, there is growth in the Noarlunga area, and to suggest that there is no growth in the O'Halloran Hill area does not overcome the fact that there has been growth in the Noarlunga area. I would ask the honourable member, because he has such intimate contacts within the college, to clearly point out to those people the assurances that I have given this evening.

Mr. BECKER: What is the policy of the Federal Government in relation to funding Loan works for the technical colleges and further education centres? Also, is it incorrect to say that the State is doing badly in relation to money available from the Commonwealth Government? I refer to the upgrading of the Marlestone College of Further Education, the estimated total cost for that redevelopment being \$4 500 000.

As I understand it, the project had to be processed pretty rapidly in order to qualify for money available from the Commonwealth Government, and I consider it a

tragedy that \$10 900 000 was committed to stages 1 and 2 of Gilles Plains when, in actual fact, there was no guarantee of students for Gilles Plains, and students had to be transferred from Marlestone to Gilles Plains. This led to the splitting up of some of the trades, particularly the building trade, the wet trades, and so on. However, the project is committed. What is the policy in relation to moneys available from the Federal Government, and what is the Federal Government's role in making money available to the States?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I point out that Federal Government allocations are specific purpose grants, not loan allocations. There is a distinction. The South Australian Government has always done particularly well in receiving those special purpose grants. It is a tribute to the Department of Further Education and the officers involved that there is such an excellent relationship between those officers and the officers in Canberra. Whereas some other States experience problems in this area, particularly New South Wales, because of their attitudes adopted in regard to asking for funds from Canberra, and because of the working relationship that has been built up over a number of years, this State seems to be able to receive those funds with the minimum of fuss and very promptly. There has been a very slight dip in the allocation of funds for South Australia on a per capita basis this year, but that is of no consequence.

The honourable member asked specific questions about the Marlestone College of Further Education, and I indicate that that college is due to be redeveloped at an estimated cost of \$4 500 000. So far, \$16 000 has been spent on design work. This year it is proposed that \$750 000 be spent. It is important that this work be completed on time so that we receive the allocation from the Commonwealth Government because, if Department of Further Education projects are held up for some reason, perhaps by the builder, we miss out on the Commonwealth allocation for that financial year. That redevelopment will allow for consolidation of existing fragmented facilities at Marlestone into one campus on the principal site, practical and teaching areas for the school building, the school of wool and textiles will be accommodated in the existing warehouse structure, and administration, library resource centre, canteen, lecture and classrooms will be accommodated in a new two-storey building on the site. The proposed commencement date is probably January 1981, and I expect that the documentation for the contracts will be prepared and made available later this year.

Mr. TRAINER: Regarding the Education Department, I ask whether, in the various redesigns and redevelopments that will take place, the P.B.D. will give attention to designs that allow for maximum school security. I ask this question because, as one example, the Ascot Park Primary School has been broken into several times. Its video-tape recorder was stolen earlier this year, it has been without this equipment for six months. This sort of mishap could disrupt the school's programme.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is "Yes". I have received some information from Treasury that will help to clarify the points raised by the member for Baudin in regard to the confusion about State and Federal allocations. I indicate that, last financial year, the Commonwealth did not come forward with an allocation of \$1 700 000, so the State Government made up that allocation from its funds, and therefore, the additional allocation has been made from Commonwealth funds this year and the State allocation proportionately reduced. Therefore, the total allocation for 1979-80 was \$12 700 000 from the Commonwealth, but we received only

\$7 100 000, even though \$8 800 000 was due.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I declare the examination of the vote completed, and I declare the vote "Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous" completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 1 October at 11 a.m.