

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 September 1983

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mr D.M. Ferguson  
 The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy  
 Mr R.J. Gregory  
 Mr T.R. Groom  
 Mr I.P. Lewis  
 Mr J. Mathwin  
 Mr M.K. Olayen  
 Mr J.W. Olsen

*The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair intends to go through the same procedure before opening the particular lines for discussion as was followed yesterday morning. The Chair will appreciate being advised if at all possible from members of the Opposition of some guidelines concerning procedures so that we can perhaps dispense with particular officers of a Minister rather than having them sitting around waiting for another line to be called on.

The Chair intends to proceed along the lines that were adopted yesterday; that is, that the Leader of the Opposition will be given the first three questions and then I will ask a Government member, and so on, alternately. Members of Parliament who are not members of the Committee will be able to ask questions only at what seems to be the conclusion of the cross-examination by members of the Committee and also to the satisfaction of the Opposition members of the Committee. The Chair warns that it will not allow members to embark on a second reading speech when seeking information. Also, members are not to direct questions to officers of the Minister's department: if the Minister wishes officers to answer questions, then the Minister will ask his officers to reply. Does the Minister wish to make any general statement relating to his portfolio before we proceed with the vote?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not wish to make any statement.

---

 Labour, \$9 497 000
**Witness:**

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour and Minister of Public Works.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr H.R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.  
 Mr M.C. Johnson, Deputy Director, Department of Labour.  
 Mr B.J. Bartlett, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Labour.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer to the supplementary papers and also to page 5 of the Programme Estimates. If a general topic is raised, is the Chair suggesting that one member can ask three questions on that particular topic?

**The CHAIRMAN:** It being usual procedure and the Chair seeing no reason to change from it, to start the Deputy

Leader will be able to ask three questions on the line that we may be dealing with. After we go through the procedure of members having the opportunity on an alternating basis to ask those three questions, we will come back to the Deputy Leader, until such time as each member does not have three questions.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will start with one of the more important issues raised at page 5 of the yellow book, and that is the question of a comprehensive review of workers compensation arrangements. I know from statements that the Minister has made from time to time that he is attracted to something similar to the Queensland or the New Zealand system. First, I ask the general question: will the Minister outline major provisions of the arrangements that are made for workers compensation in Queensland, and New Zealand particularly, which I think the Minister has quoted more recently? In other words, what does the Minister envisage? I understand that the comprehensive review is based on New Zealand information, which the Government—

**The CHAIRMAN:** We are in trouble straight away. I do not know whether I have misled the Committee, but it should be understood that the Chairman is opening up for examination certain lines, and honourable members must seek the information or ask questions on that line. I cannot see where the question of workers compensation comes under this line.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Resources from the Department of Labour are being used in a comprehensive review of workers compensation as outlined in the Programme Estimates. It states there quite categorically under 'Strategies' at page 5 that that is one of the issues actively being considered by the Government. I could find a line in the other book that justifies the question, but it is perfectly clear that resources from the Department of Labour are being used for an investigation of this matter and, for that reason, I seek information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** At present the honourable member is dealing with the yellow book part of the Minister's documents.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is why I sought to clarify the position.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I understand that the yellow book deals with the policy of the Government: it has nothing to do with the particular line in front of us at present, and that is the important part for the Committee. The Chair would suggest that the Deputy Leader refers to the Estimates of Payments dealing with the line. If any member wishes to ask questions or seek information, it must be related to the line before us. There is nothing about workers compensation in the line that is in front of us now: that is, Labour.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Sir: where in Sessional or Standing Orders does it specify that that shall be the way the Committee proceeds?

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order. Estimates Committees are a function of Parliament and deal with the Budget. Part (3) of the Estimates Committee rules provides:

There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A Committee may ask for explanations from a Minister, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

The position is clear: we are dealing with expenditure under the guidelines of the book in front of members.

**Mr LEWIS:** Where in Standing Orders does it say that it is that book? With respect, I must differ from your interpretation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member knows that we are dealing with a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of moneys from Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1984 to authorise the Treasurer to borrow money for public and other purposes. We are now in a situation where we are dealing with the Bill line by line for certain portfolios, in this case, the Minister of Labour's portfolio. We are dealing with the line 'Labour' as outlined on page 45 to 46 of the white paper in front of the honourable member.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have checked with the Clerk of the Parliament on the status of the yellow book, which indicates programmes and expenditures that this Department intends to undertake. It clearly has budgetary implications, otherwise it would be a waste of time printing the book. The Clerk was clear in his advice that we could ask questions based on this book, and that is what I am seeking to do. It is a farce to suggest that the Department has produced a book giving detailed expenditure if we cannot ask questions on it. That is absurd.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order. The honourable member can refer to the yellow book if he links his remarks with the line under question. There is no link or reference in the Department of Labour expenditure with anything to do with workers compensation.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I would link it with the line for the expenditure for an overseas trip. A proposal exists for a further overseas trip. I understand that the Minister went to New Zealand to look at workers compensation. I link it with that line where there is expenditure indicated, and I ask the same question. As I understand it, the Minister went to New Zealand to look at workers compensation, and that cost the public of South Australia some funds. Those funds appear in these Budget papers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is quite at liberty to ask the Minister any relevant question, even if it is to do with some form of workers compensation, so long as it has something to do with the expenditure on his overseas trip. The honourable member must understand that it must tie in with the actual expenditure before the Committee.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I want to ascertain whether we got value for money. I will rephrase the question. I understand that the Minister has investigated workers compensation, particularly in New Zealand, and that inquiries were also made in Queensland and money was expended for those purposes. Will the Minister outline the result of those inquiries in terms of money spent, and give us an outline of what is envisaged in the New Zealand scheme?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before calling the Minister, I am allowing this to proceed, but I have some very grave doubts as to whether we are in fact on the line. However, I will ask the Minister to reply to the question.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am not happy about that at all. I question the nature of the relationship between the progenitors of the ideas—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:**—that you, Mr Chairman, are now putting to this Committee. On a point of order, I ask that this matter be clarified once and for all. Mr Chairman, you said—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** With the greatest respect—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the member for Mallee persists in ignoring the Chair when called to order, I can assure him that Standing Orders will be carried out and there will be no doubt that he will be the loser. The Chair has not made a practice of becoming dogmatic in this area; it has always tried to be reasonable and, hopefully, quite pleasant.

However, if the member for Mallee carries on in the way that he is at present, I can assure him that the Chair can become very unpleasant. Has the honourable member a point of order?

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What is the point of order?

**Mr LEWIS:** I ask you, Mr Chairman, to rule on whether the proposed programmes under the Department of Labour, as outlined in volume 2 of Programme Estimates for 1983-84, indeed have any relevance to and relate to the \$9.497 million that this Committee is examining and, if not, why not, and, if so, why cannot they be used as reference points for questions?

**The CHAIRMAN:** For the fourth time (and hopefully the last time) the honourable member will be told by the Chair. The matter before the Chair is in fact the actual expenditure outlined in the Estimates of Payments under the line 'Labour, \$9.497 million.' The question before the Chair at present is the expenditure governed by that line. Any reference to the book to which the honourable member is referring is taken only as a guideline, and anything that is referred to in the yellow book must be linked with the line and expenditure with which we are now dealing. Hopefully, the member for Mallee understands quite clearly what that situation is; if he does not understand it now, the Chair certainly can make very clear to him that that will be the procedure. Hopefully, that clears the air in relation to what we are dealing with now.

**Mr MATHWIN:** From my experience of this system in the past I understood that it was usual for members to make opening remarks and talk generally about the whole portfolio in question. That has always been a right given to members when they have begun questioning in regard to the lines. With due respect, I would have thought that that procedure would have been incorporated in the rules governing the procedure, because such a course of action has been taken by previous Committees in that members have been allowed to talk at some length, and indeed make statements in relation to a line which they wish to pursue, for their own benefit and that of their electors and the people of South Australia generally.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I take the point raised by the member for Glenelg. Yesterday the Chair opened proceedings by asking the Leader of the Opposition whether he wished to make any comment on the overall picture. The Chair is prepared to do that in this case. The Deputy Leader is quite at liberty to open proceedings by making a general comment for a few minutes. However, in regard to the case in question, the Deputy Leader was asking a specific question which had nothing to do with the line before us. If the Deputy Leader wishes to make some comments for a few minutes about the overall portfolio under discussion, the Chair will recognise that. Does the Deputy Leader wish to do that?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, Mr Chairman. We are going to be spending a lot of time rummaging around trying to find the appropriate line in the Estimates of Payments which obviously can be done, because the yellow book is based on the Budget papers. For example, one could link up workers compensation to the line which pays the industrial magistrates, because they award workers compensation payments. The business of going through to find a line on which to hang questions is something we will have to do. The point made by the member for Mallee is quite clear, that the \$9 million allocated for 'Labour' encompasses many matters in the programme. To have to rummage around to find the appropriate line on which to hang questions to me seems to be a waste of effort, but if that is how it must be done, then so be it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is the position. We are dealing with the details of the Estimates. The Chair will offer the

same privilege as it did yesterday. Does the Deputy Leader wish to make some broad statement?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, I wanted to clarify the point raised. The Committee's questioning will be inhibited. We could hang all questions on the Director's salary. I guess, because he has responsibility for a whole range of expenditure, and, no doubt, some of his time is spent on each of these items. However, I understand that the Minister's overseas trip was related to workers compensation: therefore, that validates the question as far as the Chair is concerned. All I want is the information.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The information being sought concerns the trip to New Zealand and whether it had anything to do with workers compensation. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. Are we ready to commence proceedings?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Next year I will come at 11.25 so that I will not have to be delayed when I could be doing other work. The question as I understand it from the Deputy Leader is directed at page 5 of the yellow book, which relates to the Agency Overview wherein he referred to a comprehensive review of existing workers compensation arrangements being undertaken. The first point I want to make to the Deputy Leader is that that is in the normal course of the research branch's duties in any case, so it is not an extra burden on that branch. I think the obligation on the Department is to have comprehensive reviews in all areas and to keep up with current standards and practices in industry. I want to transgress a little in answering this question because I want to give a full answer to it, it has taken some time to get to the question and it will take some time to answer it. It is an important—

**Mr LEWIS:** More than one facet of a junket.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not have junkets, but maybe people on your side of the House go on junkets.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair does not intend to allow any debate or any sort of personality struggle such as is going on. I ask the Minister to go back to the line with which we are dealing.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** You may not have heard it, Sir, but I was accused by the member for Mallee of having a junket.

**Mr MATHWIN:** More like jelly and blancmange.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** If this is going to be the atmosphere, we can turn it on, too. If members opposite want to get some information, all right, but if they want a brawl, I am available for it. They know my style and they should not start accusing me of having junkets. They should bear that in mind.

This question will take some answering because I am going back into the history of workers compensation generally. I happen to be one of those people who have believed for about seven years that the present system is outdated, outmoded and on the verge of collapse unless something is done about it. The deterioration of the system will prevent workers from getting insurance coverage, and I am sure the previous Minister would agree with that. In 1977 or 1978, after serious consultation with many people around South Australia, I established a committee of inquiry which was headed by the former Auditor-General, Mr Byrne. That committee comprised Mr Bob Gregory, Arnold Schrape, Mr Uhrig, from the employers, and Nick Alexandrides, from the employees. That committee visited New Zealand and parts of Canada to try to establish what was and could be, looking into the future, the best possible way to give a fair coverage to the working class and to give a fair cost of premiums to employers, as it was becoming more difficult for employers to be able to cover their employees.

Unfortunately (and I use that word advisedly), that committee took longer to report (and I do not criticise it for that, because it had to establish the facts) than I would have liked. I would like to have received the report during the term of the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments. However, by the time the report was completed the Government had changed, a Liberal Government was in power, and the responsibility for acting on the report was in the hands of a new Government. For whatever reasons I do not know; I think they were pressurised, not from the employers but probably by some lawyers and possibly by some doctors not to accept that system. I believe that other interested people may have pressurised the Government. However, for whatever reason the report was buried.

The then Opposition questioned that at that time, and all it found out was that amendments would be brought into the Parliament to update workers compensation legislation but not to change the structure in any way. I believed then, as I had believed previously and as I believe now, that that system is on the verge of collapse and will not last much longer. I firmly believe that. As a consequence, when we came back to Government I asked where copies of the Byrne Report were. There were no copies around. I ordered a couple of hundred to be printed and circulated within the community to let people rethink the problem. At the same time I instructed my Department to undertake a comprehensive review on why this Act was not working, to examine in close detail the contents of the Byrne Committee Report, and to find out what were the beliefs of various people in relation to the current workers compensation system, and whether there was any clamour for change, and to give me a report on the premiums.

Premiums are at an all-time high at the moment, so much so that employers in my district (and I am sure members have heard of the same problem) have to go to great lengths to get their employees covered. I do not think that that system can continue to work. Having restudied the Byrne Report and being further convinced that change was needed to be made to the workers compensation legislation, the Director of the Department and one of my other officers went to Queensland to look at that scheme, because I was hearing reports from there about how popular that scheme was. It has been operating since 1923 without much difficulty, and both sides of the political arena seem to be content with it.

What convinced me more than anything else to go to Queensland at that stage was that I met a prominent trade union official at an airport and asked what he thought of the system. We discussed it generally and he said it had worked for a long time and that the trade unions and employers were happy with it. It was a single authority system, such as had been recommended by the Byrne Committee report and as exists in New Zealand. We looked at that system in fairly close detail, and I came away further convinced that, while it may not be the be all and end all, it certainly had better prospects of survival than had the current system in operation in the Eastern States.

As a consequence of that, the four State Labor Ministers (I was not able to go, but I sent a delegate) met in Melbourne, where it was decided that the Byrne Committee Report should be a basis for further examination which is now being undertaken in New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia.

In order to be absolutely sure that the New Zealand system was as it had been described in that report, the same two officers, Mr Bachmann and Mr Les Wright, accompanied me to New Zealand. (I apologise: I said that Mr Wright accompanied me to Queensland. I have to retract that. He did not; he came to New Zealand, but Mr Bachmann came to Queensland with me.) We made a thorough examination

of the New Zealand scheme, and I want to place on record my appreciation of the way we were treated by the N.Z.A.C.C. We were given top priority while there to look at all aspects of the scheme, and no stone was left unturned to allow us to have a very good look at their system.

In New Zealand we ascertained, first, that the system involved a single insurer concept known as the Accident Compensation Corporation (which I will abbreviate by calling it the A.C.C.). An initial part of its policy and objectives included preventative accidents, compensation for accidents and rehabilitation of victims. One of the major features, for example, is that the employer has to pay the employee for the first week. The other aspect of it which may not be totally acceptable in Australian conditions (and there is an argument about that) is that no common law claims are permissible under that system.

One of the best aspects of the New Zealand system is that, rather than lump sum settlements, there is a pension type of system for permanently disabled people. That seems to be a sensible approach because, as any of us have realised over the years, whether it involves either our constituents or members of a union, those receiving lump sum payments have found that it is whittled away and they are left with nothing. Under the New Zealand system, that cannot happen: there is no lump sum payment. The employee is paid a pension for life. From the very moment the worker is injured the rehabilitation process is put into operation. It is a very good rehabilitation process and is certainly the best I have seen.

Other matters of importance were the administration procedures of the system. There is no adversary system in the New Zealand scheme. The A.C.C. itself deals with the claims, which are processed within a week, more than a week being a very long time for someone not to be paid. Unless there are suspicious or spurious circumstances, the employee is paid almost immediately. As I said, the employer picks up the first week, so there is never any lag in time or any great disputation. While there we visited what they call their court of appeals, which involved a very simple structure. An officer of the department came along, heard evidence about an injury to a person, and that day the matter was settled. It had taken about eight or 10 days to come on and was settled in favour of the employee. I forget the exact amount involved, but I think that the employee received \$2 000 or \$3 000 over and above the offer made in the first place.

One of the major features of the system is that clearly it is quicker and cheaper than the current system in Australia. I believe that it gives a guarantee to the employee that he does not have in Australia. The attraction of it, as far as I am concerned, is the continuation of payments. Here, someone with a disfigurement or leg taken off is paid a certain sum and told 'We don't want you any more; we will put you out on the scrap heap.' The A.C.C. picks that person up and looks after him or her for the rest of that person's life. I am personally convinced of that system, although the Government has not really taken a final stance on it, because I believe as yet some water has to flow under the bridge before the Government makes its final conclusions. However, I will be making strong recommendations when the time is ripe.

Since returning from New Zealand, we have tried to get the public debate moving again in this direction. We had a feature article published in the *Advertiser*, and here I congratulate Mike Grealy, because he put together a very good, clear, concise and lucid article which would have impressed anyone who read it. Certainly the interested people read it, because already the lawyers are picking up this matter and have sent an advocate to New Zealand to check out the system so that they can get their guns ready, I suppose, to

try to intercede and see whether they can prevent this system from coming into operation here.

My press officer was also responsible for having a good feature article published in the *Business Review Weekly* that ran to about seven or eight pages. I do not know whether the Deputy Leader has had an opportunity to read that, but it would be in the Library, and I suggest that he read it. A very comprehensive and sensible article has been put together about the way that workers compensation is operating in Australia, and the person who wrote it has come to conclusions very similar to those that I have in this regard. It is a very favourable article, and I recommend it to all members to read.

When asked to address the annual meeting and dinner of the Industrial Relations Society of South Australia, I took the opportunity to deliver a speech on this subject lasting some 35 to 40 minutes. I know from the feedback on it that the speech was received very well indeed by those present. I explained the system to them, as well as its inherent problems, and said how it was better than the system with which we are currently working. I also explained the probable problems of implementation, as some people in the community would be against it.

Only yesterday I had a working lunch with the metal industry people at which some 12 or 13 of their executive were present. They raised this important question with me, and I cited numerous instances of how difficult it was to get coverage, particularly in some of the more dangerous industries. They are very interested in what I am doing at the moment and want to look further at the matter, as nobody can understand it in just one session. My discussion with them yesterday was important. Finally, in February or March next year (as it is too late this year) I wish to arrange a seminar featuring well recognised speakers who will put both sides of the question.

The common law aspect is important. A book has been written by Geoffrey Palmer, who happens to be the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in New Zealand. He has convinced me that common law is not the proper answer. I do not know whether the book is in the Library but, if the Deputy Leader is interested, I can lend him a copy. Mr Palmer put sound argument and has offered to speak at the seminar to bring the debate more out into the open. The other person, who I am delighted to say has offered his services, is Justice Owen Woodward, who was the architect of this scheme in New Zealand some 12 or 14 years ago. He is very competent and has offered to come to South Australia to put the case. I had an appointment with him from 5 to 6 p.m. and found him very influential and up to date on this question. He must have liked me because he finally took me home to dinner, and I left him about 11.30 that night. I therefore found out more than I would have in a one hour interview with him.

It is important to place on record that, of all the people we have seen (and we saw every interested party in New Zealand when we were there), nobody is now off-side with the system. The unions had some complaint about it and say that it may need amendment here and there but, under the principles by which they work, it suits them. The insurance companies, which resisted it strongly in the first place because it cuts them out, now admit that they were wrong. They say, that, for the nation, it is best to proceed along this line. We will always have someone who is not in agreement with any system, and the employer organisations felt that in a few of the circumstances some things needed tightening up but thought that the A.C.C. system was good for New Zealand and would help its employment because of the lowering of premiums.

Finally, both political Parties supported the system. In that context, if the Deputy Leader has not already done so,

I advise him to look closely at what is happening in that field, and I am sure that he will come either to the conclusion to which I have come or, indeed, very close to that conclusion. We all want what is best for South Australia in the long term. I happen to believe that this system can and will work better. It is like anything new—it will not be easy to implement, as the Deputy Leader would know.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I appreciate the Minister's answer. It is not long winded but is the sort of information we seek. Does the Minister believe that that system will work without certain prerequisites? What he says is correct but there are difficulties, one being in relation to common law suits where substantial settlements are made. That has a dramatic effect on premiums. In our view, the only way that the system can and will work is to provide the advantages that the Minister suggests, namely, that there is no adversary system, simply because litigation goes out of the system. It is a great plus. However, as the Minister well knows, the Law Society sent a delegation to Canada to look at its system. The Society then put out a series of books about as thick as the Byrne Report, knocking holes in its recommendations. Does the Minister believe that the system can work if common law suits are still allowed to proceed, as they have a dramatic effect on premiums?

I agree with the Minister that the system cuts out lump-sum payments. If lump-sum payments are removed and the weekly pension system is introduced, it will have obvious benefits. However, that bullet will have to be bitten hard if, in fact, common law suits are either abolished or strictly curtailed. We will get rid of litigation only if we get rid of lawyers. The Minister suggested that it was a grey area. Does he believe that the system can be modified to include some of these elements, as they are causing difficulty at the moment?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is allowing this type of cross-examination, based on the line of the Minister's trip to New Zealand, only to make inquiries on workers compensation. We are not dealing with the question before us, namely, actual expenditure. However, I will allow the Minister to reply to the question.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not mind answering these questions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair does not question whether or not the Minister minds. The question with which the Committee is dealing is actual expenditure and not opinions or policy.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will always be guided by your Chairmanship, Sir, as I recall your receiving many congratulations from the Opposition after the casino debate.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The casino debate is not in the line, either.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am happy to discuss the matter, as I feel strongly about it and have done so for quite some time. I am concerned about the damaging effect the present position is having on employment. The question the Deputy Leader raises is one requiring extreme consideration. I know that this system will work.

One has to do away with common law. I think that the arguments put forward by Geoffrey Palmer convince me that common law is a lottery: he says so, and if one examines the success of cases in relation to common law I would imagine that it would run at no more than 2 or 3 per cent. I do not have those figures in front of me; however, the success rate is about 2 per cent, so it applies to only 2 per cent of the people involved. The point is valid but one has to cover for it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is 13 per cent.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It is 13 per cent in regard to loading. I do not disagree with that, but this is where the lawyers are able to cash in on common law. Lawyers in

New Zealand (and I have not been to Canada to look at this situation) have not in any way downgraded their standard of living. They have been able to find work in other areas. In fact, they do a little work in this regard but in the appeals area only. For example, the person whose case I mentioned was represented by a lawyer. Of course, he was there himself but the procedure took about half an hour and it was all over, so he will not get a lot of money out of that particular system.

I would not deny that there are people on my side of politics who worry about the common law aspect of it. However, they ought to read Geoffrey Palmer's book, which certainly convinced me that we are better off with a system by which people receive a weekly payment. However, one cannot have it both ways: I am not suggesting that one can, and I have never believed that one can. In answer to the question, that is one of the reasons why we will be having a seminar next year and why public debate has again been accelerated. People will have to be convinced about this matter: if one cannot convince members of the public and carry them on this question, there will not be a change. If we can convince the public that they will be better off under it (and that is why there must be a very long and strong public debate in this area), I believe that the lawyers might have to change their minds.

However, interestingly enough, the lawyers have already sent David Quick to New Zealand, and one of my officers has already had discussions with him and compared notes to ascertain his view. I have not had a report on that yet. Members of the metal trades employers group said yesterday that they will send someone to New Zealand to look at the system because they do not yet understand it completely, and Ian Harrison will go next week to look at it. Therefore, I think that the Deputy Leader would have to agree that we have not wasted our time: we are getting something done in this area, and we are making people think about it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence. I am trying to raise in this Committee matters which the Minister and I both agree are of vital importance to South Australia. I will try hard to find the correct line. I will hang the next question on the payment to industrial commissioners who deal with this area. I want to pursue this matter with a third question. However, it appears fruitless if we cannot raise matters of vital importance to the State in the Committee. I want to pursue one more question.

It seems that the other real difficulty (if the system is changed and a single body is set up) involves outstanding claims. The backlog of claims not yet settled could run into millions. It has been suggested in some quarters that this could bankrupt the system before it starts. I do not know whether or not that is a valid point. However, if any new system is instituted in relation to workers compensation, there has to be some accommodation for common law suits that cannot be running, with other claims which are outstanding. That is one matter which has to be addressed and settled.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair is very apologetic about this. However, I must point out again that we are dealing in Committee with actual expenditure. There is a way to overcome what the Deputy Leader is obviously having some difficulty about, but the Chair is not here to explain how the Deputy Leader gets over that problem. The Chair must point out again that any question seeking information in Committee must deal with expenditure. It is not a grievance debate or a second reading debate as far as the Budget is concerned. We are dealing with lines of expenditure. I will allow the Minister once again to reply to that sort of general statement, but it will be the last time that the Chair will allow it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will clarify that. I will ask the question under the line 'Director's Salary' because the Director has been involved intimately in these visits. The Director has been involved in the planning and research, and this is a matter which would come within the Director's jurisdiction.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not mind which line you ask it under really. If you can please the Chairman, I am on-side. The Deputy Leader has asked a good question. We asked a very similar question when we were in New Zealand about exactly what happened to the backlog of payments. Of course, the people responsible for the backlog of payments had to pay them, irrespective of the future. The A.C.C. picked those up once it got into operation. What I fear is happening here is that there has been a fairly dramatic increase in the premiums over the past 18 months or so. I think that that is happening, but I cannot prove it.

In New Zealand, I do not know why they were keeping a tab on that, but they were, and they made the point that not only South Australian but Australian premiums had risen dramatically. If one asks them here what the reason is, they say that they were subsidising for two or three years and it is now only a catch-up as far as they are concerned. However, it has been a major catch-up because in some circumstances people have had increases of more than 100 per cent. I will not give examples, but I could do so. The rate of increases has been enormous.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** 400 per cent.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There have been enormous increases. I know that S.G.I.C. and other insurance companies have been considering their position in this respect. I have had talks with insurance companies, and people like Ian Small, and those who know all about the industry, including the insurance companies, know what is in my mind. I do not know whether they are jumping the gun and saying, 'O.K., we will get in and get a reservoir of spare money before the system changes so that we have sufficient money to pay the backlog of claims.' Obviously one can never determine a starting day for a system which will not cut into some particular claims: that is impossible.

However, the last point I make is that the common law claims are not dealt with in the Industrial Commission: they are dealt with in the Supreme Court, so they are under the auspices of judges in that court rather than in the Industrial Commission.

**Mr GREGORY:** On pages 7 and 8 of the yellow book under the programme of 'Department of Labour', associated bodies are listed, and it then refers to industrial relations and safety and occupational health. I note that there is an increase of 5.1 persons for 1983-84, and an anticipated increase in expenditure of about \$146 000. I also note that the projected receipts are down by about \$5 000. Can the Minister explain what these additional five people will be doing; whether this additional expenditure will cover the salaries of those people; and why it is anticipated that receipts will be down?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I take it that the honourable member is referring to an increase in expenditure of a certain line. Can the honourable member please specify?

**Mr GREGORY:** I am referring to page 8 of the Programme Estimates and to the figures given under the programme title 'Safety and occupational health in and near the workplace and other areas'.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As I have previously requested, can the honourable member link this to a specific line? The Chair is beginning to get the impression that it is a terrible pity that the yellow book was ever printed! Can the honourable member link his reference from the yellow book with a line in the Estimates?

**Mr GREGORY:** Can the Chair tell me which line that is?

**The CHAIRMAN:** It could be covered, for example, by the line 'Industrial Safety and Regional Services Division', the 'Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board', or 'Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority'. In regard to the use of the yellow book by members, it refers only to guidelines and policy. Information sought by honourable members must link directly to a line in the Estimates. All the Chair is asking is that the honourable member makes a reference to the line in the Estimates in regard to the matter with which he is dealing.

**Mr GREGORY:** In regard to the line 'Industrial Safety and Regional Services Division', pages 7 and 8 of the yellow book indicate that in the 'Safety and occupational health in and near the workplace and other areas' the number of people to be employed will be increased by five. Expenditure in that area will be increased by \$146 000. I also note that receipts are down. Can the Minister explain what additional work these five people will be doing; whether the expenditure of \$146 000 will be sufficient to cover it; and why it is anticipated that receipts will be down?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** As a matter of policy, after the new Government assumed office I quickly instructed the Department to put the programme into operation. In regard to its machinations, its method of operation, who is involved, and so forth, I ask Mr Bachmann to provide further details.

**Mr Bachmann:** When the new Government came into power we were asked to establish a unit to service a possible new authority on occupational safety, health and welfare. By rearrangement of resources within the Department we had established a small occupational safety research unit of four or five people. That meant a change in emphasis from within another area of the Department, and it adds to the people who are already engaged on this programme. In regard to the reduction in fees, that is brought about largely by decreased activity in the building industry. At present the building industry has dropped from the levels maintained in previous years, and because our fees are based on a percentage of the level of construction occurring within the State, when construction declines, our revenue lessens. Therefore, the reduction occurs mainly for that reason.

**Mr GREGORY:** I note that there is a significant reduction in fees, but the papers suggest that there will be an increase in the building industry. Yet the proposed receipts for 1983-84 are \$5 000 less than receipts for 1982-83. I understand from the press that supposedly there will be an increase above the 1982-83 outcome. On page 8 of the Programme Estimates proposed recurrent receipts for 1982-83 were \$839 000 and the actual outcome was \$787 000. The Director indicated that that was because there had been a considerable fall off in building activity, of which we are all aware. However, the proposed recurrent receipts for 1983-84 are less than those received last year, although we are receiving reports that an increase in building activity is occurring. Does that mean that these receipts are sometimes collected after the actual increase occurs?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** At the time of the compilation of these figures an estimation had to be made. Projections for this year were made on the basis of what had occurred in the previous year. This was done back in May on the basis of what was anticipated might occur in the building industry. I agree that the projections are a little bit pessimistic, but I think it is better to be pessimistic than optimistic in these circumstances, because otherwise one may give false hopes. The member for Florey would know that it is difficult to make accurate forecasts, particularly in regard to the building industry. The position now has changed somewhat. Whilst

we were pessimistic when the projections were made. I think it is reasonable to say that we are optimistic now, owing to the present input into the housing industry. I think the figures will come out better than anticipated.

**Mr GREGORY:** It will be noted on pages 9 and 10 of the yellow book that there is a significant increase in technological change in industry, commerce, and the public sector and a decrease in the facilitation of entry into the work force, which has an increase of 3.3 people. It will be noted that there is a slight decrease in the actual expenditure. Is that because a department or section has been transferred to the Minister of Technology and that slight decrease in expenditure will cater for the increase in people responsible for the facilitation of entry into the work force? Can the Committee be told just how that will happen, and what work they will be doing?

**Mr Bachmann:** As the member has observed, the unit that was in my department for technological change has been transferred under the direct responsibility of the Ministry of Technology. I think the officers are based for pay purposes in the Department of Services and Supply, hence the proposed numbers for technological change in industry, commerce, and the public sector is shown in the Department of Labour as nil.

In the case of the facilitation of entry into the work force that largely covers the departmental responsibility for the school-to-work transition programme, which is funded by the Commonwealth Government and the major expenditure of which is in the Education Department and Department of Further Education. There is some small expenditure in the Department of Labour and the number of people employed on that with Commonwealth funding has been slightly increased this year to enable further work to be done in that important area.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I refer to comments made on page 5 under Agency Overview. One management objective is to develop a youth policy and to oversee the provision of services to youth. Under 'issues' reference is made to the current combination of high youth unemployment and changing educational-training needs of the labour market requiring special attention by the department. In relation to job creation it is stated that effective job creation projects are being developed using Federal and State Government funds through a tripartite Job Creation Grants Committee. What is that programme and what effect will it have on the vast problem of unemployed youth in this State?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, when my Government took office and I took over the Department of Labour, I noticed that there was an extreme shortage of youth workers within the department. I place on record that that was caused by absolute neglect by the previous Government. I am not so much critical of the then Minister, because I think he might have tried to increase his staff but could not do it. At that time staff members were becoming exhausted and were being taken to hospital. They were having to take sick leave because they could not cope with the extreme burden and problems they faced when trying to look after the desperate youth in not only trying to find some solution to their occupational problems but also to their personal problems.

After personally investigating this situation, I was convinced that the reports that I was getting from my department were totally accurate. I immediately placed the proposition before Cabinet that CITY itself, which had operated for a long time and had served the State well and had served youth and parents well for that matter, was there to stay provided that we were able to staff it properly and give it sufficient funds on which to operate. If not, there could be a total disintegration of the whole unit because of the health of the people in the unit and the fact that they were over-worked at that time.

In its wisdom the Government gave me five officers to relieve that situation, and to a large extent (I am not suggesting either, as did the honourable member, that they are overstaffed now by any stretch of the imagination) CITY was able to continue without any great burden on the department's staff. The unit is doing a great job, and it has a tremendous task in effectively putting into operation programmes that CITY decides to undertake. Some of those programmes are well worth seeing. If the honourable member gets in touch with me or my officers, we will nominate a few of them he might like to study on which these young people are working.

The other thing we have done to try and counteract the youth unemployment problem is to introduce job creation schemes. I know that they would be against the philosophical viewpoint of the member, but even people with his political complexion changed their view about that last year when the then Prime Minister of Australia, Malcolm Fraser, brought in the schemes to be undertaken during the wage pause.

**Mr MATHWIN:** We can see good and bad in everything.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I know that you have been very critical of job creation schemes and your Party did not introduce any when it was in Government. I am not trying to suggest that they are the be all and end all, but it is a way of getting people back to work.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Temporarily.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** They are doing a lot better than some of your schemes did but, be that as it may, the policy of my department and the job creation unit has been to place an emphasis on getting 50 per cent young people employed in job creation schemes and 50 per cent of people over 25 years. I place on record the fact that one of the difficulties we have had is trying to find suitable schemes for women, because the guidelines state that 50 per cent of the persons under 25 employed under the job creation schemes must be female. We have had great difficulty in achieving this. In fact, I placed an advertisement in the newspapers quite recently urging the proposal of schemes to try to ascertain and determine some schemes that would help us out of this drastic problem we are having in keeping up our ratio of females to males in both the under 25 and over 25 schemes.

**Mr MATHWIN:** You have found it impossible.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Unless employers come up with schemes it is difficult for us to find jobs for women. They are the matters we have taken in hand, and I am sure the honourable member would agree that we are doing our best to overcome this problem. The major thing required to overcome the problem, not only for youth but also for mature people, is an uplift in the economy. I would like to build confidence, but not to build false hopes, but there are some people being employed who were not employed three or four months ago. I think that explains the honourable member's question.

**Mr MATHWIN:** The other aspect that I would like to pursue in relation to youth is what is happening to apprentices. The Government has an apprentice scheme, but I wonder how far the department has gone in relation to the employment of apprentices. As the Minister would be well aware, there is a ratio set down as to what ratio an employer can have of journeymen to apprentices. In the present situation problems for youth are great, as the Minister and I are well aware. Perhaps if one were to put priorities (that is very difficult to do I suppose when one talks about unemployed people) it would only be right to put some priority on young people to allow them the opportunity of being trained for a specific job, trade, or profession.

I wonder whether there has been any leniency given, particularly in the areas of ratios per journeyman, per

tradesman, per apprentice, for the reasons I have given. It seems to me, and it hurts me as I am sure it does the Minister, to hear of young people who have great ability with their hands, and who have proved it by their practical work at school, but cannot be placed. If one reason they cannot be placed (and it would seem to be possible in some cases) is because there is a ratio situation, then we should be doing all we can to overcome that problem for the benefit of the young people concerned.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First of all, the ratio question, to the best of my knowledge, has not been raised by anyone for quite some time, and I think that is commendable. It is in the provisions of the award, as the honourable member has pointed out, and more in times of low unemployment and high economic circumstances that question is brought into operation. It is apparent that because of the downturn in the economy and the lack of employment in all industries, the matter of the ratio is probably being overlooked, or not being brought to our attention in any case, in an attempt to try to find employment for young people without any disbarment. I think that that is a good thing, and a tolerant thing on behalf of unions that have the power, if they so desired, to bring that ratio to our attention.

In relation to what we have done as a Government, you may recall that I said in the policy speech that we would immediately employ 50 extra apprentices when we attained office. Not long after we had come to Government, the B.H.P. in Whyalla (which has possibly the best training facilities that I have seen for apprentices, certainly in South Australia—there may be better in the world, but they are very good) came to me and said that they had had a downturn, and the intake of apprentices would not be as high as it had been in past years.

I cannot recall what the numbers were, but they were about 90 down to what they had been. B.H.P. had noticed in the policy speech that we had stated that we would employ 50 extra apprentices over and above departmental requirements, which requirements would have been determined at the stage that we came back into Government as at 6 November. B.H.P. offered their training facilities to the Government. I had to think about that offer, because what it meant was that we had to give everyone in the State a reasonable opportunity of being able to apply for those 50 positions, and what would parents say about their kids coming from Adelaide, Tanunda, or anywhere one would like to mention, and having to go to Whyalla.

If it were done at Whyalla, there would have to be a reasonable complement coming from Whyalla in relation to the programme, otherwise the people in Whyalla would have been critical of the whole scheme. I sent some officers and they had long talks with B.H.P. I put it to Cabinet, which finally agreed that we should train them there. Those apprentices are apprenticed to the Director, Department of Labour. We will keep them there for a year, and then bring them down to the departments in Adelaide.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** You have not decided where the papers talk about this.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will come to that in a moment. These apprentices will come down and go into departments where they are required. The third and important factor, and it is a similar proposition that I put to Cabinet in 1977, was to instruct departments to take on as many apprentices as they could. The departments resisted that in 1977 (this would have been for the 1978 intake), and the departments then came back and said, 'All right, what we will do is that we will adhere to the instruction, but those apprentices will have to go at the end of the training period, because there may not be any jobs for them. So, we will train them but they may have to go into private enterprise or whatever'.

I was confronted with that circumstance on coming into office, because the then Minister had issued instructions that those apprentices had to finish on 31 January or some such date. I searched around, rather than accept the position that they were all not required. It seemed to me that if we had a good search of the situation we may be able to find some occupations for them, and keep them on. Some were kept on (I do not know how many) where they could be found useful and gainful employment. This created more jobs for people who seemed at that stage to be going on to the scrap heap.

I have before Cabinet a further submission for departments to 'search their souls', virtually to see what they are able to do. As a consequence of that, we have a committee examining in detail what numbers can be found employment for the next year. We are doing what we can about this position, and I agree with the honourable member that it is a difficult matter.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I wish to continue with the apprentices situation. The Minister would be aware of situations in which there have been cases of abuse by certain employers in relation to employing young people. Although employers receive financial assistance, after these people have been employed for a short time they are dismissed, with employers saying that they do not have enough work to keep them on. How does the department deal with those cases when they are brought to its attention? Has it had any success in dealing with them? I am about to say that this comes under general lines, and the only line it refers to is probably the Minister's wife.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am not sure whether or not the honourable member is aware of it, but I have often talked about exploitation in the community. I even put out a pamphlet recently to schools to give some school-leavers some indication of what their rights were with employers. I was criticised by Max Harris in the *Sunday Mail*.

**Mr MATHWIN:** That is unusual; he likes you.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Yes, we are great friends. Max Harris is an admirer of mine; he is only human, and I can understand that. On this occasion he criticised me, quite wrongly. I wrote to him and explained why I had taken that action. However, our Department is cognisant of the situation and is watching it as well as it can. We do not have the labour force to watch the exploitation as constantly and efficiently as we would like to do. Many of the complaints come to our ears from the person involved. Where we are able to act, we do spot checks and the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission plays its part in the area for which it has sole responsibility. Each apprentice for whom an employer wishes to cancel registration must go before the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission.

Mr Mill and his committee do a thorough job of investigation before they allow an employer to cancel registration. They must be satisfied on all aspects before they will consider cancelling. They are very tough. In this situation, particularly in the metal trades area where the downturn has been significant, only after total examination would they grant the employer the right to stand down the apprentice. Quite effectively, that Commission goes about its business and tries to find the apprentice a job elsewhere. It pulls out all stops to find something. It is not successful in all cases, but has a high percentage of success in finding employment. I commend the Commission as it is doing a magnificent job in the current difficult circumstances. It is extending its coverage continually and getting into training fields all over the place.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I have had dealings with the Commission and found it to be very good.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before I call the member for Henley Beach, let me say that the member for Glenelg strayed into



the line 'Miscellaneous' when talking about apprentice training schemes.

**Mr MATHWIN:** With due respect, Sir, it covers a few lines. However, it is not for me to argue with the Chair.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I seek the same indulgence, as I have a question supplementary to that of the member for Glenelg. The line is under 'Miscellaneous'. I refer to the amount of assistance made available to other apprentice areas apart from the \$220 000 provided for the 50 apprentices at B.H.P.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It relates to the line 'Chairman and Officers of Industrial and Commercial Training Commission' on page 45.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I cannot give the honourable member that answer, because the instance in Whyalla is unique to the Department of Labour; it is the only one at the moment. We do not have a figure for what happens in other departments—that is not my responsibility. The question will have to be directed at individual departments which would be able to give the figure on how much they spent on apprentices each year. It is not in my lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is it possible to get the information?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It is not impossible. I could possibly obtain it for the honourable member by writing to other departments. Although it is not my direct responsibility, I am happy to do so in the interests of co-operation. I will undertake to do it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If information is obtained, the Chair would appreciate its being presented in a form suitable to be inserted in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It may take some time, as it depends on how quickly departments respond. We will act as the agent.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to the line 'Senior Project Officer, Project Officer and Clerical Staff,' etc., on page 46, showing an amount of \$107 000, a substantial increase on the amount allocated last year and on actual payments. The footnote tells us that it relates to the Manpower Forecasting Unit. Will the Minister explain why that unit has had such a substantial increase in its budget and what projects it might be undertaking over the next 12 months?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will ask Mr Bachmann to answer the question.

**Mr Bachmann:** The work undertaken by the Manpower Forecasting Unit is now incorporated in the Labour Market Research Branch, which has a wider role than did the previous Manpower Forecasting Unit. Members will realise that there were projections for the printing and building industries. I do not have the information with me, but I could obtain it for the honourable member.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The unit plans to undertake the following additional projects:

- a study of the labour force behaviour of married women, full-time and part-time employment, hours of work with particular focus on the ease and rapidity with which they move in and out of the work force;

- changes in employment practices in the retail sector of the economy;

- a study into jobs lost in the current recession, whether they have permanently disappeared, whether they will be filled by the same or similar employees once economic recovery justifies this, or whether they will be restructured towards alternative skills to exploit new technologies, processes or products;

- a survey of employers with regard to their attitude to youth wages productivity and employment opportunities.

- work of a practical nature with a view to assisting the State Government in formulating and implementing policies designed to assist labour market adjustment.

**Mr FERGUSON:** My question relates to the line on page 45 in relation to the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit.

The Budget in this area for the coming 12 months has been greatly increased. Can the Minister explain the need for the increase, whether this relates to the earlier questions on workers compensation, and if there has been evaluation of the work of this Advisory Unit what form it has taken?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Is the honourable member looking at the line that suggests that the actual payments last year were \$80 563 and the payments proposed this year are \$120 000?

**Mr FERGUSON:** That is right.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There is a very simple explanation for it. Last year it was for only a part year, and this year it is for a total year.

**Mr LEWIS:** My question is relevant to the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit and the connotations it has for workers compensation insurance. Is the Minister aware of the enormous problems which the present Act is creating, not only in the general context in which he made remarks earlier this morning but also and particularly in the shearing industry (something very dear to his heart, I am sure) and the capacity and viability of shearing contractors and, more particularly, shearing contractors throughout the Mallee and the South-East? Because of their close proximity to the shearer populations of Victoria and New South Wales, who shear under different legislation relating to the risk and compensation of the workers compensation insurance legislation that covers them when they work in New South Wales and Victoria, they are not as well off in relation to the compensation they are paid if they happen to injure themselves in New South Wales or Victoria as they would be if they were to suffer that injury in South Australia.

In consequence, shearers who feel a bad back coming on (and one can: I have been a shearer) and who want an extended absence from work to try and overcome that will deliberately cross the State border, deceitfully obtain employment from a South Australian contractor, and then go sick with a bad back (or whatever other injury) until they either recover or find alternative employment in another industry. That has meant that, under the terms of our legislation, shearing contractors in South Australia are being forced to the wall because the amount that they can charge and the amount that they have to pay their shearers is fixed by a Federal award. Indeed, the premium they must pay if they operate in South Australia in some cases has now, on recent advice that I have been given, gone to more than 100 per cent of the wages they are paying to the shearers they are employing.

This question has been alluded to. It is a very serious matter and it was first alluded to in an article on 26 July in the *Border Watch* which quoted the Federal President of the National Safety Council of Australia (Mr Clive Peterson) as saying that a national review of workers compensation was necessary (and I am paraphrasing his remarks to save time) to get greater uniformity, and that that was an essential prerequisite to creating more employment opportunities in industry in general. I think that the case of the shearing subcontractors to which I have referred bears that out.

He said that there are significant anomalies between the States, and that premiums in New South Wales and Victoria were as much as two or three times those in Queensland for equivalent classifications. In this statement he made no comment about the problem in the shearing industry between South Australia and Victoria. However, he further stated:

While premiums in Victoria had risen by more than 300 per cent this year and there had been rises in other States, the last movement in Queensland was in 1978 when there had been a reduction of 10 per cent. Another anomaly was evident in the compensation payments for cardiac disorders.

A case in point, which I used to illustrate the specific instance that I have raised, was drawn to my attention by

Mr Bruce Fraser, who lives at Willalooka, near Keith. He has corresponded with me on behalf of a large number of shearing contractors on a number of occasions about that problem. I think that the relevance of that to the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit and the money that we are applying to that unit should be obvious in that, without its operation, such anomalies could not be addressed, in the first instance.

The second point is that it would not be possible to analyse, examine and promote ways in which people in general (shearers in particular) could be got back to work, in either that industry or another. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he is aware of these anomalies that exist across the border, between State borders, the effect that they are having on the shearing subcontractors in South Australia, and whether the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit has been able to assist those shearing subcontractors in getting injured shearers, in particular, alternative employment outside the industry if they cannot go on shearing, or getting them back to work again more quickly than has been the case otherwise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before the Minister replies I point out that the member for Mallee was referring to the line relating to the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit. The honourable member has broadened the concept of that, but that is the line with which we are dealing. Does the Minister wish to reply?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am not sure what the honourable member wants to know. Nevertheless, I have a great deal of sympathy with what he said, because I understand what he was talking about. Some time ago I received a deputation from the shearing contractors of South Australia, led by someone from Murray Bridge (I forget his name; perhaps the honourable member knows the person to whom I am referring), who complained to me that a great deal of difficulty had been experienced in getting some shearing contractors covered by workers compensation. One such contractor was with the deputation. It was later discovered, after I had investigated the matter pretty thoroughly, that one of the offending shearing contractors had a pretty bad record in the provision of safe working conditions on the job. This fact was pointed out to me by two or three insurance companies who had had a close look at this contractor.

I referred those involved to the Insurance Assistance Committee, which has a responsibility to try to locate possible insurers for people who require assistance, and as far as I know those people were suitably accommodated. I have not seen the final report, so I do not know the cost involved. At that stage it was nothing like 100 per cent, though. I think they were taking about 45 per cent, which in any case is high enough. I canvassed the matter of premiums earlier this morning. I do not dispute the fact that they are much too high. However, I do not think it is the responsibility of the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit to pick up what the honourable member is saying. The matter goes deeper than that. The Advisory Unit has a responsibility to notify any person who is off work for 12 weeks.

**Mr LEWIS:** I have to relate it to something.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Even so, I want to defend the Unit. The Unit is not responsible for workers until they are injured. At the beginning of the thirteenth week an injured employee is notified, and at the twenty-sixth week the unit commences rehabilitation efforts. I intend to find out (and I will let the honourable member know) whether or not any shearer has been called in for rehabilitation after having been off for the required 26-week period. The Act provides that rehabilitation cannot commence before 26 weeks has elapsed.

In regard to the matter raised by the honourable member about shearers crossing the border to obtain workers compensation, as the honourable member would know, each State has a different rate of compensation and different methods of compensation. Whilst in the final analysis the compensation paid by each of the three States mentioned (New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia) could be about the same, the method of getting compensation is totally different in those three States. I met with the shearing contractors for about an hour, quite a long time, but during that time they did not raise with me the matter of shearers crossing the border after feeling a back complaint coming on. I happen to know a little bit about the industry, and I know that back complaints usually come on very suddenly, after attempting to catch a sheep or due to a sheep's kicking or something, or because one's back wears out.

Maybe in the circumstances to which the honourable member referred, if a fellow's back was wearing out and he could feel it coming on, such a person may have gone across the border and obtained workers compensation in South Australia. However, I think the likelihood of that is fairly remote. I think that sort of occurrence would not happen with any great frequency. It is not that easy for one to move from one employer to another in the shearing industry. Most shearers are booked up for a run for the whole of the season, or certainly for some part of it.

I think it is a little bit preposterous for the honourable member to allege that a shearer in Victoria decided to come across to South Australia to have a back injury. I would like to see evidence of it. Even if it is true, I do not think anyone in South Australia can be held responsible for it. It is one of those things that may or may not be happening. I have the perfect answer for the honourable member in regard to this. He ought to be doing what I have been doing for a long time, although the lack of result simply shows the total inadequacy inherent in the whole system. Both of the Parties to which we belong should be agitating more strongly for a national compensation scheme. If that were in existence workers would have similar coverage right across the country. No-one would be advantaged or disadvantaged. That scheme has a great deal of appeal to me, and it would eliminate any disadvantage or advantage that may be occurring.

**Mr LEWIS:** Under the line 'Department of Labour, Director' for which \$56 220 is allocated, what discussions or negotiations has the Minister had (or might have in the future) with the Federal Minister for Labour and Industry in regard to this matter?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The honourable member may not have been in the Chamber when I gave a rather long-winded answer to the Deputy Leader (although I prefer to give precise answers in these matters). I referred to the matter of the four State Labour Ministers (that is, Ministers from Victoria, Western Australia, South Australia and New South Wales) who have all shown concerns similar to mine in relation to the success or otherwise of the present compensation scheme and the future life of that scheme. Those Ministers met in Melbourne (although I had to send a deputy, because I was unable to attend, but he was able to put my point of view) and decided to pick up as a basis for examination the Byrne Committee of Inquiry Report, which they have all had for some months. I have not heard a lot from New South Wales, but I know that the Victorian Minister of Labour has been quite active, as has the Western Australian Minister for Industrial Relations. In fact, Western Australia has asked to come and see us, to see how far we have advanced and what we are about in this field. There is a general interest in the matter. It is my intention, when we decide that this is positively the track to go down, to see whether we can obtain support through the Ministers'

conferences to get the Federal Government to at least examine the matter, as it is doing in some safety, health and welfare areas, and the like. It is a long-range plan to bring in this scheme nationally, although I cannot speak for the Federal Government; South Australia can only put its viewpoint to it.

*[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]*

**Mr MAYES:** Will the Minister explain the role played by the Women's Adviser in his Department?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I refer to my press release of 20 June 1983, which, dealing with the appointment of the Women's Adviser, states:

The Minister of Labour (Jack Wright) today announced the appointment of a full-time officer to advise the State Government on ways to improve the position of women in the work force. She is Beverley Good, at present the co-ordinator of a course at the Department of Technical and Further Education designed to help young women into non-traditional areas of employment.

This is a very important appointment, especially considering the difficulties that young women encounter in trying to break into the non-traditional areas. This is one of my major concerns. Consequently, I have made it one of the most essential ingredients of the role of the Women's Adviser. My press release continues:

Mr Wright said Ms Good had impeccable credentials for the job of Women's Labour Adviser to the State Government. 'Ms Good is a qualified teacher, holding a Bachelor of Education and Diploma of Teaching. In addition she has had the practical experience of over 20 years in the labour force, first as an employee, then as an administrator of her own business, which involved the recruitment and training of staff,' said Mr Wright.

The committee recommending the employment of Ms Good had a tremendous task in selecting the best applicant from a field of about 80 persons not only from this State but from all over Australia. My press release continues:

Ms Good's appointment honours a pledge made by the Government before the last election; it is the first time any Government in Australia has appointed an officer with the specific task of improving the position of women in the labour force.

So, there are two aspects involved in the press release: first, helping young women into non-traditional employment areas; and, secondly, helping women in the work force generally. My press release continues:

Mr Wright said Ms Good will have wide terms of reference in her position. 'She will be required to report to me on discrimination against women in the labour force and to devise programmes to eliminate that discrimination. In addition, Ms Good will be required to advise the Government on the implementation of programmes to help women and girls gain greater access to non-traditional areas of employment,' said Mr Wright. The Minister said the appointment comes at a crucial time for women in the labour force.

Earlier today, in reply to the member for Glenelg, I said that it was difficult to find employment for women in job creation schemes. Indeed, I made that point as far back as June 1983, and said that that was a reason for the appointment of the Women's Adviser. My press release continues:

It's an established fact that the unemployment rate for girls leaving school is far higher than the unemployment rate for the work force in general.

Those three aspects completely confirm the logical reasoning behind the appointment of the Women's Adviser soon after my Party came to office. My press release continues:

'But it might not be realised that the situation is being exacerbated by the fact that the traditional employment areas into which female school leavers move are being severely contracted by a number of factors, including the introduction of new technology,' said Mr Wright. 'It is essential that the Government has someone who can make a detailed and specialised study of all those factors. We can then be given a plan of action to implement to ensure, as far as possible, that women and girls are not discriminated against in the labour force. I believe Ms Good with her experience as a worker administrator and educator will be able to give us the information which we need to achieve that,' said the Minister.

I commend the appointment of Beverley Good as Women's Labour Adviser: she has been extremely active in her role. The following are some of her duties: first, she has been reviewing the report of the task force on women's employment and unemployment and is to make recommendations to the Minister on that report, which is ultimately to provide information for the Government on issues affecting women's employment and future training. Beverley Good has been involved in training in TAFE for some time now. Not only is she intensely interested in women's issues, she is also interested in appropriate training being provided for women and for them to obtain the proper skills, ensuring that, after they are trained, occupations must be open for their employment.

Secondly, Beverley Good is undertaking a publicity campaign to promulgate the acceptance of young women entering the non-traditional areas of employment. This will take much penetration: many men have complained about women getting into non-traditional areas, and it is difficult to break down that attitude. Beverley Good's task is to entice women into those areas and to see that they have equal rights with men. This involves designing a poster and brochure to be distributed to high schools, private schools, Commonwealth Employment Service branches and career reference centres.

The Women's Adviser has been involved over the past three months in getting out into schools, both public and private, to explain to young school-leavers the possibilities of their training in non-traditional areas and informing school-leavers generally on how many are to be trained for specific occupations. Beverley Good has also been involved in the Work Skills (Australia) Committee and in planning and advising on the involvement of more young women in 1984. She has been a member of a working party on developing a trade union managed centre through the Occupational Safety, Health and Welfare Committee. Ms Good is a member of the Review Committee on Training of Government Apprenticeship and of 10 committees concerned with the educational training issues that affect women in employment and training.

It can be seen from that resume that the Women's Adviser to the Department of Labour has a big and important task to undertake over the next few years, and I am more than satisfied with what she has been doing over the past three or four months. In fact, I would say that she is one of the busiest women in South Australia. She is involving herself in all facets of employment for women. She does it willingly and openly and holds many discussions with women's groups daily. She will not be railroaded by some people who say that it is not the time for this or that: she has the policy of the Labor Party to implement and she is doing that extremely well.

**Mr MAYES:** I thank the Minister for his answer and commend him on the appointment he has made. In referring once again to the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit I want to concentrate on one particular area of rehabilitation. In the Estimates of Payments an allocation is made of \$120 000 for the full year. I know the Minister has answered that question in relation to the allocation but there has been some debate in the House about deafness and the rehabilitation of people who suffer from work-induced hearing loss. As this is International Deafness Awareness Week, I wonder what efforts the advisory unit will be making particularly in relation to industrial deafness. I acknowledge that this could be a fairly intense question.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I think it ought to be made fairly clear (I do not think the honourable member was in this House when the legislation was introduced) that, because the rehabilitation unit is indeed a rehabilitation unit it does not play a preventative role. I would hope that in the not too distant future we can get a co-ordinated approach from

all political Parties in South Australia towards a new fundamental policy and principle concerning workers compensation and rehabilitation, but that does not apply at the moment.

Eventually we will be looking at preventative activities, and that is one of the reasons why I have set up the steering committee to look at accident safety, and welfare areas. That steering committee will be reporting its first paper tomorrow afternoon. The paper will be released and I will call on people to make contributions to it. The steering committee has a new role to play, and I see it is as having a new responsibility in relation to preventative activities rather than rehabilitation which is the situation at the moment.

The responsibility of the Rehabilitation Unit is to induce people to take more interest in their rehabilitation after they have been off work for 26 weeks. The Unit has been devised to ensure that people do not drop out because they have suffered an injury. Quite often, as they think that they are of no more worth to industry or to society, they drop out of the race for survival. The Rehabilitation Unit will contact these people after 12 weeks and again at the end of the 26-week period, when counselling will take place in order to try to ascertain what is wrong with them and to assess the sort of occupations in which they can go back to work. It is not a preventive unit at the moment.

**Mr MAYES:** I was not in the House when that legislation was introduced. I was concerned because the former Minister, in a debate earlier this year, said that there was no such thing as perfect hearing, and I knew that the new Minister would not adopt that sort of approach. In regard to the job creation schemes (on page 47 of the Estimates of Payments) I was trying to extrapolate from the yellow document the employment structure within the department, given all the moneys that have been allocated by the State and Federal Governments for job creation, particularly under CEP. I am wondering what staffing arrangements the department will be making to assist the CEP programme.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I think we should take both programmes into consideration, although it is a reasonable question of the honourable member—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I think that the member for Unley is really seeking advice and, as the matter comes under the next vote to be considered ('Miscellaneous'), I do not think we ought to be venturing into it at this stage.

**Mr MAYES:** Is the programme of the Government job transfer office being gradually wound down, or is some other administrative arrangement being undertaken?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** No. The programme in itself is not being wound down but things have changed quite dramatically, because under the previous Government some departments, obviously pursuant to Government policy, had created surplus labour which had to be dispensed with through the job transfer unit. When we came into office one of the first things we did was to undeclare surplus labour in the Public Buildings Department. I think about 90 people in the Public Buildings Department were to be transferred elsewhere. I issued instructions to that department to undeclare those people surplus labour because I believe that that particular action would have been inhumane. I found employment—

**Mr LEWIS:** You weren't feather bedding, were you?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It is interesting that the member for Mallee asks about feather bedding. Let us deal with feather bedding. The policy of this Government has been not to be placed in a position of paying people twice. The policy of the previous Liberal Government, of which the member for Mallee was a member and was therefore part of the decision making of that Government under the Tonkin Administration, was in fact to pay twice for work done by

the P.B.D. It issued as many contracts as it could in the last eight or nine months to try to create a great aura of success in the private area and at the same time could not find work for its own employees. It paid them twice: it paid them for sitting on their tails and it also paid private enterprise for doing some work (not all) that could easily have been done by the Public Buildings Department. The policy of my Government is not to pay twice but to pay once, and once only. Therefore, my instruction to the department was to find viable, useful, gainful work, and that has been done.

When one has to deal with people like the member for Mallee, one wonders how they can get preselection. One really wonders about the honourable member. He mutters to himself and makes inane interjections. As I said earlier, I thought this was a Committee to give information, without people being nasty to each other, but the honourable member continues to be nasty to me. However, the office to which the honourable member refers now operates a voluntary transfer system, monitors departmental weekly-paid staff numbers, and acts as the approving authority for appointments from outside Government in order to see that the policies of preference to unionists and to existing permanent employees are adhered to. It continues to publish a weekly paid job vacancies notice to facilitate the voluntary transfer mechanism.

Originally, it was suggested to me that perhaps the job transfer unit could be transferred to the Public Service Board. With the greatest of respect to the Board, I felt that my department was the department more capable of handling that matter, because as the Department of Labour its responsibilities are to look after human relationships. So, I decided to keep it where it is at the moment. It has a useful function; it is not as busy as it was under the previous Government (there is no question about that), but it is there to do a job where people themselves want to transfer, exchange jobs, and so forth. The honourable member ought to be aware that I believe that that unit still plays a very useful role.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Page 5 of the yellow book states:

Rapid developments in the industrial relations area require continuous consultation with employer and employee interests and frequent adjustment of the legislative framework if South Australia's good industrial record is to be maintained.

I link that with the line 'Deputy Director, administrative and general staff'. One of the officers of the department has given some evidence before the Industrial Commission, I understand, in relation to redundancy payments. It is the Government's stance on this issue that is of great interest to me and particularly the employers of this State. The Minister quoted from his press release earlier, and I would like to quote briefly a couple of excerpts of statements that the Minister made publicly. On 8 June this year he said:

South Australia would support the main thrust of the A.C.T.U. case for:

- (1) standard job protection provisions for all Federal awards,
- (2) extended periods of notice based on years of service for all dismissals;
- (3) a minimum standard of severance pay for workers made redundant, as well as a minimum period of notice.

In another press release at about that time (on 24 May) a statement by the Minister was referred to as follows:

Mr Wright said he would be urging other Labour Ministers to take a united stand and support the proposals.

The proposals I refer to are the proposals that the A.C.T.U. put forward to the Arbitration Commission which are as follows:

Three months notice of termination of payment in lieu thereof;  
Four weeks pay, plus four weeks pay for each year of service, plus

One week's pay for each completed year of service when the employee is aged 35 years of over, plus

An additional two weeks pay for each completed year of service in excess of 10 years service if the employee is aged 45 years and over, plus

The full value of accrued sick leave, long service leave and annual leave with loading, plus

Maintenance of income payments for a period of twelve months after termination, plus

Any relocation expenses and the cost of training or retraining.

I think that that reflects the South Australian Labor Party's policy. The Minister stated in those press releases that the South Australian Government intended to support that claim, and in fact I am informed that the South Australian Government did in fact intervene and that evidence was presented to the Commission indicating that the South Australian Government generally supported the A.C.T.U. claim. I raise this matter, because this ranks alongside the question of workers compensation, with which the Minister is obviously grappling, as a major worry to employers in South Australia, and it has been put to me on several occasions by employers that if anything even remotely approaching those sort of conditions are enacted they will go out of business. I am talking not about the very large employers but about the middle-range people whose undertakings would be classed generally as small businesses. In fact, the amounts of money involved in that sort of judgment would put them out of business straight away.

I would like to know the nature of the evidence tendered by Government officers in this case. I should also be interested to hear the Minister's rationale in view of his obvious concerns that the costs which apply to employment in South Australia are immediate disincentives to employment and increase the level of unemployment very markedly.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I totally disagree with the last statement made by the Deputy Leader wherein he said that this had a drastic effect on unemployment in South Australia: I think quite the reverse, but I will deal with that in due course. First and foremost, there has been no evidence given by any officer of my department or any other officer of any other department in this particular case.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No statement?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That is a different story: you said evidence. Let us be factual in what we are talking about. You were talking about evidence, and I said that there was no evidence given. A submission was given by Crown Law which is not evidence: it is a submission of the Government's stance, and I personally make no apology for that stance, because over the last two to three years I believe that some of the activities of employers in South Australia, and elsewhere for that matter, have been quite obscene. Their action in dispensing with the services of employees is nothing short of obscenity. If the Deputy Leader supports the old philosophy of the pink slip being placed in a person's pay envelope when he walks out the door at 5 to 5 having been told, 'Don't come back tomorrow; here's a week's pay for 30 years service,' so be it. Let the Liberal Party come out and advocate that policy at the next election. I hope members opposite put it in their platform because I do not think that they will receive much support around South Australia, or Australia for that matter. The submission which the South Australian Government made in support of the A.C.T.U. case was consistent with the A.C.T.U. claim, and for that I make no apology.

I believe that it is about time employees had some protection in the work place. Some employers are better than others and enter into retrenchment arrangements, but usually after they have taken action to dismiss the employee. It is not good enough that an employee can give a term of devoted service to an employer and then find, because there has been a down-turn in the economy, that he or she is

dismissed on the spot. I have not supported that. We can go back to 1979 and look at the last Bill that I introduced into the House. I foresaw these things happening at that stage, picked up the English legislation and adapted it to South Australian conditions. History now records that that legislation had to be withdrawn because of allegations about non-communication that I do not believe were accurate.

During the life of the previous Government, we saw people being dismissed, fights taking place on the job, with placards and rebellious attitudes being shown by workers who were dismissed or cast out of the factory or work place like pieces of dirt because the employer had finished with them. We can go along the lines that the Liberal Opposition wants us to. However, I wish to correct the situation. I place on record that, if not this year or next, certainly in time to come, workers will have protection in their work place in regard to dismissal. I do not know how long it will take to come about, but if a case is being heard in the Federal Arbitration Court and the Government or I can assist, we will do so. If we believe in arbitration, surely one has the liberty to go along and make a contribution as one's philosophy would allow.

The philosophy of my Government is that workers ought to have protection in the work place in all aspects and certainly in regard to conditions and the capacity of employers to discharge them. If the honourable member is looking for a statement of policy, I can give it to him. I am suggesting that the Arbitration Commission clear up the matter. We went to the umpire to determine the answer. As I understand it, the A.C.T.U. has withdrawn the claim and has placed a set of arguments before the subcommittee of the Commission. In fact, this matter is *sub judice*. I was not going to hide behind that and not give the honourable member an answer. I will debate the matter anywhere at all.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I want to disabuse the Deputy Premier's mind on the attitude of the Liberal Party to this question. It is a matter of facing economic reality. No doubt the Premier would agree with the Liberal Party if it said that everybody's wages should be doubled, particularly politician's wages. Everybody would agree with the notion that maximum security of employment is a desirable goal. However, the whole question has to be looked at in a balanced fashion: namely, what does one do to maximise security in employment? Putting forward a series of proposals, such as those embodied in the A.C.T.U. claim, in our view simply jeopardises employment. Has the Deputy Premier or his officers, in support of the application, done any calculations on the cost of implementing the proposal in terms of its impact on various categories of employment? Certainly, employer groups have done it. Would the Deputy Premier carry the thinking of his Government further in relation to the number of bankruptcies that would escalate if it were to be implemented?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** No officer of my department has given any evidence or made submissions on the matter. The submission was made by Crown Law, which clearly does not come under my Department of Labour. The instructions given to the Crown Law Department were given on the firm belief and understanding that the social costs occurring in the community had to be rectified.

If one wants to get into the financial costing of matters, one also has to balance it with the social cost. The social cost is more important than the financial cost, I believe. The social cost of a person going home to a wife and saying, 'Dear, I have just been sacked' is horrendous in my view, especially if one has not expected or known that that was coming. Employer organisations in this State and in Australia should have honest and frank discussions with their employees. Some employers do so, but others do not. They should play it straight, lay it on the table, and give advice

on what is happening within the industry. For some strange reason employers are loathe or frightened to do so.

I could instance one of the great innovations of my time. It happened in Germany with the Volkswagen company. With that company the employees were taken into consideration and were told of what was happening. Those employees, in turn, were responsible for correcting the problem that Volkswagen was having. Instead of transferring the plant out of Germany it is still there and is employing almost as many people as it always did. It is still there even though it was on the verge of collapse. Employers must make employees aware of what is happening within the factory or the industry. The employer has a responsibility to take into consideration the amount of service an employee has given.

Does the Deputy Leader think it is appropriate for an employee with 10, 15, or 25 years of service to get the pink slip as he is walking out of the gate? What sort of social cost is involved when he goes home to his wife? What sort of feeling is in the home that night? The concept Labor Governments, Federal or State, support is simply that we want to get into the records a termination or retrenchment advice notice. I will not accept the argument that an employer does not know when it is coming. Any employer worth his salt is able to determine the fate of his industry and say to an employee six or eight weeks in advance that things are not good, and then tell them whether they are facing the possibility of retrenchment.

It is not the money that the employer has to find and say, 'Here is three month's pay for you.' The argument is that it is three month's notice, or a notice about when he will close down that factory or retrench the employee. If the employer chooses to go the other way and say, 'We will not give notice,' and keeps the employee on the premises, then he has to give proper remuneration to the employee. I happen to think that employers have had this facet of the employer-employee relationship so much on their side that it is no longer funny. If one looks at what happens in England, Sweden, France, Austria, and other places where industrial relations are much better than they are in Australia, one will find plenty of precedents.

Even in places like America one will find agreements of this nature. However, one will find plenty of precedents where there is some employment protection legislation operating in those countries. The latest protection legislation in Australia was introduced about four or five months ago in New South Wales. The Victorian Government is certainly in the process of discussing the progress of this type of legislation with employers and unions. However, I believe that, rather than doing it at a State level, it ought to be done through the A.C.T.U. and the Federal courts, and let all the States accept the formula that the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Court determines. I think that is a proper way of approaching it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The absolute weakness of the Minister's case has come to light out of his own mouth. No-one from the Liberal Party is arguing about the social cost of dismissal. However, when the Deputy Premier admits that no calculation at all has been carried out in relation to the financial cost of the proposals, then he has not done his homework. Every social cost must be met with a financial cost, and the point I was making in an earlier question was that it profits no-one if the financial cost is such that it puts firms out of business wholesale and there are no jobs at all.

No-one is arguing about the tragedy of dismissal: it has happened to friends of mine. That is one of the tragedies of the economic slump. However, it is the height of irresponsibility to put forward schemes that are not costed and where the impact has not been determined, as it has been

determined certainly by the employer groups and others. If one adds up the financial cost that has to meet the social cost, it is quite enormous in terms of these proposals. I know that workers compensation would pale into insignificance in terms of industrial and commercial cost if the full claims of the A.C.T.U. were to be met. Yet, the Deputy Premier has not even done the homework before going into the Industrial Commission and supporting the A.C.T.U.'s claims.

I make perfectly clear that no-one is arguing about the tragedy of unemployment. In fact, someone of our kin lost his job because the Government closed down Honeymoon. Bang: no work: so much for the Government's worry about creating unemployment. The mine is closed, and he is out of work. One of the aims of the Liberal Party is to maximise employment and development in this State, so the great weakness of what the Deputy Premier is saying is the fact that he has not costed it and does not know whether it will create an enormous number of bankruptcies in the State and create unemployment in many areas. I think that, if this were put to employees in terms of whether or not they have a job, they would opt for the maximum chance of having a job. Does the South Australian Labor Government support those claims in full?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will allow the Minister to answer the question. However, the Chair has to point out again that we are roaming away from what is before us. I repeat: what is before us are simply lines of expenditure to be dealt with by the Estimates Committees, and in no way can the recent remarks of the Deputy Leader line up with any expenditure that is before us. It is simply a straight out debate now about the policies of the Labor Government and the Liberal Opposition as to unemployment. I will allow the Minister to reply. However, in future the Chair does not intend to allow this sort of debate to continue for the whole afternoon and evening.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I link it to the Deputy Premier's pay line. He is the first on the list.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The interpretation of the Chair is that under no circumstances could it be linked with that line.

**Mr MATHWIN:** It is in the book.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will not accept that sort of explanation.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Mr Chairman, I would have to agree with you completely. Your judgment is quite clear, because when I look at 'Deputy Premier—Minister of Labour, Special Acts' no money is allocated.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is certainly correct.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Therefore, I cannot see how we can line it up with that line. Nevertheless, if the Deputy Leader wants to debate the philosophical viewpoints and you, Mr Chairman, want to let him, I am part of it: I am happy to be involved.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is simply pointing out to the Committee that it will not allow (and unfortunately for three different times we seem to have got into) a complete debate about the philosophies or policies of the two major Parties in Government and Opposition. This Committee has nothing to do with that concept.

**Mr MATHWIN:** We have done it before in the past three years. The member for Mawson would know nothing about it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the honourable member for Glenelg wishes to take on the Chair, he will get the same warning that I gave before. The Chair repeats: it will not allow the continuation of a debate between members of the Government and Opposition as to the philosophies of politics. It will only entertain the seeking of information or asking questions of a Minister on a line that is before us. I ask the

honourable Minister not to roam too far away from that procedure.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** In fairness to me (and I think that I am entitled to defend myself), I have attempted to answer questions in accordance with the way that they have been asked. If the proponents of those questions want to roam away from the subject, I think that I am entitled to roam with them, provided that I stay somewhere in concert with their questions. Mr Chairman, I agree with you completely and utterly that the debate today has certainly departed from lines. I think that the Deputy Leader has a plan in his mind, and is trying to get me to admit to things about which he wants to publicly argue. That is all right: I am prepared to debate him publicly about any of these matters. As I understood the last question (it was a long time ago), it had nothing to do with any line that I could find. I understand that it had something to do with costs.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Do you support the A.C.T.U. proposals?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am not familiar with what the final proposals are.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I read them out some time ago.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** They have gone to Canberra. The honourable member did not even know that it was *sub judice*, so he is not familiar with what is happening with the final proposals, and I have not been given an account of them either. Let me say this to the honourable Deputy Leader once and for all: if claims by the A.C.T.U. now are consistent with the original claim that went before the Federal arbitration system to give workers protection in the work place in all circumstances where there is likely to be a downturn in the industry or retrenchments, well and good.

I am not talking not about dismissals due to misconduct, but about retrenchments due to a downturn in industry, and so on, and about employers saying, 'I have not made quite enough money for the past six months, so I will lay off some workers.' If the honourable member wants to subscribe to that view, that is his business, but let him go out into the community and outline that to the public and all the workers who have been laid off in the manner that I have been talking about, having received a pink slip while walking out the gate. Let the Leader, and other members of the Liberal Party, tell the community that they are supporting employers and that they are not supporting the rights of employees. If that is the philosophy and the policy of the Liberal Party, so be it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, it is not.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Well, I have never heard the Liberal Party enunciate measures for protection of workers. I have never seen an industrial policy come from the Liberal Party. If the claim now before the Arbitration Commission is consistent with giving workers protection and of making sure that employers cannot dismiss employees at their whim, this Government would support it. We originally supported it; we made a submission through the Crown Law Department, and we supported it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before calling the member for Florey, I point out again that for the rest of this afternoon and this evening the Chair does not intend to allow any member to stray from the lines before the Committee. I am giving fair warning, and I do not intend to deviate from that ruling.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Which line is the Committee considering at present?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Committee is considering the 'Labour' vote of \$9 497 000, the lines for which are contained on pages 45 and 46 of the Estimates of Payments. Questions to the Minister must be linked with an appropriate line under that vote.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I have been fairly tolerant today and have been in one of my good moods, as usual. I have answered questions about matters all over the place, in some cases having had nothing to do with the lines. It is making it difficult to provide information, and, as you, Sir, pointed out a moment ago, the proceeding has become a debate on philosophies and viewpoints. This is an unusual way to question a Minister. Many of the questions from Opposition members have borne no relationship to any of the lines, although I have attempted to enter into the proceedings in a happy mood and in free style. In future I should like members, when asking a question, to identify to which line he is referring on page 45 of the Estimates.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister has reiterated the point that the Chair has just made. It is obvious to everyone that there has been a wide straying from specific lines. It is the opinion of the Chair that unfortunately too much notice is being taken of the yellow book, which really is only a guide, in many instances simply outlining the policy of the Government, a matter which is not before the Committee.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The yellow book provides details of and puts meat on the bones of the lines that are delineated in the Budget papers. The whole idea of the yellow book is to give fine details of expenditure in relation to the operation of Government departments. In regard to details of expenditure outlined in the yellow book, one can fish around and find a line somewhere or other under the vote relevant to those details. To suggest that the yellow book is not relevant is, with respect, way off the beam. The book gives the fine detail of the Budget proposals of the various departments. The whole idea of producing the book is to give members and anyone else who cares to read it more information about the lines. To suggest that basic questions relevant to the book are not appropriate, I would say, with respect, is way off the beam.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair does not accept the explanation of the Deputy Leader. The yellow book simply provides guidelines in regard to a line of a vote under discussion. In other instances the yellow book is simply a policy statement of the Government that may have nothing to do with a line of a vote under discussion. The Chair does not accept that in all instances members of the Committee can simply go on with a detailed debate about the policy of the Government, allied to the yellow book.

**Mr MATHWIN:** The precedent set over the past three years in dealing with these matters is that details in the yellow book can be referred to in questioning in regard to Estimates. That was the situation when the Liberal Government was in office.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has no argument with the comments made by the member for Glenelg if reference to the yellow book is linked up with a line under the vote being considered. What I am taking exception to is the fact that at present members are pursuing a course of action (and the Chair is beginning to get the idea that it is being done deliberately) of linking up a statement of policy contained in the yellow book with a line in the Estimates, which does not agree. The Chair will not allow that.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a point of order, Sir, I fail to understand how you can come to such a conclusive opinion about the relevance of the material contained in the yellow book or Programme Estimates.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is irrelevant whether the member for Mallee can understand it or not. The matter before the Committee concerns the lines in the Estimates of Payments. The Chair intends to uphold the ruling I have made in this regard.

**Mr LEWIS:** On a further point of order, Mr Chairman. Before lunch the member for Unley asked several questions that did not refer to the lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Unley did ask a question that had nothing to do with a line in the Estimates: he was pulled up by the Chair and told his question was out of order. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Florey.

**Mr GREGORY:** At the top of page 9 of the yellow book there is an increase from 12.4 last year to 18.4 this year in the number of persons handling dangerous goods and substances, and the Estimates show that there has been an increase in the estimated expenditure on that work. What are the duties of those six additional staff members?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, about which line are we talking?

**Mr GREGORY:** The appropriate line relates to the Employment Division of the Department of Labour.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair does not want to keep on pulling members up or arguing with them. I have made clear that, when a member asks the Minister a question, the question must be linked with a line on the Estimates.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** In this case, the appropriate line shows an estimated expenditure of \$1 354 000 on staff in the Employment Division.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I appreciate the Minister's seeking to help his colleague, but the Opposition is at a serious disadvantage as a result of a series of rulings that have been given. It is a matter of definition, Mr Chairman. What information do you require when a member seeks to link an entry in the yellow book with a line of the Estimates?

**The CHAIRMAN:** So long as a question can be linked to a line of expenditure or a division of expenditure, the Chair will accept it.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The increase of six in the number of officers handling dangerous goods and substances results from the transfer to my Department of officers who were previously in the Explosives Division of the Department of Services and Supply. With the transfer of that division, the Department of Labour has acquired 200 hectares at Dry Creek on which the Magazine Section operates a 200-tonne public explosives storage facility. Advice on the storage, transport, handling and disposal of dangerous substances is given to the public and other Government agencies, notably the Education Department and the Waste Commission.

**Mr GREGORY:** Under the Employment Division, I notice in the supplementary book that there is increased expenditure in apprentice training subsidies for industry. It is a significant increase—

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** What line are you on?

**Mr GREGORY:** I think half of the problem we have is that some idiot has prepared two books which were given to politicians, which means no-one can work anything out, despite all the assistance from people opposite who have done their best to muck up this Committee and turn it into a farce. Information is given to members of Parliament that there is a significant increase in apprenticeship training subsidies, and I want to know what it is for.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Simply, the member for Florey is seeking information from the Minister on the Employment Division, Chairman and Officers of Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. Does the Minister understand that?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It is a reduction. Really, it is under 'Miscellaneous'.

**Mr GREGORY:** I will ask that question when 'Miscellaneous' comes on.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will answer if you want me to.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The answer would be completely out of order.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I can give the answer. It relates to the Whyalla apprentices. It is the only area where we are

increasing the costs for apprenticeships, so clearly it has to be the Whyalla apprenticeship subsidy.

**The CHAIRMAN:** At present that is not going to be the Minister's answer. It will be referred to when the line 'Miscellaneous' comes on. Has the member for Florey any other questions?

**Mr GREGORY:** No.

**Mr MATHWIN:** On page 16 of the yellow book, in relation to fair trading, it is stated that one need being addressed is that the fair and orderly trading and conduct of the distribution of motor fuel is essential to ensure that adequate supplies are available to the public while allowing smaller retailers to compete successfully with larger traders. The Minister is aware as I am of all the problems that exist in this State in relation to the pricing of petrol. No doubt he will have been approached, as many of us have been, by resellers in particular, who are having great problems because of the discounting policies of the large oil companies.

It has now become a major problem to the public of South Australia in that in certain areas of Adelaide one can buy fuel for up to 4 cents or 5 cents a litre cheaper than in other areas. I do not think that people living in my Glenelg area are able to buy petrol as cheaply as people living in the Minister's area which seems to contain a number of petrol outlets selling petrol for as low as 40 cents a litre. I wonder if that programme description is tied up with the line under 'Motor Fuel Licensing Board', which deals with the Board, or does it come under the general lines which total \$1.354 million? Does the Government intend to take some action to deal with this serious problem? What will the Government do to sort out this shocking situation?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, and I think most importantly, I need to make the member aware that my responsibility in the petrol area is confined to the Motor Fuel Licensing Board, of which a lawyer, Mr David Quick, is the Chairman and Mr Lindsay Bowes (ex-Director of the Department of Labour) and Mr Fred Lyall are members. It is their responsibility to determine the number of service station outlets that should apply in South Australia. This Board was established in 1972 or 1973, when the disinvestment schemes were commenced round Australia to try to reduce the number of service stations and to get some control in the industry.

Whilst the Board over the years has received some criticism from various people, I found it most useful, last time I was in Government and this time in Government, for determining and settling disputes with the oil companies which in some circumstances may or may not be persecuting resellers. I have been able to use the Board in those circumstances as an arbitration committee, and whilst there has been some criticism of the Board and it has been suggested that it ought to be disbanded, I have taken the strong view that the Board ought not to be disbanded. I believe it should be there, particularly for the protection of the smaller reseller who may get into some difficulties with his supplier; secondly, it also regulates the number of petrol-selling outlets that is viable in South Australia. One of the main worries I had about the Board when in Government prior to 1979 was its costs. I appointed a new Chairman after the previous Chairman had left, and asked him to reduce the costs of running the Board. He has done that and I think the Board does an excellent job. It also has the complete support of the Automotive Chamber of Commerce, whose interest is to look after petrol resellers. I think the Board does a tremendous job, but it does not get into the area of pricing.

The question by the member for Glenelg concerned the difficult situation that occurs from time to time, not only in this State, in relation to the prices area where discounting occurs, and where some people suffer and others gain: it depends on the price at the pump from the wholesaler. However, if the honourable member wants to pursue that



question and obtain more accurate Government policy on it, he ought to see if he can get on the Attorney-General's Committee and pursue it with the Attorney-General.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I now understand that the whole of the pricing situation would come under consumer affairs. At page 16 of the yellow book, one of the 'broad objective(s)/goals' mentioned is to ensure that bread is baked within the prescribed hours. I know that this has been a long-running problem for some time, not only for this Minister but for previous Ministers. I wonder whether the Minister will increase the number of inspectors? In relation to the explanation of sub-programming, there are routine inspections, and the Minister does receive complaints, carries out investigations, gives advice and assistance to shopkeepers, and prosecutes for breaches of legislation. That all comes within the regulation of shop trading hours. Does the Minister expect that there will be an alteration in the shop trading hours to allow trading in this area, and also the trading of bread under one's own pricing because, as I said earlier, it comes under the whole aspect of shopping hours and the discounting of bread, and the like. With the previous problems, does the Minister believe that he has enough inspectors, or does he need to increase the number to keep up adequate supervision, and maybe even curtail or cut out the problems with after-hours baking and the like?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** If I can transgress into a bit of history—

**The CHAIRMAN:** I hope not too much.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:**—I will not belabour the Committee too long, but I recall that in 1975, when I was elected to the Ministry, I walked into this House and the late John Coumbe walked across the Chamber to me, and he said, 'Congratulations, but beware of bread', and I have been careful about bread ever since, as have all Ministers.

**Ms Lenehan:** Potatoes!

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Yes, potatoes are much better: you can buy them whenever you like. The matter of bread-baking hours is a difficulty for all concerned, including the unions. I am not involved in prices; I am involved only with the hours in which bread is baked. I suppose for survival in the down-turn of the economy at the moment people say they need to bake bread for Saturday and Sunday use. We do not have enough inspectors to do spot checking all the time on bread baking. At the bottom of page 17 it can be seen that the proposed 1982-83 employment level was 0.7; that was the outcome, and the same figure is proposed again. I am not suggesting that the policing of law breaking in bread baking is not important. However, there are other priorities at the moment being undertaken by the Department at my instigation; that is, where we have some spare time, we try to police the awards, wages and conditions of people by spot checking. We believe that in time we should eradicate the underpayment of wages by spot checking. Whether we will ever eradicate the breaking of hours by bread bakers, I do not know. We prosecute them and bring them into the court after the inspectors have gone there. However, inspectors do have great difficulty sometimes even getting in, because the employers get to know that there are inspectors knocking on their doors on Saturday afternoon and Sunday, so they lock themselves up and bar themselves in and will not let the inspector in. So, in some circumstances, these people are very hard to detect.

In other circumstances I am receiving letters from politicians who say that the hours should be changed, that the little bread-baking concerns in their electorates will go broke. I will not mention this baker's name but there is a baker in the metropolitan area who has been fined I suppose eight or 10 times now, but he persists in baking. Some of the fines have been quite steep, but he must think it is better to bake for a financial reward and be caught, than not to

bake and not get caught. I do not know the real answer. There is some argument in the community that we ought to go completely to a five-day bake, that there ought not to be any six or seven-day bakes, as the country areas have a right to do, as the honourable member probably knows. We have representations from other members of Parliament saying that if some bakers were reduced to a five-day week they would go broke, and no-one wants to establish that sort of criteria. It is a very difficult problem, and I am not sure whether the honourable member is supporting the right of people to bake longer hours.

**Mr MATHWIN:** As long as they pay the proper wages.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I would not think that was normally a problem. If they work overtime, the overtime rates are paid. Incidentally, in these circumstances, the industry and the union, which is rather rare, are of the one accord in relation to bread-baking hours. They say that there ought to be a five-day bake right across the State, and that the only way that the bread-making industry can be saved in South Australia is to have a five-day bake. I am not sure whether this is the real position, but it is one being put to me universally by the employers and the trade union people. I do not know whether Mr Johnson would like to say something on this; he is a specialist on bread.

**Mr Johnson:** The Minister has covered it.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I refer to the line 'Industrial Affairs Division', which covers the expenditure of \$1.491 million. At page 5 of the yellow book we see the following:

A comprehensive review of penalties under various Acts is being undertaken.

That is one area the Minister might like to explain. Will the Minister also refer to the consideration that is being given to the recommendations of the Cawthorne Report on legislative change in industrial relations.

I take it that the Minister is about to make some changes to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Is he going to consider or embrace the main recommendations in the Cawthorne Report? Quite obviously, for a variety of reasons, nobody would agree with all the recommendations in every report. It is not usual for a Government to agree completely with the recommendations of a report. What type of alterations does the Minister believe will be needed? Will they come in short bursts or larger bursts, and will it be at some future date?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The member for Glenelg has asked two questions: he has also asked me to comment on the activity concerning the Cawthorne Report, and he has also asked what I am doing about increased penalties under the various awards. In regard to penalties, the policy is not to introduce into the Parliament a total review holus bolus by bringing in all the Acts under my administration to increase penalties therein. Most, if not all, penalties are out of date and have not kept up with inflation. As we change an Act, for whatever purpose, at the same time we will review the penalties consistent with a reasonable amount based on today's costs, inflation, c.p.i., and so on. Whilst a percentage has not clearly been established, we will be putting them on a more credible basis than they are currently.

I refer to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, which I am reviewing currently through a steering committee and three other committees set up to review such legislation before next year. To give an example, four people were killed in an accident, and the employer was fined \$250 as a result. We cannot place a value on life but one would have thought that a life would be worth more than \$62.50.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Was he negligent?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** He was fined for negligence. The employer has to pay more if he is negligent.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Was that the maximum fine?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That is what it was on that occasion. The second example is where a person had a hand completely crushed and, again, the employer was fined \$250. That is not good enough. Clearly, we have to look at those matters seriously. As other Acts come before the Parliament for necessary amendments, I have instructed that there be a total review of penalties.

The second part of the honourable member's question related to the Cawthorne Report. In the context of what we are doing in relation to the total report, the Department has prepared, and Cabinet has approved, amending legislation, which is before the Industrial Relations Committee for its consideration. It has had it for roughly a month and we are hopeful of introducing legislation during this session of Parliament. The honourable member made the valid point that most Governments hardly ever pick up the total recommendations of any report, as they have their own philosophy. We will be doing that to only a minor extent with the Cawthorne Report because, largely, the legislation to be brought into Parliament will be consistent with its recommendations.

I remind the honourable member that it was his Government that authorised the report and his Minister who stole the report when he left the Department of Labour. Despite being asked by the Director to leave it behind, he refused to do so. It was only by chance that we ever got a copy of it. I place on record my absolute commendation for Magistrate Cawthorne who was commissioned by the Liberal Government to do the job at a cost of \$126 000. His work will not be wasted as it would have been had the Government not changed. That report would never have seen the light of day. The Minister would have taken it home and hidden it around his tennis court. The report is now public and has been well received in the community. This Government will be bringing in legislation consistent with that report.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I refer to line 22 on page 45 of the Estimates of Payments: 'Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority'. I link the question to information supplied on page 6 of the yellow book under the heading 'Safety and occupational health in and near the work place'. Is the health authority a tripartite body, and is the \$6 000 related to fees? The research branch has been allocated \$130 000 this year. Does that branch provide information for the Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority? If so, what sort of research is provided?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The line to which the honourable member refers relates partly to a policy determined by the Labor Party prior to the election and is now in the process of being carried out through the committee of inquiry being conducted by John Matthews. I referred to it earlier and stated that tomorrow Dr Matthews and I will be releasing a discussion paper. I place on record my appreciation of the expediency with which that steering committee has been operating. It has been in operation for only a few weeks but we already have a discussion paper.

Of course, the \$6 000 to which the honourable member refers is proposed on the basis that this Authority may be set up, say, possibly early next year, so we have to have something with which to pay them. If we had not taken that into consideration, the Department could have been \$6 000 down out of other funds. It also relates to the previous line involving a figure of \$1 000.

In relation to research, I am not clear at this stage whether the Industrial Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority will depend upon the research unit for its information or whether it will require its own information. The research unit is there to support it at this stage, so one would imagine that that would provide the basis of the information required. Of course, one has to remember that this is an advisory authority which will be almost auto-

nous in its own way. Charles Connelly is also a specialist in this area, and the unit has been set up to supply the Department with information. One would imagine that the information available to the Department would or should be suitable to the Authority itself. Let us be clear: the Authority may want to do something of its own volition.

**Mr FERGUSON:** My question relates to the line 'Industrial Relations Advisory Council—Members' fees' on page 45, for which \$10 000 is allocated. I assume that that is an estimate of the number of meetings for the next 12 months. Approximately how many meetings would that represent?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, it is hard to estimate exactly how many meetings of this committee will be held. Of course, it is a very important committee, and it is possible to have two or three meetings, say, in a fortnight. Then while the members are digesting information and researching the necessary legislation, they may not meet for another six or eight weeks. However, the honourable member would be aware (he was in the Chamber when the Bill was passed) that the proposal is that, if necessary (and I hope that it does not always take that long), the committee can examine the legislation or whatever I put before it for a maximum of two months. I hope that it would not take that long every time, because it can have the effect of slowing the process down. Therefore, it is difficult to say exactly how many meetings will be held in a year. However, we have allowed \$10 000, which we hope will be adequate for this financial year, in any case. If it is not, we will have to find some money elsewhere.

I would like it to be noted in *Hansard* that the committee has now been formulated and one meeting has been held already. The committee comprises me, as Chairman; the Permanent Head (Mr Bachmann, who attends the meeting but is not really a member); Mr R.W. Fairweather, who represents the employees; Mr Lesses, who represents the Trades and Labor Council; Mr Rennoldson, who represents the employee organisations; Mr C.D. White, who represents the trade union movement; and Mr Fricker, Mr Hill, Mr McCutcheon and Mr Perry, who represent the employers.

The fees paid to members of this committee are consistent with the Public Service Board recommendations, namely, \$85 per half-day session, and we expect that, when the committee meets, it will meet for the full half day. In those circumstances, the members become entitled to \$85 for half a day.

**Mr FERGUSON:** My last question relates to the line 'Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board' on page 45. The vote for 1982-83 was \$1 000, and the actual expenditure was \$1 440. The estimate for the coming 12 months is \$1 000. Does that mean that there will be a decline in the amount of activity of this Board, or was there an unusual spurt in activity for the last 12 months?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That is a reasonable question, because the situation as it exists on paper can be confusing. Activities of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board were speeded up with various propositions more particularly after the Labor Government came into office. As a consequence, it had to hold more meetings to consider various recommendations, and it therefore exceeded the amount allocated by \$440. The amount proposed for 1983-84 is only \$1 000, but the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board will be replaced by the Safety and Occupational Health Authority, for which \$6 000 is allocated. If for some reason we are unable to put that in place (although I cannot think of any reason why we will not be able to do so, because we are well advanced with the proposal), the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board will continue to operate, and obviously the amount allocated for the Authority would be transferred to the Board.

**Mr LEWIS:** Page 5 of the programme papers refers to the increasing of random checks on award payments and conditions. Can the Minister define 'random', and can he say to what extent this will be done and for what purpose?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** During the Estimates Committees last year, I was critical of the former Government for not providing random checking and testing. The answer I received was simply that there was not sufficient staff. Personally, I did not think that that answer was good enough. There is very strong evidence that people in the work place are not being paid the proper award rates. This is found to be particularly evident regarding younger people. I believe that having merely sufficient staff to check any complaints arising means that only certain employers find out that the inspector is alive and well.

If it is possible to have people checking and testing conditions of employment in the work place continually, that sort of news travels fairly swiftly from one employer to another. I am not suggesting that in all cases a deliberate underpayment of wages occurs, but certainly underpayment of wages is prevalent in the community, and I want to eradicate that practice if possible. One way of doing that is to carry out random testing and not simply wait for complaints to be made. We act on complaints as well, receiving many complaints by telephone and by letter. We think that we can head off these unjust practices if we have the staff to do it. At the moment we have increased the staff for this purpose by only one person, but we are advertising for a second officer. This was the subject of a recommendation I made to Cabinet on staffing. The two inspectors will be able to concentrate on not only the city but also the country area. We will continue to send inspectors to check on wages and conditions for country areas as well as for city areas.

We were consistently receiving complaints from Port Augusta and the northern areas. Recently a very efficient and capable inspector was placed at Port Pirie, and he is vigorously applying himself to inspections at Port Augusta and outlying areas. I think he goes to Quorn and other places as well. He is keeping a very close check on employers and their wage sheets. I am not suggesting that we will be able to eradicate the problem completely. However, I am sure that the honourable member would not disagree with me that everyone who goes to work is entitled to receive award rates of pay and that the only way that we can ensure that that occurs is to keep checking the rates of payment made.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Minister has overlooked replying to my question about the definition of 'random' and about how the random checks are carried out.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** 'Random' means checking without complaint; it means spot-checking and going from warehouse to warehouse, shop to shop, employer to employer, factory to factory while carrying out that random checking. We also make checks following complaints that are made. For example, a shop steward might telephone and ask for certain practices to be examined, or an employee might complain about a wage award.

**Mr LEWIS:** Reference is made on page 5 of the programme papers to the fact that a women's adviser in labour matters has been engaged. I recall the answer given by the Minister to a question asked earlier this afternoon by the member for Unley. Does the public servant referred to do anything that in any way differentiates her from the person appointed in the same capacity, I understand, in the Premier's Department? If that is so, why is there duplication?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am surprised that the honourable member has asked such a question. The two positions are not related. The Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department deals with the general affairs of women. The lady employed in that position must operate within a very broad

spectrum in regard to advising the Premier on women's affairs.

I read out a list of duties of the Women's Adviser to the Minister of Labour. The honourable member has referred to two different positions. Whereas my officer confines her activities to getting women back into the work force, to getting women into non-traditional roles, and to getting young women through the school-to-work transition period (all of which functions are related to labour and employment), the Women's Adviser to the Premier has duties that cover the broad spectrum of women's issues on which she advises the Premier. The two positions are as different as is chalk from cheese.

**Mr LEWIS:** I refer to another area in which I believe there is apparent duplication. At page 45 of the Estimates, \$6 000 is provided for the Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority. How is duplication avoided between expenditure for this purpose and the expenditure to be found under the vote for the Minister of Health concerning environmental and occupational health?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Again, there is no duplication, although the duties in respect of safety and occupational health may at times impinge on the work of Health Commission officers. Ministers of Health throughout Australia have had a specific interest in this area over the years, as have had Ministers of Labour. Some people see the role of the Department of Labour as an inspectorate ensuring that the safety and occupational health provisions of the appropriate legislation are enforced to protect the workers. Others see occupational health problems as coming within the ambit of the Health Commission, and there is discourse on this matter between health departments and departments of labour throughout the world. The recent trend has been to establish a single authority to administer the occupational health inspectorate and ancillary functions.

I set up a steering committee to advise the Minister of Labour on what should be done in this regard, and subsequently three committees have been appointed. The sum provided in the Estimates represents an expectancy regarding fees to be paid. The purpose of the establishment of the steering committee is to advise the Government on who should have the responsibility in this area. When the final report is submitted I shall be better able to make considered recommendations to the Government.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Minister has repeatedly referred to the facilitation of entry into the work force, and the sum allocated for this work this year is \$178 000. This subject is of great interest to me because I believe that the need has arisen, as a result of the ignorance and indifference of parents and unemployed people as to what is required of them as human beings if they are to make a meaningful contribution to society by way of work for reward. This regrettable ignorance, and the consequent necessity for something to be done to combat it, now cost the taxpayer much more money for no real increase in the number of jobs in the labour force (indeed, there may well be a decrease in the number of jobs), because each Public Service job that is filled means that more money is being spent in the public sector rather than in the private sector, which pays the taxes.

Can the Minister refute that expression of opinion, and can he say how many additional jobs have been created in the South Australian economy by the establishment, and now the enlargement, of this group of people in his department? In pointing out that there has been an increase in the size of that group, I do not mean to impugn the professional ability or integrity of those officers. However, I wish to ascertain whether, by this vote, we are merely enabling people to compete with each other at a higher level than the level at which they competed previously by educating them in a way in which their parents and other agencies in

the community have failed to educate them, so that, being educated in this way, they understand that, if they are to get productive employment of their talents and labour in the work force in return for wages and a livelihood, they must demonstrate their aptitude and concern for the process in which they seek to engage in the work force. In short, is any benefit derived from this vote?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair again points out that it is extremely difficult to get any balance into this situation when members, off the cuff, make general statements that cannot be reconciled with a vote in the Estimates with which we are dealing. Further, the Government of the day, whether Labor or Liberal, goes to great pains to bring departmental officers to the Estimates Committees simply to help Ministers answer questions on expenditure votes. If members engage in off-the-cuff remarks of a general nature, the whole procedure of the Estimates Committees becomes a farce. Although I will allow the Minister to answer the question, I find it difficult to reconcile it with any heading of expenditure under this vote.

**Mr LEWIS:** May I, with respect, ask you a question in relation to your ruling?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Has the honourable member a point of order?

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What is the point of order?

**Mr LEWIS:** It is a clarification, I suppose. I believe that the matter to which I referred comes under the Employment Division of the Department of Labour on page 45 of the Estimates of Payments. It has been referred to by other members of the Committee several times earlier today. The second query I have relates to your remarks. Do I understand that you believe me to have engaged in farcical activities by asking the Minister to let me—

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is quite out of order. That is not what the Chair said at all. The previous seeking of information by members of the Committee from the Minister dealt with certain lines that are in front of us, for instance, they dealt with the Industrial Relations Advisory Council and so forth. What the Chair is saying at present in regard to the member for Mallee's concept of asking for information from the Minister is that the member for Mallee is making a broad statement, which in no way can be linked up with a particular line. Nevertheless, I will allow the Minister to answer, if he can. I point out that it is extremely hard, especially for the officers who attend, to even remotely line up some of these statements with the vote before us.

**Mr LEWIS:** Without wishing to antagonise you, but seeking your clarification, I believe you have misunderstood. I explained a question I put to the Minister which was: has the facilitation of entry into the work force unit within the department resulted in an increase in the total number of jobs available in South Australia or has it simply meant that those people applying for jobs compete on a higher plain? I do not know, and I wonder whether the Minister or his officers can answer that. I am concerned to see South Australia's employment position improve, and that is why I asked the question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is not a question of whether any member of the Committee is concerned or not concerned with the unemployment position of South Australia. That is not what we are dealing with.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am pleased to hear that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Whether the member for Mallee is pleased to hear that or not, it is the truth of the matter. I am allowing the Minister to reply to the member for Mallee. My ruling is based on the vague understanding that the question might have something to do with the overall wage structure of the department.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Next time I am asked a question by the member for Mallee in order to square up I will walk out, because he is not paying me the courtesy of giving me the opportunity to answer the question. He has made a great long diatribe, talking about philosophy rather than asking a question or relating it to the line. I believe your direction to him was quite in order. If he wants to take his marbles home, that is up to him. He is probably out there now playing marbles.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair cannot allow that either, because we are not dealing with that area. If the Minister wishes to reply he may do so.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The question I was asked was whether or not the school-to-work transition scheme had increased employment in South Australia. First, it has been funded by the Federal Government for some time so it really does not cost the State Government anything except the cost of our officers overseeing the scheme. Secondly, it is not a job creator: it has no concept of job creation at all. What it is about is to get school leavers ready to face the work place: it is a training scheme. It is a scheme that takes them out into various vocations. Late last year I announced, if the member for Mallee had bothered to look at it at that stage, that I was able to convince the then Federal Government to increase by about 700 the number of people who could get vocations.

The simple answer to the question is that I do not have figures available. I do not suppose anyone has figures of how many jobs this scheme is creating, but it certainly prepares young people for the opportunity to go to work. I think that is the important facet of the whole scheme. I hope the honourable member, some time or other, bothers to read my answer.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** A statement is made on page 5 of the yellow book that one of the strategies of the department is to take account of the changing requirements of industry for skilled workers, and that the department is continuing to develop a very adaptable and flexible response to training. I link that up with the two bottom lines on page 45 of the Estimates of Payments under Employment Division. The statement says that the department is developing a flexible response to training with the new Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. I should like to know what changes are taking place; what is happening with this new flexible response; and what benefits are flowing from it?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am delighted to be able to answer the question. As I stated earlier this morning, the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission is very active. It actually works hand-in-hand with the requirements of industry, and that is an important facet of its work. I give three examples of what it has done in the past few months. The commission asked for authority to move into other areas based on the requirements of some industries.

The first one related to roof tilers; this had not been recognised as being a trade. That skill has now been taken under the wing of the Training Commission, and it has been described as being a declared vocation. The second approach related to automotive technicians, and that is also a new declared vocation, also at the request of the industry. The last one that has been recently proposed to me is one in which I have some interest, and that is in relation to the training of farm hands. Some of the farming organisations have said that there is room to give 250 farm hands a specialist training course in farming.

That is what we mean when we say that we are working in concert with the requirements of industry. I can give you more detail, in which you may be interested. An Apprentice Training Record in the form of a small booklet has been developed for hairdressing. It forms a mechanism for inte-

gration of the technical college course with on-job experience, as well as a means of communication between the college and employers. It is intended to develop similar booklets for other vocations. The major study of training for business and commerce earlier commenced is continuing. The initial student survey has been completed, and an employer survey aimed at assessing the level of acceptability of the courses covered in the study is in process.

In consultation with all relevant industry organisations two training advisory committees (TAC's) have been established. Procedures to establish a number of others are in progress. The building and construction TAC was formed in September 1982, and the local government TAC, in January last. Those in progress cover the following sectors of industry and commerce: electrical and electronics engineering; metals engineering; plastics and rubber; tourism and hospitality; and vehicle retail and repair. Further possible developments during 1983-84 will include the sectors of economic services (accounting, banking insurance etc.); and printing and packaging.

The Industrial and Commercial Training Commission is very active, liaising directly with the requirements of industry. That is the important thing about this Commission; it is a tripartite Commission, which has representation from all sides on it and therefore has an input about the requirements of industry. I think it is working very well.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Several references in this booklet, one on the same page, relate to the occupational health activities of the department, and there are also several references in the yellow booklet indicating that there is a fair thrust in the department in relation to occupational health. That is linked up with the line 'Safety and Occupational Health Advisory Authority' at page 45 of the Estimates of Payments. Will the Minister outline the role of that section, because there is a section in the Health Commission that is specifically charged with looking after aspects of occupational health. It seemed to me in the past that there could be some overlap, and in fact there could be some fighting to retain a bit of territory between departments. I would be interested in the Minister's comments on the role of his department, and the resources put into that in terms of these lines, and what overlap, if any, there is with the Health Commission, and how he sees that Commission's role in relation to the expenditures here.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The honourable member must have been absent from the House when I answered this question, because the honourable member for Mallee asked a similar question. If you care to study my answer to him, you will get your answer.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is fair enough; I happened to be out of the House. However, I will ask the Minister if he would be prepared to summarise what he said.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** No, I will not, because I have already answered it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the Minister refuses to answer my question, we will press on.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Let me make myself clear. The member left the House then returned and repeated questions asked by the member for Mallee. I have explained to him that the question has been answered, and for him to study the answer given to the member for Mallee. Now he asks me to summarise what I have said; if that is the best he can do, he is not going well. It is obvious to me that there has not been much work done on that side of the House about questions.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Unfortunately, when I was called away to the phone, I could not hear what was going on in the Chamber, but I take the point. I will read what he had to say. I trust that he did answer those questions,

because the honourable member for Mallee said that he did not.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** He took his marbles home.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** He did not leave the Chamber when that was being discussed, because I was here when he left the Chamber. However, at page 6 of the yellow book, under 'Conditions of Employment (+ \$508 000)' it states:

The increase in receipts in this programme is due primarily to increased collections from employers into the trust account for long service leave for itinerant workers in the building industry and investment earnings thereon.

Will the Minister state why that increase has occurred when there has been a fairly substantial downturn in the building industry? I will link that up in due course under the Employment Division—we are talking about employment.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Of course, it refers to the Long Service Leave Building Industry Act.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, but why the increase?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will let you have the details so that you will know as much as I do. There were 444 payments; \$1 537 767 of gross dollar payments in 1982-83 (including payment to Australian Taxation Department). Item 2 is where the increase comes in. There were 10 766—he is not interested in the reply; I will wait until he is ready.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I take it that the honourable Minister is answering the Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The number of works as at 30 June 1983 was 10 766; as at 30 June 1982 it was 5 133. The increase was due to more accurate figures being available from the new I.B.M. computer system and the increased number of employers. One can see that there is a big increase between 30 June 1982 and 30 June 1983: in fact it is from 912 to 1 201, an increase of nearly 300.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They had been dodging their payments.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** They had been dodging their responsibilities, but I do not think anyone could be blamed for that. What the minute to me points out is that once the I.B.M. computer was installed it was able to provide detail more efficiently than it had been able to in the past. Does the Leader need any more details?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am certainly interested in that area.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The 1983-84 retrospective contributions will be less because of the time factor. The 1983-84 cash reserve will be higher to cover increased worker payments. The 1983-84 salaries figures will be increased to allow for proposed reclassification of all Long Service Leave section positions. The 1983-84 operating expenses are expected to rise because of increased activity. The 1983-84 payments to workers will be higher as more workers qualify. Payments are expected to increase by \$400 000 (from \$1 600 000 to \$2 000 000 in 1983-84). Interest on investments for 1982-83 totalled \$1 255 242 (for 1981-82 it was \$903 903). The balance of the fund, as at 30 June 1983, was \$9 996 297.

**Mr LEWIS:** I refer to the Estimates of Payments, page 45, in particular, members' fees for the Motor Fuel Licensing Board (\$15 000); the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board (\$1 000); the Industrial Relations Advisory Council (\$10 000); and, on page 46, members' fees for the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission (\$13 000). How many members are on each commission, what are their names, what are they paid, and what does the difference in the amounts represent? I refer, first, to the Motor Fuel Licensing Board, the members of which appear to receive \$15 000 a year. Who is on the board and what are they paid?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is the member for Mallee asking a question?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am convinced that members on that side have not done any work on this line. The questions they have asked are infantile. Details of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board are already in *Hansard*. However, to save the members embarrassment (as they have not done their homework), I will give the details again. The membership consists of Mr David Quick (a male lawyer), as Chairman; Mr Fred Lyle (a male) as a member; and Mr L. Bowes (also a male), another member.

**Mr LEWIS:** I wish to know about the difference in fees paid to members.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The fees are set by the Public Service Board and the Governor-in-Council. I do not set the fees. The retainer per annum for the Chairman in \$3 500 and for a member \$2 750. The fee per session up to four hours is \$80 for the Chairman and \$60 for a member. For a session up to eight hours it is \$160 for the Chairman and \$120 for a member. They hold formal hearings when people give evidence, are cross-examined, and so on.

**Mr LEWIS:** That information does not show the difference in the amounts being paid to professional people for the time they spend. Do they get only \$10 000 per annum?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am the Chairman of IRAC. The Permanent Head is Mr Bachmann (representing the public sector); and members are Mr R.W. Fairweather; Mr J.K. Lesses; N. Rennoldson; and C.D. White, all representing the employees in the private sector. Representing the private sector employers are Mr G.A. Fricker; Mr C.J.H. Hill; Mr M.G.G. McCutcheon; and, Mr Michael O.R. Perry. Their fees are \$85 per half-day session (up to four hours). That information is already in *Hansard*, but if the honourable member wants duplication, I will give it to him.

**Mr LEWIS:** The other question I put to the Minister is in regard to the difference in rates of pay for the various bodies upon which people are required or asked to sit.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not set the rates of pay—the Public Service Board sets such rates, depending on responsibilities. It makes the recommendations which the Government picks up. The difference is only about \$5. It may be that one rate was set a little later than the other. The honourable member is probably referring to the Motor Fuel Licensing Board having a different system.

**Mr LEWIS:** I wanted to know why members of various councils, bodies, boards, etc., set up under the Department of Labour are paid at different rates. Does the Minister think that that is fair and legitimate?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Clearly, it depends on the amount of responsibility that each committee has. The rates are recommended in the first place by the Public Service Board. Those rates are to be reviewed. Obviously, the rates for the whole of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board are not current and need revision as they are so much lower. The IRAC Committee has just been established and, therefore, the Board's recommendation is a recent one, whilst other rates have not been looked at for some time.

**Mr LEWIS:** We can compare that to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board members' fees of \$1 000.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Executive Council established the Board on 7 March 1974 under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1983. It has about five two-hour meetings per year. Membership consists of Mr H.R. Bachmann, as Chairman, and Mr C.L. Fisher (the Chief Inspector of the Department of Labour), both representing the public sector. Other members representing the private sector include Mr P.J. Hampton, of the South Australian Employers Federation; Mr Michael G.R. Perry, of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Mr O.A. Beaton, of the Master Builders Association; Mr Malcolm Maslen, of the Metal Industries

Association; and, Messrs R.D. Clarke, R.W. Fairweather, R.G. Owens, and A.C. Saunders, all of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. The fees payable for that body are \$45 per half day. Therefore, one can see that it is a tripartite Board which serves the Government well.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer to the line 'Overseas visit of Minister and Minister's wife (where approved) and officers.' The princely sum of \$2 000 is proposed for that line for 1983-84. Last year there was an amount of \$9 461. The Minister has already indicated that he went to New Zealand, and I guess that that would be an overseas trip. However, there is also an amount of \$2 000 for an overseas trip this financial year. What trips are envisaged? I understand from his answers to questions that the Minister intends to go to the I.L.O. Conference. Someone must be picking up the tab, and I am interested in what overseas trips are envisaged and what this line is meant to cover.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Last year I had nothing to do with the formulation of the Budget, but we did send a project officer (Mr Sheehan) to Singapore to attend a conference on technological change. That was not a very large cost: it was only \$1 327.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Is the New Zealand trip in that?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will give the details on that. The New Zealand trip cost \$8 000 for three people: J.D. Wright (the Minister) and Messrs Bachmann and L. Wright. I am not sure that I did say that in the House. I certainly told the Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am sorry if it was private. I thought that the Deputy Premier mentioned that in the House.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I could stand corrected, but I do not think that I said it publicly: I told you personally.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Anyway, there is a line for an overseas trip. It is a legitimate question.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I want to deal with this: you want to duck it. I do not think that the Deputy Leader has the right to bring up in this Committee what I told him privately, and I am quite surprised that he is doing that. It is the first time that I have noticed him doing such a thing.

**Mr LEWIS:** Who brought it up?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** He did. This year it is South Australia's turn to represent the Commonwealth Government at the I.L.O. Conference. I have not been told officially by the Government of the day that I will be chosen to do this task. If I am offered it, obviously I will want to go to the I.L.O. conference. However, I do not want that to pre-empt in any circumstances any decision that may be made by the Commonwealth. That is why I have not made anything public about it. The Deputy Leader and I were talking about other matters. It is not my intention to take part in any other trips in the next financial year. However, that may not occur, as the Deputy Leader would know. The member for Mallee can laugh as much as he likes. There may have to be a special trip somewhere: one has to go. Let us be honest about that: if I did not go, he would be criticising and condemning me for not going. Who knows what will happen in relation to all sorts of industries and problems?

Let me phrase it so that the member for Mallee would understand it: there are no trips planned by me so far as the State is concerned next year, except that I may have to do something for the State in conjunction with the Commonwealth trip.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I apologise. I had no intention of talking about things that the Minister told me privately. However, the line is there and I am interested in information in relation to trips. I take it from what the Minister says that he does not envisage any trips by his

departmental officers either, because they are included in this line. As has been suggested, \$2 000 would not send anyone anywhere when one is talking about going overseas.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There are no overseas trips planned for officers of my Department for the next financial year.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On page 8 of the yellow book appears a line and a programme title which refers to employee participation. I guess that in the Bible that would come under the lines dealing with employment. The expenditure proposed in 1982-83 was \$90 000, and, in effect, it was \$117 000. This year the amount proposed is \$59 000. Of course, that amount is far less than was proposed last year, when in the event, much more was spent. I ask the Minister for information on that line. What does the employee participation involve, what led to the over-expenditure last year, and what is the position where there is a very sharp withdrawal of resources in that area?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am not sure what the question is.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will repeat the question. I thought that it was clear. There is a line in relation to an employee participation programme for which \$90 000 was voted last year. The amount of \$117 000 was spent, and \$59 000 has been voted for this year. A lot more was spent last year than was indicated. I want to know why that was and why there is such a big cut-back this year. Was the programme a flop? I am merely seeking information.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It is to do with the Employees Participation Unit, which had some four officers. Presently, there are only two officers in the unit. Of course, that would bring about a deficiency so far as the financial commitment was concerned. It may be of interest to the honourable member to learn what these people have been doing. He did not ask that.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I thought that the question was clear. For the third time: I asked why was \$90 000 budgeted, \$117 000 spent this year, and \$59 000 budgeted this year. There was an increase last year on what was allocated. This year there is a marked decline. I asked a simple question.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair points out again to the Minister that the problem is that the expenditure on page 8 of the yellow book to which the honourable Deputy Leader is referring in no way could be linked with any line with which we are dealing now in relation to the Department of Labour.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We are spending money not voted for.

**The CHAIRMAN:** As the Chair has pointed out all afternoon, the difficulty is that honourable members are not referring to the vote that is in front of us.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Then the Department is spending money without a line, money that Parliament is not voting. It is there in black and white: they will spend this money.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is not on the line. The Chair persists in saying that the Deputy Leader cannot refer to a line that has nothing remotely to do with the vote under consideration.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is a criticism of the lines.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If the Deputy Leader wishes to ask a question, the Chair will allow him to do so. However, the Chair points out that it has nothing to do with the vote.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** With respect, any money spent by Government must have the sanction of the Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will not enter into a debate with the Deputy Leader. I have consistently made the point concerning reference to specific lines. If the honourable member does not want to accept my ruling he can

take a certain procedure. The Committee must refer to the specific lines before it.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer to the Employment Division, as we are talking about employee participation—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair is quite well aware of what the Deputy Leader is referring to. I am saying that the Deputy Leader is referring to the yellow book, which is simply a guide to policy, and so on. The honourable member's reference has nothing to do with the vote under consideration. If the Minister wishes to reply to the matter raised by the honourable member he may do so, but the Chair would point out that it has nothing to do with the lines.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** With respect, Mr Chairman, I am referring to money that is being voted in the lines: if the lines for which the money has been allocated are obscure, then that is the fault of the layout of the lines. I suspect that the allocation that I am referring to fits into the block of lines under 'Employment Division' which you, Sir, suggested that we could refer to. An amount of \$117 000 was spent last year on employee participation in employment.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I will allow the Minister to reply, but that matter has nothing to do with any line presently before the Committee. Does the Minister wish to reply?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Yes. The honourable member has asked a question that is not consistent with a specific line, but I am being very tolerant in that regard. The answer to the honourable member's question is simple. I point out that initially the matter was considered in the 1982-83 Budget, which was the responsibility of the previous Government. The Employee Participation Unit began with three persons in it. Another employee was transferred to the Unit to look at occupational health and safety matters, which in turn provided that there were four people in the Unit. Because the staff total increased by 33 per cent, the cost of the operation of the Unit increased. Also, wage increases occurred through the year, which meant that extra costs were incurred. The deficiency this year in regard to the amount prescribed is simply because staff has been reduced from last year's total of four to a total of two this year.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I refer to the line 'Cost of reporting services'. The amount allocated last year was \$493 000 and actual payment was \$415 623. The allocation proposed this year has been reduced by \$3 000. Having regard to economic conditions, will the Minister say why the allocation has been reduced by \$3 000?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not quite understand the figures mentioned by the honourable member. Payments last year amounted to \$415 623, whereas this year's proposed allocation is \$461 000. How then can the member maintain that the allocation has been reduced by \$3 000? A comparison of the proposed allocation of \$461 000 and the amount voted last year of \$493 000 could be deemed to represent a reduction, but that calculation would amount to a reduction of \$32 000, and not \$3 000. So, the honourable member's arithmetic is not too good. Simply, the position is that last year the reporting services were not used as much as was anticipated, because the activities within the court were not as great as was expected. Hence, there was a saving of \$78 000. However, this year we had to try to strike an average: if you like, it is a bit of a guesstimate. It may be that we will not spend \$461 000, but it is better to be safe than sorry, because if the allocation is not sufficient one is running around trying to obtain money from some other line that may not necessarily be available.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I refer to the line 'Commissioners and Industrial Magistrates', for which \$368 000 was voted last year. Actual payments amounted to \$422 983, which in fact

represented an overspending by the department. This year's allocation is to be \$425 000. What was the reason for last year's overspending? Is such overspending to continue? This year's allocation has been increased by a substantial sum.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The overspending occurred as a result of mismanagement by the previous Government, which, in my view was pretty bad mismanagement, because upon assuming office we found that two part-time magistrates were getting almost three salaries—it may not have been quite that much, but certainly they were getting the equivalent of 2½ salaries, owing to the method by which they were working as casual labour. Most of the time they were working full-time on that basis. On the advice of the Director, who brought the matter to my attention, I investigated and decided that we would have to cancel out that situation and get rid of the two part-timers and appoint one new magistrate. The previous situation cost a lot of money, and hence the increase in expenditure above the amount allocated. Wage increases through the year contributed to the increase, but it was mainly due to the rates paid for casual labour. The allocation of \$425 000 may appear to be a little light-on, but we have dispensed with the part-time employment that existed in that area and have employed one full-time magistrate.

**Mr MATHWIN:** The actual payment for the Workers Rehabilitation Advisory Unit was \$80 563. Proposed expenditure this year is \$120 000. I presume that as this is a new Unit an increase in cost is to be expected. Will the allocation of \$120 000 be used merely for the payment of salaries to the personnel of the Unit, or will other payments be made from that sum?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I reiterate that there is not much cohesion between the Opposition members because that question was asked earlier in the day.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was not.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It was certainly asked; check *Hansard*. The simple answer to the question is that the actual payments for 1982-83 of \$80 563 were not for a full year and the \$120 000 estimated expenditure for this year will be for a full year. That question was answered—

**Mr FERGUSON:** I asked it.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There you are, the member for Henley Beach asked the question.

**Mr LEWIS:** Does the Minister share the Chair's opinion that was expressed earlier this afternoon that the Department has nothing to do with job creation when the line on page 46, under 'Employment Division', specifically refers to the job creation unit with an expenditure this year of \$171 000? Why has that amount been increased? How many jobs has it provided for people employed outside the Department over and above what might have otherwise occurred in the economy spontaneously?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I reiterate that this situation is just a shambles. There has not been a sensible question asked since the Deputy Leader asked the first question today.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That reflects on your Party as much as it does on ours.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not care. The fact of the matter is that you are plucking questions out of the air. You have done no examination of the details—

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is rubbish.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr MATHWIN:** You're hiding behind the yellow book.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the member for Glenelg is going to carry on in defiance of the Chair, the Chair will act. I also ask the Minister not to comment and to please answer the question that the member for Mallee asked him.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The question that has just been asked by the member for Mallee is totally different from

the question he asked me earlier. He asked me a question earlier about the school-to-work transition programme wherein I said it was not a job creation scheme, and it is not. The \$171 000 he mentioned is the payment for the job creation unit itself.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Why didn't you give a sensible answer?

**Mr LEWIS:** That has nothing to do with the question I asked the Minister.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair is not going to continue to keep pulling up members indefinitely; there will be some action taken by the Chair if members do not desist. The Chair is trying not to interrupt proceedings, but if the member for Mallee in this instance wishes the Chair to do so, I will take appropriate action. I take it that the member for Mallee has a question?

**Mr LEWIS:** I will repeat the question: under the line 'Job Creation Unit', how many jobs have been created? How many jobs does the Minister expect will be created, acknowledging that the expenditure that we are being asked to approve is being increased from \$58 000 to \$171 000? I trust that the Minister may be able to divorce himself from making gratuitous insults of me and from misquoting me.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before the honourable Minister even remotely looks at what he is endeavouring to find for the member for Mallee, it might be interesting for the Chair to point out to the member for Mallee that the line that he is now trying to link with the job creation scheme does not cater for that particular point at all. The line to which the honourable member has referred simply deals with the expenditure relating to the unit. If the honourable member refers to page 47, under the line 'Miscellaneous', he will find that that expenditure deals with the job creation scheme. I am ruling the question completely out of order. Are there any other questions?

**Mr LEWIS:** Why is the Committee being asked to consider expenditure of \$171 000 under the heading 'Executive officer, administrative and clerical staff—Job Creation Unit'?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That sum represents the wages for the eight people in the Job Creation Unit during 1983-84 and flows from a mandatory condition from both the Liberal and the Labor Commonwealth Governments: that the State Government had to pick up any charges incurred in the running of the two schemes, the job creation scheme and the CEP scheme. In order to establish the Unit, money had to be allocated, but that allocation of \$171 000 has nothing to do with creating jobs as such. The staff of the Unit are public servants who are there for the purpose of managing the scheme: the sum referred to is not part of the job creation funded money. It is State money, not Commonwealth money, that has been allocated specifically to pay the salaries of officers of the Unit.

**Mr LEWIS:** If the taxpayers of South Australia, in accordance with this vote, meet the cost of \$171 000 for the establishment of the Job Creation Unit and its maintenance by way of salaries and related payments, what benefit in the form of jobs does the Government expect that expenditure to create?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The number of applications received so far under the wage pause programme—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair will not allow the Minister to pursue that line and to engage in that sort of debate at this time. That line refers to the 'Miscellaneous' vote, and it can be discussed when that vote is before the Committee.

**Mr LEWIS:** Given the variations, as revealed by the Minister in reply to my previous question about the rates of remuneration to members of these boards and committees to which I have referred, does he believe that the whole question of the rate of remuneration to members of the



advisory bodies within his Department and other departments should be reviewed? Are the present variations legitimate and reasonable? If the Minister does not think that they are, how does he plan to rectify the situation?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Earlier, I said that the method of fixing the fees had been established by the Public Service Board, which considers the responsibilities, the time of sitting, and other relevant factors before declaring the rate of remuneration. On the recommendation of the Public Service Board, the Government offers that rate of remuneration to members of the committee or board. If the members do not like the figure set they do not accept it. The Government will not, as a matter of policy, get into the business of setting rates. True, there is a variation, but there is probably good reason for it. Some of the fees have been set later than others: in fact, the fees payable to members of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board are due for review soon. Although the fees for members of certain bodies may seem a little high, they have been fixed on the advice of the Public Service Board.

**Mr LEWIS:** If the Minister were considering industrial awards, he would probably have a coronary if he heard himself make the statement he has just made. Does the Minister disclaim all responsibility for the mechanism by which these fees are determined and agreed to?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not know why the honourable member is persisting with this matter, although it is probably because he has had no Ministerial experience. The system I have referred to has operated for some time: it was operating when I became a member of Cabinet in 1975; it operated during the term of the Tonkin Liberal Government; and it is operating at present.

I do not know what other instrumentality within Government has the ability or know-how to have an inquiry into a board's responsibilities, other than the Public Service Board, which has industrial officers and a full complement of industrial relations people available to it who can make such recommendations. I do not know what other method the honourable member has in mind. If he can produce a fairer method or a more honest type of reporting to Government than that, I would be happy to listen to him. I understand that that is the system; it applies in other Governments in Australia, and it is a system that has served well.

**Mr LEWIS:** In view of that answer, does the Minister believe that the Public Service Board should fix the remuneration of all public servants in the same way?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Are you talking about wages?

**Mr LEWIS:** All remunerations.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There is a Salaries Tribunal and also an Arbitration Court to do that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair once again points out that that has nothing to do with any form of expenditure that is before us. Does the honourable member for Mallee have any more questions?

**Mr LEWIS:** Salaries, wages and related payments are the specific matters that we are referring to. I am trying to understand how these arbitrary rates are fixed, and presently I have had no real information at all. If it were to be for a large block of employees, they would be represented by a union, before an arbitration court, and the matter would be determined there. At the present time the rates are determined in a subjective way according to what seems to be a fair thing by an industrial officer in the Public Service Board. I think that that is untidy, and I want to know if whether the Minister in this instance given that it is this Department that we are considering and this Minister who is responsible for the Arbitration Commission and the way in which every other kind of remuneration in our community is fixed, sees it as his personal responsibility and that of his

department to rectify these anomalies that do exist. I have been trying to find that out since 1975, even before I entered this place.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair would point out that, again, we are in a very grey area at present. There is some doubt in my mind whether the Minister has any dictates or control over the Industrial Commission.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am not asking that. I am asking whether the Minister personally disclaims any responsibility whatsoever for the way in which the remuneration of people serving the Government is determined and why, if he disclaims responsibility, he does so, and what other officer of Government determines it. We as a Parliament and Committee have been asked to consider expenditure specifically relating to the kinds of Government agencies to which I have referred, and there is no other way in which I, as a member of this Parliament, can either draw attention to those anomalies or otherwise understand how they can be rectified, unless I do it here.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It seems rather ironic to me that the honourable member has sat in this Chamber on previous Estimate Committees and has not raised this question that he has raised today. I cannot imagine the reason for his persistence, but there certainly have been at least two other occasions when he has had an opportunity.

**Mr LEWIS:** I was never a member of this Committee before.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair is endeavouring to make the position as clear as it possibly can. The honourable member for Mallee is now into the field of setting a wage structure that is governed by an industrial commission or industrial court, and in no circumstances—

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No it is not.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** It is outside that ambit. That is my very point; you have misunderstood me entirely.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair has understood the situation very clearly and is pointing out that we are dealing with actual expenditure that will be the responsibility of the Minister. At present the member for Mallee has in fact asked no question at all to do with that particular expenditure. I think the Minister in his reply will stray completely from the question by bringing in the Industrial Commission, but nevertheless I will let the Minister continue at this point.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First of all, the policies of the past four or five Governments, including those of which I have been a member, have always been similar to that which is being adopted at the moment involving the relationship between fees members of a board and those for people who do part-time work (if one looks at it on that basis) for the Government and I defy anyone to say it was any different under the previous Government—

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It was not; it was the same method. The method is simply this: the Public Service Board is given the task of reviewing remunerations for those people who do part-time work for the Government from time to time. They are called in when new committees like IRAC have been established. It is the responsibility of the Board, not the Industrial Court or Arbitration Commission, to determine those part-time jurisdictions and wages. That has been the policy of the Government. They do it by a series of meetings, I understand, with the people involved, ascertaining from them the amount of work they have to do, the number of hours they are sitting, and the responsibilities they have. The Public Service Board then, through its Chairman I would imagine, makes a recommendation to the Premier, who in turn would bring that into Cabinet.

It is not my responsibility as Minister of Labour to interfere in the remuneration of part-time employees. I have explained

the system to the honourable member, and that has been the system since I have been associated with Government. It was the system of his Government through whose term he sat in this Parliament for three years and never questioned it.

**Mr LEWIS:** Does that make it right?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Now, because he has no other questions to ask, he wants to pursue this.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I ask the Minister whether, in pursuing the point which the member for Mallee rightly raises—whereby this Parliament is being asked to vote expenditure to pay boards which come under the Minister's direct jurisdiction—the Minister is disclaiming any responsibility for the payment of those funds. That is what the member for Mallee is asking. The fact is that when in office the Liberal Government was well aware of the fact that there were serious anomalies in remuneration between various boards and individuals doing work for the Government, in other words, for the people of this State. The attempts by the Minister to denigrate the member for Mallee are right out of order. It is his responsibility for the money on which we are to vote. If he wants to shovel his responsibilities on to somebody else, let him say so.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair accepts that and points out that the Minister is certainly responsible for anything to do with members of the boards in question or the expenditure involved. However, the point that the Chair made to the member for Mallee is that the honourable Minister has no responsibility for the wage fixation aspect.

**Mr LEWIS:** I was not asking about wages.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Are there any other questions?

**Mr LEWIS:** Given my questions about the remuneration of these people employed on various boards and committees being anomalous: given that this matter has in no way at any time ever been considered by the Arbitration Commission, a court or judge, but is considered, the Minister assures us, by the Public Service Board; and given that the Minister will not personally accept any responsibility for their determination but nonetheless expects us to agree that it should be appropriated in the vote within his department, will the Minister nonetheless undertake, with those powers and authorities available to him within his department as Minister of Labour, to investigate the anomalies and also undertake to annually fix a scale of fees according to skill, responsibility and frequency of meeting, which members of these boards can then be paid, so that there is some consistency?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** No, I will not take the responsibility for doing all that is being asked but, if it will satisfy the Committee and allow us to move on from this question, I will pass the whole matter over to the Public Service Board for its review and to make further recommendations.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being no other questions I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Mr J. Mathwin  
Mr K.H. Plunkett

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour and Minister of Public Works.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr H.R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.  
Mr M.C. Johnson, Deputy Director, Department of Labour.  
Mr B.J. Bartlett, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Labour.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer first to the Estimates of Payments and to the line on page 47 'Job Creation Scheme—Project Grants—Wage Pause Programme' showing a proposed expenditure of \$13.540 million to the next line 'Community Employment Programme', proposed expenditure \$21.739 million, and to the following line 'State Government Employment Programme including Home Assistance Scheme' proposed expenditure \$5.7 million, a total of about \$40 million—a large sum in this State Budget. As these amounts have been allocated to generate employment for what length of time will people who gain employment remain employed on average, because of the expenditure of these large sums of money.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The schemes must have a minimum life of six months. It is difficult to forecast how long any individual will work under any scheme. For example, as at 30 January 1983 a total of 2 012 people were employed under these schemes. There would be more people so employed now as we are a lot further down the track. The simple way of putting it is that each of these persons will get a minimum of six months work. That does not mean that these projects will not go longer as some of them certainly will. The Porter Bay project at Port Lincoln will certainly go longer than six months and other projects will do the same. That does not preclude the opportunity of someone who has worked under a scheme being picked up again in another scheme: that is quite possible. This programme will continue for the next three years—the term of the Federal Labor Government. It is possible that someone may get 18 months work out of it, but I cannot put a finger on matters at this stage, except to say that people involved in such schemes will get a minimum of six months work.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** This scheme highlights the complete inadequacy of the thinking about what are euphemistically called 'job creation schemes'. This is expenditure for the current 12 months. An amount of \$40 million is to be spent on job creation schemes. It has been put to me that the maximum time, on average, that these people will be employed is about nine months. That was stated by the Federal Minister. In other words, we are spending \$40 million of taxpayers' funds (Federal Government funds and some State funds) on what is euphemistically called 'job creation schemes' which will only create temporary jobs lasting for about nine months. Is the Minister suggesting that this money will create employment for three years? This amount is for this year's Budget, but the Minister talks about continuing Federal schemes which are running into hundreds of millions of dollars. He is saying that this money is to be spent this year to create temporary jobs. I have been told by his Federal counterpart (who appears to be better informed) that the average time jobs created under this scheme will last is about nine months. Does the Minister disagree with what I am saying?

Deputy Premier and Minister of Labour, Miscellaneous,  
\$42 429 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mr H. Becker  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr T.R. Groom  
Mr I.P. Lewis

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am not disagreeing with what the Deputy Leader is saying as he could be right. Nobody can put a time on it and nobody can say emphatically that these jobs will last for six, nine, 12 or 18 months. The assurances from the Federal Government are that the scheme now in operation will be continued over a three-year period. I do not know (and I do not believe anybody knows) what the average time of employment for each employee will be. At least we will have everything on computer and will be able to trace people. We are set up to understand job creation, what happens to people, where they go, the type of job they are doing, and so on. We will be able to analyse matters after the first 12 months of operation.

The other factor that ought to be taken into consideration quite seriously is that the preference to the schemes in operation is on the basis that they will provide continual employment. The instructions to me, and the guidelines given to the Job Creation Unit are to choose schemes (for up to 30 per cent of cases) which will have an effect on employment later. I am cognisant of the fact (and it is the same with any job creation scheme) that there is nothing permanent about it. It is like the scheme run by the Federal Government where the employer was putting on people for four months, discarding them and then picking up another employee for four months and repeating that process. The honourable member must be aware of that. At least in these circumstances, where someone is able to get a job under this scheme they are guaranteed six months work and are employed for that period. In some circumstances people have been offered full-time employment, not because the scheme provides it but because some prospective employer needs those people once they have proved their worth at work. They are then offered full-time employment. It is a little too naive and difficult to say that the schemes are not worth while as they only provide a maximum of nine months work. I believe that many people will have the opportunity of working within the scheme who would not otherwise have an opportunity to work. They may then get an opportunity in industry, one way or another, having established themselves as good workers in that scheme.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Minister is saying that this is a job training scheme rather than a job creation scheme. He is saying that no permanent jobs are inherent in the schemes approved. What evidence does the Minister have that this is not novel to the South Australian Government? The previous Labor Administration spent upwards of \$50 million of South Australian taxpayers' funds on so-called job creation schemes.

What evidence does the Minister have from past experience with these schemes as to how many permanent jobs they lead to? If the Minister is talking about job training (and that is what he really said) he is saying that one can get some experience by working in these schemes which fits one to be taken on by another employer. Does he concede that there may be a more satisfactory way of spending this \$40 million, such as providing people with employment in existing industry instead of having to lay them off?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The first thing that we have to clear up is that, except for the \$5.7 million allocated by the State Government, the balance of the money (which is the bulk of the approximate \$40 million) was allocated by Federal Governments of both political persuasions. It was allocated by the Liberal Government under the wage pause scheme. We were given the money and told, 'This is how you will spend it.' We were also given certain guidelines. Let me say that the Commonwealth guidelines in existence now are easily the strictest guidelines I have ever seen. Therefore, it is very heavily weighed in favour of the Commonwealth Government getting credit for it. It is the Commonwealth's money and it will tell one how to spend it.

The money allocated by the Hawke Government for the CEP schemes has similar conditions attached to it. The guidelines also contain provisions for training purposes. I was not referring to it being merely a training scheme. I was saying that it gives people the opportunity to establish that they are able to do a day's work. There are people within our community who have never worked: let us face that point. Also, there are people who have been out of work for two or three years.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Twenty six per cent of our young people, according to statistics.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There are people who are not given the opportunity to establish themselves as being able to work within the community. I support these schemes: I have always supported job creation schemes very strongly, in fact. It took the Liberal Governments in Australia a long time to change their philosophy, to come around to our way of thinking and to establish that we were right in the final analysis. I see these schemes as being very worth while, as putting a lot of people in work who would never otherwise have had the opportunity to work, and as having the continuing effect of getting people to work on a permanent basis who would otherwise never have been afforded that opportunity.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson):** The Deputy Leader has had his three questions. We will come back to him at a later stage.

**Mr GROOM:** I want to deal with the item 'Self-employment Venture Scheme'. I notice that the proposed allocation from 1983-84 is \$116 000. I also note from the Auditor-General's Report that the scheme aims to foster self-employment ventures for unemployed people. Can the Minister outline how successful these types of ventures have been, what they encompass and whether or not they permit some sort of drift towards Government assistance for alternative lifestyles?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** This scheme has turned out to be fairly popular and fairly effective. So far, in 1982-83 we have funded 27 ventures and there have been loan repayments of \$33 034.08. Unfortunately, one went bad on us and we had to write off a debt of \$1 796.67.

**Mr BECKER:** A very high success rate.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It was an extraordinarily good year. Of course, these people are well canvassed and investigated before they get the opportunity of taking on a scheme. However, I agree with the member for Hanson that it is a very high success rate. In fact, the Department of Labour's annual Christmas dinner last year (and I had not been in the Department very long at that stage) was a great success story for a couple of young people who wanted to get into the catering business. These two young people were doing extremely well and catered for the Department of Labour's annual Christmas dinner. One could not have had better catering. Overall, we are pleased with the scheme. We have allocated money again this year for it. Obviously, there has been an element of risk in all these things. However, nothing risked nothing gained is my view. As I said, people applying are well screened by my departmental officers before they are given the opportunity to obtain a loan.

**Mr GROOM:** I now deal with the item dealing with apprenticeship schemes and the apprentice training subsidies for industry. I want to congratulate the Minister on his initiatives in this area. Can he indicate what is the relationship with apprentices, for example, who are being trained at B.H.P., as I understand that a lot of the apprentices are absorbed into the Government? Ultimately, how successful has the scheme been, and do any of the apprentices trained find their way back into the private sector, or is there scope for them to go back to the private sector?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** This is a very useful question because it allows me to make some explanations. The scheme has been extremely successful. We were able to enrol without much difficulty—

**Mr LEWIS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Chairman.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ferguson):** Just a moment, Minister. There is a point of order.

**Mr LEWIS:** To which line does this relate?

**Mr GROOM:** 'Group Apprenticeship Scheme—Government Contribution'.

**Mr LEWIS:** How does the expenditure of these funds relate to B.H.P.?

**Mr GROOM:** It is referred to on page 31 of the yellow book.

**Mr LEWIS:** But that—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! There will be one Chairman only, thank you. I do not accept that point of order. I am prepared to accept the line mentioned by the honourable member. The Minister will discontinue answering the question.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Can I answer the question under 'Group Apprenticeship Scheme'?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** We will get to B.H.P. later in the evening, I imagine, because it is specifically mentioned further down. The allocation under 'Group Apprenticeship Scheme—Government Contribution' is money that we give to metal industries, master builders, and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce to assist them to train apprentices. I cannot remember exactly when this scheme started, but I am sure that it was in my time as Minister. The proposition was put to me that, if we could help financially, those industries would pick up a certain number of apprentices and train them collectively. 'Collectively' means that they go from one employer to another when the first employer has insufficient work for them. We examined this proposal and had the former Apprenticeship Commission look at it. The Commission was satisfied that the young people would be effectively looked after in such a scheme, and it is now working well. I do not have the figures with me, but the three organisations that receive grants from the Government for this scheme use them effectively. In fact, last year just before Christmas I was given the opportunity of presenting a trophy to the apprentice of the year who came from the group apprenticeship area. I understand that there are 90 such apprentices in the Master Builders' Association, 28 in metal industries, and 25 in the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. Therefore, one can see that quite a few apprentices are being trained under the scheme.

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

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I wish to make an apology for Mr Johnson, who has been with us all day. Unfortunately, he has had to go home owing to his wife being unwell.

**Mr GROOM:** To some extent my question is supplementary to that asked by the member for Kavel, dealing with the job creation scheme and the wage pause moneys under the item referred to. First, I want to pay a tribute to the Minister for the very good deal he has obtained for South Australia. Recently I read criticisms (I think the article was in the *Port Pirie Recorder*) that the job creation scheme did not provide permanent jobs. The Payneham Community Centre, which cost \$268 000, is in the electorate that I represent, the District with which I am immediately concerned. From my own involvement with that project I know that it will provide a very big boost to the area. Although it will provide short-term jobs, clearly, permanent jobs are associated with it, with a likelihood of expansion.

As more community groups develop and make use of the centre good jobs will be provided in that way. Will the Minister further elaborate on the Job Creation Scheme and the future direction that it will take?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, I think I ought to place on record the facts about the way the scheme works. In the main, the money is provided for the scheme, begun by the previous Liberal Government as part of the wage pause scheme, as well as for the Community Employment Programme scheme, which will be continued, by the present Federal Labor Government. The terms of reference and the guidelines stipulate that there must be a committee. The committee is comprised of the following people: the Chairman is Mr Phillip Bentley, who is an Assistant Director in my department; Mr Lyall Miller from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Father Joe Grealy representing S.A.C.O.S.S.; Mr Bob Fairweather from the U.T.L.C.; Christine Maher, Local Government Association; Michell Lennon, Local Government Department; Ian Proctor, Treasury; Rosemary Wighton, Women's Adviser to the Premier; Doug Martin, State Development; and Trevor Rowe, Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations.

It is the responsibility of that committee to examine in minute detail schemes set up by the Job Creation Unit. It should be remembered that the schemes are first examined by the Job Creation Unit where some eight people work very hard in getting appropriate schemes to put forward to the Wage Pause Programme Committee. That committee examines them in further detail and the onus is on that committee as well as on the Job Creation Scheme employees to propose schemes that satisfy the following criteria: they must have a six-monthly duration, a 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female composition and have a component of 50 per cent of the people being under 25 years of age and 50 per cent over 25. It has been very difficult to get schemes that accommodate the female content requirement. Members may have noticed that recently I put an advertisement in the paper trying to encourage further schemes to come forward.

The second responsibility of that committee is to ensure that any scheme which comes before it is one that is consistent with the guidelines set down. One of those guidelines very clearly indicates that preference will be given (although it does not mean that the committee will give total preference) to a scheme where there is an ongoing possibility of employment after the actual setting up of the scheme has been completed. The committee takes into consideration very strongly that criterion, and in the main attempts to put forward where possible schemes that will guarantee in the first instance perhaps more than a minimum six months employment of people. Of course, sometimes those schemes can run for 12, 15 or 18 months. Secondly, and more importantly, the committee tries to develop schemes that will give a guarantee of continuing employment afterwards, for example, one can site gymnasiums, swimming pools, or the Porter Bay complex at Port Lincoln. All such schemes will produce on-going employment after the actual construction of the scheme. I am not suggesting that every scheme about which the committee makes recommendations to me will afford the opportunity on on-going employment. But that is certainly one of the criterion of the scheme that is given close attention by the committee which makes its recommendations to me.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I refer to the State Government Employment Programme, which includes the Home Assistance Scheme, for which an allocation of \$5 700 000 has been made in the Estimates. Will the Minister say what is the criterion for this scheme in relation to the work involved? Previously, the Home Assistance Scheme related in part to the provision of work for tradesmen to upgrade properties

for pensioners and people who were invalids and in need of some sort of assistance. Where assistance was given to those people there was a reluctance in some areas to allow certain parts of the work to be done. I refer to one case in particular which in some respects seemed to me to be a farce: a job was allocated to a person to help an aged invalid with a heart condition and who could not get up on a ladder. However, it was maintained that the scheme would allow the workmen to paint only the doors and window frames on the outside of the house. The person running the scheme was a council member. He was overseeing it, but it was the department which allocated the funds, laid down the criteria for what was to be done, and which determined the work that would be allowed.

In the case to which I refer, the biggest problem faced by the person living in the house was the painting of the high parts, the gables, gutters, and so on, which were in a very bad state of repair and which really needed to be painted. The only part that really needed to be done was the part that the person concerned could not do himself. To me, that was quite wrong. Another matter that was brought to my attention was also in regard to some painting work required in the interior of a home owned by an old lady. The painters were allowed to do the walls and so on but they were not allowed to do the ceilings. The same situation occurred in that instance, namely, that the person concerned was unable to do the job or to pay for the job to be done. The assistance given to people in those circumstances was the reason why the scheme was introduced, and that is why it is of great benefit. One of the good parts of the scheme concerns its benefits to people who are unable to pay for work to be done and who are unable to do it themselves, and this applies particularly to aged people and people with health problems. Will the Minister outline the criteria that apply in relation to work done under the Home Assistance Scheme, for which \$5 700 000 has been allocated?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First of all, I am delighted to receive assurances from the member for Glenelg that he commends the scheme as it was, except for some little indiscretions that have occurred in relation to the interpretation of what the guidelines were at that particular time. I would also remind the member that the introduction of that scheme was at my initiative, back in either 1976 or 1977. Unfortunately, when the member's Government was in office, it decided to scrap the scheme. I thought it a very great political loss, because this is a scheme which has great potential; it is enjoyed very much by elderly people who have reached a stage in life where they are no longer able to do their own repairs around the house. I was determined, when the Budget figures were being allocated, that I would try to resurrect this scheme.

In a tight budgetary situation, that was not an easy matter. Nevertheless, the Premier and Cabinet finally agreed to my persuasive arguments and decided to include it. There is an amount of \$700 000 from which some money must go into the general scheme, but there will be a minimum of \$500 000 for this scheme, and I am hoping for a little more.

There has been some criticism, not only from the member for Glenelg, in relation to some people who were not able to enjoy the benefits of the scheme the last time it was in operation, and those people are on file. I did write to most recipients of the scheme some time in 1979, asking them whether or not they were pleased with it and whether they wanted to continue with it. I do not recall the exact number of replies I received, but it certainly had great popularity amongst elderly or handicapped people. What we are doing at the moment is taking into consideration any matters of concern that we have from our experience with the last scheme, and we are trying to put together some guidelines which will overcome the very matters about which the

honourable member is concerned and about which I personally was concerned. As soon as we are in a position to circulate those guidelines as to how it is to be effected, I will post a copy of them to all honourable members of the Parliament so that they can be aware of the guidelines and take up any matters of complaint that they may receive from their constituents.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Would you—

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Yes, the honourable member can write to me about it. If he has some ideas about how the scheme ought to work, I would be happy to hear them, because it is a very important scheme and we want to make it work. I thought it worked very effectively last time. I do not suppose it matters what sort of scheme one introduces; there are always teething problems and someone is always dissatisfied with it. Generally speaking, it was a popular scheme throughout South Australia at the time.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I complimented you at the time. I agree. Another matter on which I would like some information from the Minister is the line immediately under that, which is the pay-roll tax rebate scheme for youth workers, and I see the actual payments last financial year were \$174 810. The proposed allocation this year is only \$90 000. There is quite a difference in those two figures. I would like the Minister to tell me the reasons why there is such a vast difference in those figures.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First of all, the reason why there is such a great discrepancy in the amounts is that the scheme has been phased out. That is the initial reason, but I think we ought to give the honourable member some more information, so I propose to give him the departmental information, from which I think he may then draw his own conclusions.

On 30 September 1979 the then Government introduced the pay-roll tax refund scheme in an endeavour to encourage employers to employ more young people. The scheme operated for 12 months and was continued for further 12-month periods from 30 September 1980 and 30 September 1981. Provision was made for the scheme to continue for a further 12 months to 30 September 1983, but on 30 June 1983 it was discontinued. The eligibility criteria includes certain conditions: youth workers to be under 20 years of age, work at least 35 hours per week for a period of three months, be additional to the greater youth employment numbers as at 30 September 1979, 30 September 1980, 30 September 1981 and 30 September 1982. The maximum refund available is: one additional youth worker, \$600 per annum; two or more additional youth workers, \$1 800 per annum. During the period 30 September 1979 to 30 September 1983, 970 employers employed 1 837 additional youth workers, and a total of \$1.061 million was able to be funded.

If we go to the continuation of the scheme itself, the detailed statistics of the scheme, we find that, from October 1979 to June 1980, 420 employers and 584 additional youth workers were approved, with an expenditure of \$129 244. From July 1980 to June 1981 there were 253 employers and 509 additional youth workers approved, with an expenditure of \$371 109, and from July 1981 to June 1982 it fell away again to 204 approved employers with 529 approved workers. The expenditure at that stage was \$386 274, and from July 1982 to June 1983 the approved employers were 93, so we can see the actual number of employers taking up the scheme fell from the first year at 420 to the last year at 93, so the fall in employers was some 300. The additional youth workers in that year were 215, as opposed to the top in 1979-80 of 584, and the expenditure fell to \$174 811, so I think, overall, from July 1979 to June 1983, the total approved employers numbered 970 and the total youth workers numbered 1 837 over the four-year period, with a total expend-

iture of \$1.061 million. I think I have given all the information that is available.

**Mr MATHWIN:** Another area in which I would seek information from the Minister is in relation to the National Safety Council of Australia, South Australian Division, for which the voted allocation last year was \$94 000. In actual fact, the payments were \$114 000 and the allocation this year is only (and I say 'only' with respect) \$98 000. Because \$114 000 was spent last year, one would have thought that at least that sum would have been allocated this year, especially when one considers the importance of the National Safety Council of Australia. However, the allocation has been reduced.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Normally, I would agree completely with the honourable member because I do not believe that Governments, both Commonwealth and State, can do enough for the National Safety Council of Australia. Indeed, every chance I get I try to help the council in any practical way I can and in any financial way possible in light of the budgetary situation. True, \$114 000 was spent last year, although the original allocation was only \$94 000. Early this year, representatives of the council told me that they wanted to commence a new scheme called 'Management by Objective', which is a five-star scheme originally started in South Africa. Having convinced me that the scheme had good points that would result in an increase in safety for people in the work place, they asked for a grant of \$20 000 to start the scheme. I recommended to Cabinet that the money be granted and Cabinet approved my recommendation, so that \$20 000 was made available last year as a one-off grant that will not be repeated this year. This year, the \$94 000 estimated grant of last year has been increased to \$98 000.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I refer to the job creation scheme, about which questions have already been asked. I have been involved with similar schemes, such as the RED scheme and the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. Could the present scheme be altered for the benefit of less fortunate councils, such as those in my district (for instance, Thebarton and Hindmarsh), in whose areas there is heavy unemployment and where the councils have not the necessary finance to attract a grant? I am given to understand by the Minister's office that these councils will not miss out but, since the scheme has operated, the more prosperous councils seems to have benefited most.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Last week in Parliament I explained the philosophy behind the wage pause and CEP schemes. The aim is to ensure that councils, irrespective of their wealth or lack of it, receive a share of Government money per capita in respect of the number of unemployed persons in their districts. Probably some of the more affluent councils have been able to get their schemes going more quickly than have some other councils. Recently, Burnside council was criticised because it was alleged that the council, having received a share, wanted more. However, I assure the honourable member that the money will be shared between the councils on the basis of the number of unemployed within their districts.

The broad objectives of the scheme are as follows: to establish or expand community facilities of long-term benefit to the community; to ensure that projects approved will provide overall a wide range of employment categories and will, as is practical, maximise funds available for the payment of wages and salaries; to give preference to those projects that provide potential ongoing and additional employment upon completion; to give preference in funding to projects located in areas of high unemployment; and to give preference in funding to project sponsors who are prepared to contribute their own funds (minimum 20 per cent of total project cost required). Like me, the member for Peake represents a district where there is high unemployment. The

Thebarton council, which has submitted a major project that has been considered twice by the recommending committee, made representations, through its Mayor, who was given a good reception. I assure the honourable member that the committee will make recommendations on that project.

The requirement that a council shall find a minimum of 20 per cent of the total project cost required raises difficulty because some sponsors, such as councils and community groups, have been unable to find that amount. Indeed, we like to have the sponsor contribute 30 per cent, if possible, and some sponsors have contributed as much as 50 per cent of the total project cost. Under the guidelines laid down, we have the authority to balance out the contributions for councils or community organisations that cannot find 20 per cent of the cost, so we are trying to balance the contributions across the board in order that all organisations get an opportunity to apply whether or not they can raise the 20 per cent.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I do not criticise the scheme: I make clear that the more unfortunate councils should get a share of the money available. Regarding the Self-employment Venture Scheme, I have a constituent who, 16 months ago, took over a factory that had been closed down by the employer. My constituent was one of two people who, having taken over the factory, continued to employ six of the eight people who had been employed there previously. Is there any ongoing assistance under the Self-employment Venture Scheme?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I doubt that they would fit into the category of the Self-employment Venture Scheme (it means individuals), but so that I can give the member the correct answer, he should write to me and spell out in specific detail just what it is about, and if those cases fit into the category of that scheme, we will have it examined and give him an answer.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** My last question is on the Auditor-General's Report. How successful was the scheme which provided for pay-roll tax deduction for employees in relation to the employment of full-time teen-age employees, and could the Minister elaborate on its future direction?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I answered that question in great detail a few moments ago. The answer that I gave the member for Glenelg will give all the details.

**Mr BECKER:** I notice there are two grants included in the line: International Youth Year 1985, \$15 000, and the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, \$60 000. They may not be related but on page 45 of the yellow book, under the programme title 'Employment and employee incentive schemes, need being addressed' the following statement is made:

In May, 1983 there were 68 200 people looking for work in South Australia. The percentage of unemployed aged 15 to 19 years was 27.5 per cent. For both 15 to 19 year olds and the unemployed generally the average duration of unemployment was 40 weeks. A disproportionately high percentage of the unemployed in South Australia are young people with well over half being under 24 years.

That statement regrettably highlights a terrible situation that has occurred in South Australia over the past five years, where we have extremely high unemployment and 50 per cent of the persons unemployed are under 24 years of age. Because the pay-roll tax incentive scheme has been phased out (and unfortunately we were not able to obtain any statistics as to how many permanent jobs that scheme had created), I am concerned that we may be losing the opportunity to create permanent jobs for young persons. Therefore, I was wondering whether International Youth Year 1985 may in some way be a means of promoting the problems of youth unemployment, but whether the Youth Affairs Council can pick up the opportunity in the meantime to try

to reduce the very high percentage of young unemployed persons.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The first grant that the honourable member talked about was the provision for International Youth Year 1985. The purpose of that grant was to allow young people to be involved in the development of planning for that year. That will be administered through the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia.

The Government is quite concerned about the promotion and the promoting of Youth Year 1985. I thought that there was a need when we came into Government to have some consistency about what was happening in Australia with the Youth Affairs Council. The Youth Affairs Council of Australia had contacted me sometime before the election was called, and asked what our policies were in regard to the establishment of the Youth Affairs Council in South Australia, because at that stage it had not been set up. I promised them that, if we were elected, I would advocate a \$20 000 grant to get them established, off the ground and mobile, and that allocation was carried out very quickly once we came into office, within two or three months. The provision now for the \$60 000 is the allocation for the 1983-84 period, and I am expecting (and I am sure that I will get it) recommendations for policy to the Government from the Youth Affairs Council. So far they have been very active, very virile, and a very useful body in their performance in advocating to the Government policies for youth.

Following Cabinet's decision to establish a South Australian Co-ordinating Committee for International Youth Year and a Government subcommittee, nominations are still being sought and these groups will start to meet within the next two months. The Department is responsible through the Youth Bureau for participation on the national I.Y.Y. steering committee. There is liaison with Government departments, non-government organisations and young people about I.Y.Y., there is the production of a regular I.Y.Y. newsletter, and the provision of a grant to the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia to allow them to employ a half-time I.Y.Y. officer. We are on the verge of trying to find a top co-ordinator. I know that the honourable member is interested in this, so I will give him all the information I can. I was looking for someone to chair the steering committee for that project, and I actually offered this job to Anne Deveson, who I think everyone in South Australia would have been pleased to see on the committee. She wanted very much to accept it (she wrote me a lovely letter), but she needs to go back to Sydney, and therefore quite reluctantly she had to refuse the offer.

If the honourable member has any ideas about anyone which could help in this area, I would be delighted to hear from him. I do not want to give the job to someone who receives two or three days publicity, and then drops out and nothing more is heard about it. This is a continuing thing up to 1985. I would be delighted for anyone to come forward with some names. We are currently looking at some people, and I want to make that appointment in the next few weeks.

**Mr BECKER:** There is another programme the Minister started, the Community Involvement Through Youth programme (CITY) which has in my opinion been an outstanding success and, having associations with organisations for the disabled, I know the value of that in the setting up of youth camps, etc.

Is David Turner still involved? I have a tremendous amount of respect for him and, indeed, he may be the person to go on the committee. I realise that the Minister is looking for an outstanding person to chair the committee. Can the Minister comment on the continuing success of CITY, advise how it is functioning and say whether it is able to meet demands put on it? It provides a valuable

back-up system for voluntary organisations. Is CITY fully funded or has it had to be pruned a little because of the tight economic situation?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I appreciate the honourable member's comments on David Turner, who has been associated with CITY since I established it in 1977. He has been an extraordinarily useful person in that field. I suppose that, had he sought promotion outside CITY, he would have got it, as he is well respected. I assume that he has found what he wants to do. His ideas are excellent. When we came back to Government, concern was expressed about the number of staff CITY had. There was sickness, and genuine concern was expressed to me by Dave Turner about the running down of the staff and the fact that the unemployment position was surging upwards. He said there was a need for more staff.

The Director of the Department, Mr Macklin, investigated the matter for me. In fact, I went along personally to see what was happening. We induced Cabinet to increase CITY staff by five people which has relieved the pressure greatly on those people who were having nervous breakdowns, and so on, because of the heavy burden they were carrying. In conclusion, David Turner has been responsible for many activities within CITY. I am told that over 2 000 people have been affected in some way or another through CITY. The honourable member said he appreciated it as it is a great find for young people. I am often invited to go along to see projects for which they are responsible.

I was invited to go to Harrogate, where the Church of England has erected a holiday camp. The land was donated by the person who owned the property, and the church decided to involve CITY in the project. These young people built a magnificent dining-room cum recreation hall as well as six or seven other units where people can take holidays. I advise any member who has the time to drive up to Harrogate (although CITY may not still be there) to see the end product and how effective the place is. It is another fine example of the methods by which David Turner works to ensure that young people are not running around the streets and getting themselves into trouble. It gives them something useful to do, and they love it. The structure is made up of mud bricks.

**Mr BECKER:** I refer to the Self-employment Venture Scheme with a voted amount of \$116 000, and I am pleased to see an increased allocation. I think the losses so far are minimal, and one would expect a programme like that to suffer some loss as a risk is involved. I would expect some risks to be taken. We cannot be too conservative as it is an important stepping stone. From small ventures such as this many multi-national companies have grown. However, we do not want multi-national companies but rather multi-Australian companies. I understand that the organisation for the disabled, HETA (Handicapped Employees Training Assistance), is funded by the Federal Government through the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. There is a separate programme for the Crippled Children's Association.

I believe that HETA has directed a person to this scheme who was able to set up a small backyard business venture. Does the Minister have any details of disabled persons being able to qualify for this scheme? The Epilepsy Association has been funded under a scheme called TAPS (Training and Placement Services) for young unemployed people. The programme started off six weeks ago with 12 people and already two people have obtained jobs. It has been found by the Federal Department that organisations for the disabled can far more successfully place handicapped people than can the Commonwealth Employment Service. What are the chances for disabled persons to qualify under this scheme?

Is there a possibility of their being encouraged to come under it also?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I have no specific information with me on whether or not disabled people have applied. Irrespective of whether people are disabled, coloured or anything else, they are entitled to apply under the scheme. Each case will be treated on its merits. I would hope that the honourable member is not asking an idle question here and that he has something in mind. I know that the honourable member is interested in and works very hard for disabled people. If he has something in mind, I ask him to discuss it with my officers. If they produce a scheme able to be funded under this system, well and good. I would be delighted to accept that sort of proposition.

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

Public Buildings, \$39 902 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr Max Brown

**Members:**  
Mr H. Becker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr T.R. Groom  
Mr I.P. Lewis  
Mr J. Mathwin  
Mr K.H. Plunkett

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour and Minister of Public Works.

**Departmental Advisers:**

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

Mr G.T. Little, Director, Administration and Finance, Public Buildings Department.

Mr L.H. Bates, Director, Client Services, Public Buildings Department.

Mr R.D. Jarrett, Acting Manager, Programming and Budgeting, Public Buildings Department.

Mr R.R. Alwis, Manager, Management Accounting, Public Buildings Department.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. I take it that the honourable member for Davenport will lead the questioning.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Yes, I will. I understand that I have the right to make a 15-minute speech and that the Minister has the right to make a 15-minute reply, but I think that it would be most inappropriate in terms of the time. Because of the nature of this vote and particularly because of the time. I certainly intend on behalf of the Opposition to keep my questions short, and I would appreciate fairly brief replies, and if we want further information perhaps we can indicate that at the time.

My questions cover a number of specific lines or allocations of funds (in fact, anything for wages) concerning surplus employees within the Department. I know that about 12 months ago there was a considerable surplus of carpenters in the weekly-paid sector, and I know the difficulties that we had in engaging those people. We eventually worked out a scheme. Probably the most effective scheme was to have

them doing subcontract work on certain projects. There were known surpluses of public servants, generally officers in the engineering profession, within the Department. What is the present status of such surplus employees within the Department, what problems are they causing, and how are those problems being overcome?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** There is now no surplus labour in the Public Buildings Department. Everyone working for the Public Buildings Department, from architects to labourers (including carpenters, or whoever else is there), now has useful and purposeful engagements. On coming into office, I found that certain people had been declared surplus. On the advice of the Department to me, there is now no surplus labour: everyone is usefully employed. There may be pockets of people who are not 100 per cent employed all the time, but there are other pockets, because of work that has been generated, which are called upon to work overtime in some areas. So things are looking better for the Public Buildings Department so far as the work load is concerned, and I know that the honourable member will join with me in hoping that that continues.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Will the Minister supply me with information (and it could be perhaps a written reply, because I do not expect him to have the information here) relating to the last three months as to what areas are now working overtime, the total number of hours worked overtime, and in what sections that occurs? Can he indicate the manpower projections for 1983-84, and say what changes in manpower numbers he expects in the weekly-paid and in the Public Service sector of the Department during the year? Will it be static, or is it likely to increase or decrease through natural attrition? Can he indicate the number of engineers in what used to be the old engineering section (which I think has been partly broken up into the Client Services Section and some of the other sections or divisions)? Certainly less than 12 months ago it was well known that there was a considerable surplus of engineers particularly. How has that surplus been overcome? I would be only too happy if the Minister would prefer to supply some of that information in writing after obtaining it.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I will give the honourable member some information in writing that I cannot give off the top of my head. However, I think that I can deal with most of it. First, there may not be a lot of overtime worked, but there are certainly areas working overtime now which were not working overtime a year ago. There is a small amount of overtime being worked which one would not have imagined could have occurred 12 months ago. I think that the major reason for that is probably that I, unlike the previous Minister, wanted to see the Public Buildings Department improve its work situation. I was instrumental in having a Cabinet submission prepared which instructed the Premier to write to all other departments and bring to their attention the fact that there was some surplus labour in the Public Buildings Department, that there was some idle time, and that consideration ought to be given by those departments to giving the Public Buildings Department the opportunity to fulfil any contractual arrangements that it may have in regard to work.

Secondly, I changed the course of action that had been implemented by the previous Government, and that was simply that the Public Buildings Department was to get its fair share of the work. I also changed the impetus and policy introduced by the previous Government of trying to allocate the majority of the work out to private enterprise. For the last eight or ten months particularly of its term, that Government was in a big hurry to get out as much work into private enterprise as it could.

I recommended to Cabinet, that the Public Buildings Department ought to have been given the opportunity to



do the work, and at the same time I pointed out to the P.B.D. that I expected it to do this work. The Department is not competent to do it all, but I expected it to do that which it was competent to do. I did not intend to accept the situation of double counting, which is the position I found on coming back into Government. I found that work was going out to private enterprise and that people in the Department were idle. That is not good economics. I am not an economist by any stretch of the imagination, but that situation does not fit into any type of economic budget that one could contemplate.

Those two aspects of the situation were changed. Although there has not been a dramatic turn-around (it will take some time to alter the situation), it certainly has had an effect on the morale of people within the P.B.D. who now feel that they are wanted again because they are getting some work that they were not getting previously. Also important from the point of view of morale is the fact that other Government departments are recognising that the P.B.D. is able to do good quality work in an efficient and speedy manner.

The honourable member's other questions referred to whether or not employment numbers had been reduced by attrition, and I point out that that has occurred (I believe that the number involved is 114). The Government really does not have a policy of not replacing those lost through attrition. That is just too straightforward, as far as I am concerned. If we stick strictly to that policy we will find that we will have an elderly, unbalanced work force not capable of doing the jobs required of it. It is not easy, but we are monitoring the situation so that we do not get in to a difficult position of having an imbalance in the work force. In those circumstances we must replace some people, but at this stage we are not replacing many.

I know that the Director is concerned about this matter of imbalance in the work force. The budgetary situation also compels us to make further reductions through attrition. I think the figure stipulated in the present Budget is 119 positions. However, because we do not have a blanket policy of non-replacement of those lost through attrition (that would have to be instigated by Cabinet), we are at liberty to replace a person who we feel should be replaced. In regard to the parts of the honourable member's question that I have not answered, my officers will supply the necessary replies in writing.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I shall list those questions by way of summary, so that the Minister's officers can provide the appropriate information. What overtime has been worked in the past three months, and in which areas has it been worked? How many hours were involved? What are the exact manpower figures relevant to this, and what changes will occur in areas in the present financial year? Perhaps in obtaining that information the Minister's officers could list the other work that the Department has received from other Government departments as a result of the Cabinet directive. Perhaps I could also be provided with details of all the work which would normally have gone out to contract but which has not gone out to contract and is now being done by the Department, where the value of that work has involved \$100 000 or more, which I think is a reasonable cut-off point.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The difficulty with that is the matter of what is deemed to be normal; I think that is a difficult question to answer, because we might have differing opinions on what is normal.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Perhaps I could be provided with details of all work being paid for from the capital works side of the Budget where the expenditure for those projects involved is more than \$100 000. The next point that I want to raise concerns the line under the Public Buildings Department 'Buildings and land—Maintenance,

furniture, furnishings, equipment, services and other expenses of accommodation and land tenure—School buildings, Hospital buildings and other Government buildings'. This matter was referred to in the Premier's Financial Statement, attachment II of which contains a list of maintenance expenditure on schools and other Government buildings. Obviously, the Government is rather sensitive on this matter, and it went to the bother of providing that information, covering the best part of a page, trying to justify the fact that, at least on the Government's calculation, maintenance is being continued on a basis comparable to that which occurred in 1982-83. In fact, that is not a fair assessment. I will quickly analyse those figures.

In regard to maintenance of schools the first reference made is to payments as per the Budget document. That is a specific allocation. Next there is reference to replacement of furniture that has been transferred to the Education Department lines. I agree that that amount should be deducted from the 1982-83 figure as well. Further, there is a one-off allocation to stimulate the building industry. Whether the Minister likes it or not, that was money specifically allocated by the previous Government for maintenance and, therefore, it is real maintenance expenditure and should not be deducted.

The next reference is to redeployment of surplus work force capacity, which was the way that the previous Government decided to allocate resources for maintenance and, therefore, that figure (\$1.8 million) should not be deducted, either. I think that the provision for likely wage and price increases, which is added to the 1983-84 figure has a reasonable basis for inclusion. If one goes through the other Government buildings maintenance programme on the same basis and makes the appropriate adjustments, the result is as follows: maintenance of schools in 1982-83, \$13.8 million; and in 1983-84, \$12.4 million. So, in real dollar terms that represents a very significant reduction. In regard to maintenance of other Government buildings, the figures are as follows: \$6.9 million in 1982-83; and \$6.2 million in 1983-84. Therefore, the total figures applicable to maintenance are \$20.7 million for 1982-83 and \$18.6 million for 1983-84.

Assuming an inflation factor of about 10 per cent in the building industry in 1983-84 (and I think that that is a reasonable sort of figure to work on), that works out as a real reduction in the maintenance allocation of 17 per cent this year when compared with last year. It concerns me, because I know the extent to which there was a backlog in maintenance both in schools and other Government buildings. I asked the Director-General in about late 1981 to prepare a list of what was regarded as fairly urgent maintenance needed for such buildings. I recall how extensive that list was; it ran into tens of millions of dollars. I know that there was a policy in the late 1970s that the easy way of saving money was to cut back on maintenance. I inspected a number of schools when Minister and found that planks in school buildings had been replaced and had not been painted because there was no money to do so, or the best that had been achieved was a thin coat of pink primer, but seven years later it still did not have a final coat.

If I recall correctly, Mr Rowley Johns accompanied me to one school in the eastern suburbs that was in very bad repair. That is the reason why the previous Government made this special allocation of \$4 million, to try to catch up on some of the maintenance backlog. What concerns me is that there is to be a 17 per cent reduction in maintenance this year, whereas I believe that the least the Minister should do is maintain in real terms the expenditure of last year. I say this because public assets are being run down. I think they are being run down on a short-sighted basis, because eventually, instead of simply replacing odd timbers here

and there or carrying out routine maintenance, the entire asset will need to be replaced and that will be at far greater expense, so I would ask the Minister to review that decision of the Government and to make sure that adequate funds are provided this year for maintenance to be kept at least at the same level of real expenditure as last year.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** We are at a bit of a loss at the moment to pick up the actual figures the honourable member is putting to us. Even my advisers cannot come to terms with them.

**The Hon D.C. BROWN:** Page 33. I am saying, running down those 1982 and 1983 columns, \$14.2 million.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It depends on which way he wants to add it up, but I get a figure of \$11.4 million as opposed to a figure in 1983-84 of \$12.4 million.

**The Hon D.C. BROWN:** Mr Chairman, please, I explained to the Minister why—

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The honourable member explained in his terms.

**The Hon D.C. BROWN:** I explained, quite justifiably, why two of those items should not be included in that column, the \$8.6 million and the \$1.8 million.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** This was put out by the Treasurer and I am prepared to accept his word rather than the honourable member's word. Be that as it may, whether the Treasurer is right or the honourable member is right (and we know that he is not bad at concocting figures and the like, and my officers cannot come to terms with his figures at the moment), we are not spending as much money on maintenance as we would like, but neither did the previous Government over-spend in maintenance areas. There are plenty of schools and other Government buildings which were pointed out to me and which needed maintenance badly when we took over Government. I can only have sufficient money to do those jobs which Government allows me and that is the amount of money that has been voted this particular year for maintenance. Quite clearly, it is not as much as I would have liked.

**The Hon D.C. BROWN:** I do not think the Minister has argued the case well with Cabinet, in that case, because it is absolutely essential that there be an increased allocation for maintenance and we cannot afford a real reduction of 17 per cent this year.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not think there is a reduction of 17 per cent, but we will certainly get the honourable member's figures examined and, after we have looked at them in detail, we will see whether or not his figures are correct. As I said, at the moment my officers cannot come to terms with those figures. I reiterate that the maintenance programme under the previous Government was a pretty poor performance. The allocation is not as much as I would have liked, but I do not think the member has the right to put to me that I put a poor argument to Cabinet regarding this matter. Cabinet has priorities upon which it decides the way the money is going to be spent, irrespective of what arguments are put. The honourable member can pull up his nose and do what he likes, but Cabinet places its priorities, the same as does every other Government. We will examine the figures and come back to the honourable member on them.

**Mr LEWIS:** Whilst I share the concern that the member for Davenport has as to maintenance, my first question relates to building schools. When will the Pinnaroo school be commenced?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** We are not discussing capital projects at the moment.

**Mr LEWIS:** If that question is not in order, can the Minister provide me with a table which sets out the electorate office of each member of Parliament in the House of Assembly and which specifies the amount of telephone allowance

for that member, the cost of rental of the member's office premises per annum and the cost of any sign work that has been done on those electorate offices at any time during the last two years? I do not expect him to have this information with him tonight, but I wonder if he can get this information for me.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I do not particularly have any objection to providing this information to the honourable member. There will be some problems in putting it together, so he will have to bear with us until such time as we are able to provide it, but I am happy to provide it.

**Mr GROOM:** I would like to see the country members' telephone bills.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** We will get the lot. The member has asked for the lot. He has not discriminated; he has said he wants the information about the entire 47 members of the Assembly. No other members have offices. I am wondering about the import of the question and why the member wants such information, because to the best of my knowledge, he will probably find very large differences in rents paid, particularly throughout the metropolitan area. It depends on where one's office is located, how much rent one pays: I had an office for a long time where I was paying, I think, \$20 a week.

**Mr GREGORY:** More than I pay.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The honourable member's office is not worth anything: he should be paid to use it. It is a reflection on who owns the building when one has to live in those sorts of premises and the member for Florey would be entitled to move and pay more rent if he could find something more suitable, because he is living and working in substandard conditions.

**Mr LEWIS:** A brown dog would not live in them.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** They are the honourable member's words. However, I will provide the information that the member has asked for. I just wonder why he wants it.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Regarding the maintenance problem, less than 12 months ago the Minister went to an election as a member of the Labor Party, whose policy contained the following statement concerning educational facilities:

Labor will not participate in false economy exercises with regard to maintenance and building programmes. A study of future needs and penalty cost impact will be done.

I presume that that means penalty costs for not carrying out adequate maintenance. Labor's first Budget, however, is in direct conflict with the stated policy that a Labor Government would not reduce spending on maintenance. I would be the first to say that there is an urgent need for additional money for maintenance. That is why I, as Minister, went to Cabinet and argued for a one-off grant of \$4 million for urgent maintenance. In addition, I arranged to use the surplus weekly payments on a visiting tradesmen scheme to enable them to visit the schools to increase that maintenance programme. That is the sort of priority that the previous Government gave effect to by implementing those programmes. Will the Minister prepare a detailed penalty cost impact statement showing what occurs because of failure to carry out adequate maintenance and bring it to Parliament as soon as possible? Labor's policy also stated:

Labor will examine ways of implementing lighting control systems in educational facilities.

Has such a statement been carried out and, if it has, what are the anticipated resultant annual savings?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I would have thought that the responsibility to which the honourable member refers would be that of the Minister of Education, not that of the Minister of Public Works. However, as the honourable member has raised this matter, I will ascertain the position and, if it is the responsibility of my colleague, I will refer it to him.

Regarding maintenance programming, one of the difficulties the Government has run into is the misinformation that the previous Government gave the people of South Australia about the true budgetary situation. The over-run of \$60 million by the previous Government has been proven: we certainly were not told of it before we came to office. The honourable member as Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Education in the Tonkin Government was responsible for the outlandish promise made to the people of Kingston that they would get a new school costing, I think, \$5.9 million. That announcement was made only two or three days before last year's election, although the contract was never signed. Because some obligation, albeit not much, rested on the incoming Government and because I am a man who honours his word, my Government picked up the project, and I am sure that the member for Mallee appreciates that. However, that cost the Government, unbeknown to us, \$5.2 million, whereas, had that promise not been made just before the last election in a very outlandish way and without much thought, I could have recommended to the Government not to proceed with the work because no contract had been signed and an additional \$5.2 million would then have been available for maintenance projects.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The Minister is dealing with a capital item, whereas this Committee is dealing with recurrent expenditure. The Kingston school was part of the Government's school programme for the year: a commitment had been made and had to be honoured. It was not an outlandish promise, as the Minister would have members believe. Will the Minister say how the reorganisation of the Public Buildings Department is proceeding? Does it appear to be working effectively? Have all the officers been allocated to positions under the new organisation? What has happened to any officers who may have been surplus? Have they been reclassified in other positions?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The review was commenced in 1979, and on the change of Government there was a change of policy and direction. As to the effectiveness of the reorganisation, it depends on to whom one speaks. There has been much criticism from the Public Service Association about this matter and only last week we had a big meeting with the shop stewards and association representatives to determine where we are, where we are going, and how we will get there. This is a difficult matter. The Public Buildings Department is a large structure with many employees. It is cumbersome to work and difficult to administer. The problems in this area never seem to go away. In order to give the honourable member the information he seeks, I ask the Director of the department to reply.

**Mr Roeger:** The reorganisation of the Department is well under way from the top down, with one position still outstanding (that of the Director, Management Services). An appointment to that position is expected to be confirmed within weeks. The reorganisation of the working groups is being effected and discussions are proceeding with the Public Service Association on certain details of the regrouping. Positions are being found in the new organisation for people at their existing classifications, except for one or two for whom positions have been found elsewhere in the Public Service.

Much work remains to be done in educating the people in the organisation on how it is expected to work, on their roles in the organisation and their relationship to other groups. Perhaps it is too early to say what are the real benefits from the reorganisation, but over the last year or so I have found benefits from it, even though it has not been completed, compared to the situation previously.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** When I was Minister, we initiated a gathering of people working in the construction industry called the Construction Industry Conference. I

understand that the Minister organised a meeting of this group earlier this year. I appreciate and understand fully the reason why such a meeting had to be delayed. Will the Minister continue that conference and, if he will, how often will it meet? Will its role be similar to what it was previously?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The meeting had some value. We had a meeting in May this year. It was explained to me that the conference had been set up with the intention of meeting once every six months but, unfortunately, I could not attend the May meeting, so I got my colleague the Hon. Don Hopgood to chair it. He later reported to me that the meeting went well and that such meetings were well worth continuing, so they will be continued.

Rowley Johns is very keen about this conference and has talked to me lately about convening another one. I have told him to do so, but I am not sure what date it will be on, or whether or not it will continue in the vein in which it started. I want to see how it performs and to use my own experiences within the media conference to judge it. If departmental people, or industry people, want to make recommendations about changing the format or fundamentals of these conferences, I will listen to them, but the answer to the question is 'Yes', they will continue. I think that they have a good and useful purpose, but whether or not they retain the same format only experience will determine.

**Mr BECKER:** I am a little concerned about the amount of \$333 000 that has been allocated for electorate offices, accommodation and service costs. With the recently announced redistribution of electoral boundaries, will members be able to apply for resiting of electorate offices or will that have to wait until after the next State election to do that?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That is a very good question, and one that has been troubling me as well. I have yet to find a seat myself. This matter needs some consideration, but in these circumstances I would not consider making any recommendations to the Government until after preselections have been dealt with on both sides of the political arena. I understand that the Liberal Party has some problems about preselection and where members may sit after those preselections, so I do not think that we should be attempting to relocate offices at this juncture until those preselections are determined and seats taken up.

There is one other factor that I am giving consideration to that I think that the Committee is entitled to know about. Some of the members (and I mention Todd and Newland in this respect) will be handling a large number of people for the next two years until after the next election. I do not know whether the honourable member is in that position himself, but some members will be. After preselection they will be looking after their own seats while trying to do something about the new seats. In those circumstances, I think it is reasonable that we should look at having some extra electoral help for that period only, not on a permanent basis, because after the election everyone ought to be back to their \$18 000-odd situation or whatever the case may be. However, there will be a large burden on a lot of people between now and the next election. The honourable member for Davenport was good enough to take into consideration our responsibilities prior to the last election by supplying us all photostat machines, which provided a tremendous advantage. I will certainly be thinking about this matter and making some recommendations in regard to it.

**Mr BECKER:** I am concerned for the need to keep within budget, so if there is room for my new electoral office in the Public Buildings Department building on Marion Road, it might be handy to put me there and we may be able to save a few bob!

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That would be political, would it not, to put you in there?

**Mr BECKER:** I do not know about that. It might be handy. The maintenance of Government buildings is something that worries me, as within the whole of the maintenance budget the actual payments for 1982-83 were \$6.9 million and the proposed payment for 1983-84 is \$5.924 million. Does the line relating to maintenance cover wages as well? I am looking for the line to cover wages for maintenance. I understand that the department does have surplus employees, and the Auditor-General's Report made mention of that at page 184 where it states:

Payments for maintenance of building on behalf of other departments totalling \$26.9 million included a programme of special projects totalling \$2.4 million to employ surplus labour of the Operational Services Branch.

It was most regrettable under the previous Government that when the regular cyclic painting of Plympton High School was being undertaken, the whole of the school could not be painted because sufficient funds were not available, yet the department had the staff to do the work. My concern is, as there has been a reduction in the Budget and we still have surplus staff, how these people are being paid and what account is being debited with their wages.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** They are being paid out of capital as there are not sufficient funds in the recurrent account to pay them. Answering the original part of your question, when you referred to surplus labour, last year there was an amount in A.G.B. of \$577 000 for surplus labour. This year there is no allowance in there at all. I explained earlier to the member for Davenport that we do not have any surplus labour. On my information we have everyone fully and gainfully employed at this moment, and I hope that that situation continues.

**Mr BECKER:** There is no doubt that we can find work for these people. I could find that work at some of the schools in my district, but we need the money to enable the work to be carried out.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** That is true. As I pointed out earlier to the member for Davenport, the Government had certain priorities about where it wanted to put its money. It put a large amount into education and housing, and there is some money (not as much as I would like) for maintenance, but if we want to get into this maintenance situation, one way of doing that would be to cancel some very major project. Which one do we cancel? Do we cancel one in the member's district, my own district, the member for Davenport's district or the member for Florey's district? If one has these projects on line, coming forward and assured by Government, one has a responsibility to carry them out. It is like the Kingston school, I honoured the obligations in those circumstances, and let me say that when I looked at that school I agreed with everything people were saying. There was no doubt that school had to be repaired as it was in a very bad state of repairs and should have been repaired a long time ago. A way of achieving a large maintenance programme is to deplete capital investments so far as some major project is concerned.

**Mr BECKER:** I refer to the departmental review of additional classified positions. Have all positions now been filled? I understand that the suggestion was that in certain categories, such as executive officers (EO1 to EO6), there were several new classifications. I believe that there were two new classifications in that area alone. For engineers there was a proposed reduction of 13 in the levels EN1 to EN4. The architects (AR2 level) faced a reduction of 10 (an overall reduction of 14), quantity surveyors a reduction of three, whilst in administrative officers (AO4 level) there was an increase of eight, AO1 an increase of six—overall an increase of 15. For drafting, technical officers and assistants there is a reduction of some 75. Clerical officers from CO1 through to CO6—

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** From what authority are you quoting?

**Mr BECKER:** I am quoting from 'Comparison of Positions in Previous and Proposed Organisations'. There has been a massive reorganisation within the Department and it appears that about 163 positions are to go in the various executive levels. How will that effect the overall efficiency of the Department? I am wondering why there has been a massive reduction in architects (down 14), engineers (down 13), administrative officers (up 13), drafting technical officers and assistants (down 75), clerical officers CO1 to CO6 (down 38). There are large movements of staff. Whilst the activities of the Department have altered, I am concerned at the reduction at the junior levels. We have an ageing Public Service and we need juniors to come through the ranks. I am wondering whether the review within the Department is working satisfactorily.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The review is an ongoing matter and has been going for some time. I do not suppose any of us will live long enough to see the completion of it. That is the major worry we all have because of the very nature of P.B.D. One senior position has not been filled, namely, the Director, Management Services. A person has been recommended for the position but an appeal is pending. If one looks at the organisation structure on page 62, one will see the position.

I am also concerned about the depletion since we have taken office and the number of staff who have left. They have left because of attrition and not because they have been asked to leave or because we have declared them surplus labour. They have left because of age, to take on other jobs, to go interstate, and so on. I explained to the member for Davenport that, whilst we do not have a policy of complete attrition with no replacement, staff ceilings are such that it is difficult at the moment to fill all positions. That does not mean to say that we cannot do so. We are cognisant of the situation that we may have an ageing and imbalanced staff, and it is a worry on our minds. I have asked the Director and his staff to closely monitor the situation. In circumstances where there needs to be replacement when someone leaves, a recommendation will have to be made to me and we will have to fill that position.

In relation to young staff, the Premier has announced that 300 young people will be employed in Public Service areas. That does not mean that they will necessarily be going into P.B.D. We want to take on young people this year, and there is absolute need to do so. Again, one of the difficulties is being screwed down with a Budget which does not allow much expansion. We are not supposed to have any expansion whatsoever, but we are looking at the question and will try to take on young people.

**Mr BECKER:** I am concerned about the impact on the efficiency of the Department.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Maybe the Director could answer that question as he is more expert in the field.

**Mr Roeger:** Naturally, any organisation must have fresh blood to remain viable and dynamic, and it is necessary to correct the imbalance. The work force is getting older. It is easy for us to fall into the Peter principle and become incompetent. It is necessary to get some fresh staff now and again. If we cannot engage new staff, perhaps the alternative is to send our people out on jobs transfers and secondments to get new ideas. We are looking at the area and are doing some work on it. If the problem is allowed to continue for too long, it will reduce the efficiency of the Department.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** As the honourable member is interested in recruitment, I am informed that we will be taking on 23 apprentices. I cannot designate grades at the moment. That will play some part in enrolling young people into the Department. We want to do that in other areas as

well. The honourable member also asked about the direction in which the review and reorganisation were going. The Director, Management Services, position has not been filled. There are three other positions, not at that level, but branch management positions. There are 15 positions, 12 of which have been filled and three others are in the process of being filled.

**Mr LEWIS:** I refer to electorate offices. Can the Minister tell me whether he at any time or under any circumstances has told the Taxation Department that members' expenses incurred in providing themselves with electorate office facilities are not legitimate expenses deductible from their taxable income? It is of particular relevance to me as I do not have an electorate office other than in Parliament House. It is not possible to find a central location in the electorate of Mallee suitable to all disparate elements of which it is comprised under the present boundaries. The area covers people on the Bremer and Angas Plains, around Strathalbyn; in the District Councils of Millicent, Beachport, Robe, Lacepede (near Kingston); Tatiara (near Keith); Browns Well (at Waikerie); Loxton (in the north); Ridley (around Swan Reach); Murray Bridge, Lameroo and Pinnaroo.

There is no one central location to which those people naturally gravitate, other than the capital city (Adelaide). The electorate office is and always has been, even prior to my becoming a member for that electorate, in Parliament House, and it is still there now. However, to give reasonable access to those people on limited incomes who live in each of those towns, including the most central which is Coonalpyn and Tintinara (in the District Council of Coonalpyn Downs which I have not mentioned), I have found it necessary to make visits to those localities on a regular programmed basis so that people on limited incomes who do not come to Adelaide at all are able to get access to their elected representative. They appreciate that: so much so that many of the district councils allow me to use a room in the district council chambers (at no expense in most instances). There are instances in which I incur a rental cost, and I have not approached the Department for any reimbursement of that cost. I have taken it from my electorate allowance, and to my dismay I find now that the Government (or someone) has directed the Taxation Department that that is not a legitimate expense and that I cannot claim it as a legitimate deduction from the income that I get. Did the Minister or any officers of his Department tell the Taxation Department that that was not a legitimate expense, or alternatively, does he believe that it is in the interests of the constituents whom I represent that they should have access to their elected member, and that it is, therefore, legitimate for me to incur such expenses if, as, and when it is necessary for me to do so to provide that access?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, let me commend the member for Mallee for looking after his electorate as well as he does. Of course, it is his choice as to where and when he has his electorate office. Therefore, if he decides to have it in one of the council areas that he has to look after, the Government will accommodate him, and he is fully aware of that.

In regard to his expenses in hiring offices, to the best of my knowledge (and I can only answer in that way) no officer of my Department would have, without my authority, I would not have thought, advised the Taxation Department that that is not a legitimate expense. I do not see how they would be competent to make that judgment in any case. Certainly, the Director is shaking his head. I do not recall anyone coming to me about it. I certainly do not recall writing a letter. I would have discussed it with any member, including the member for Mallee, had it been brought to my attention. That is my practice in those circumstances. Therefore, I would say that officers of the Department, the

administrative staff, and I are all innocent in this regard. However, now that the honourable member has raised it, I will have it checked first thing in the morning to ascertain whether it has been done. However, I am very doubtful whether that is a fact.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am not seeking any reimbursement from the Department or this Government, but does the Minister regard the expenses which I incur in providing those, if you like, part-time access points throughout the electorate as expenses that I ought to be able to consider legitimate in the course of my work?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I prefaced the answer by commending the honourable member's activities. I thought that that covered the part of the question in relation to whether I agreed that that expenditure was proper in those circumstances. I am not buying into the argument about whether or not they ought to be taxation deductions, because I am not competent in that field to give advice to the honourable member or anyone else. In those circumstances, I would suggest that, if the honourable member is looking for some rebate so far as taxation is concerned, he should go to a taxation consultant and seek his advice. In my view, that sort of expense is clearly a legitimate expense for a member who looks after his constituents. By saying that it is legitimate, of course, could mean that it needs to be covered by the member's electorate allowance. It is like other expenses, such as petrol, and so on. However, I am not saying that it is an illegitimate expense: I am merely saying that I am not buying into any taxation argument.

**Mr LEWIS:** I thank the Minister for the frankness of his reply. In connection with electorate offices, in relation to the line (since I see your knitted brow, Mr Chairman, I do not wish to incur your wrath) 'Electorate offices—accommodation and service costs', is there any likelihood of it being possible from those funds or other funds that I cannot identify (perhaps maintenance of building and land or something—\$11 million) to provide some of the furniture and fittings that I have requested for the room which is occupied in Parliament House in the centre hall second floor attic and in which we have had a fair bit of home-made furniture, some remnants of carpet, and so on, since we were fortunate enough to be granted space on moving from the first floor after the last election? Is it planned to do that this year, or to leave it as it is?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** When did the honourable member write the letter?

**Mr LEWIS:** It was late last year or early this year, at the time that that space was allocated to me. For a time, I was sitting around on my thumb.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Has it been rejected?

**Mr LEWIS:** No. At the time it was explained to me that there were no funds available during the last financial year after meeting the costs that were already likely to be incurred in renaming, relabelling, and so on, around the State in other electorate offices. I accepted that: it was explained that I could expect that in this year's expenditure my staff might enjoy some improvement in facilities, so that they did not have to suffer from the difficulties of being unable to hear whenever there was a heavy rain storm, and so on.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The first thing I would say in that regard is that I want to see all members comfortably and properly accommodated, as I know how hard the job is without having to scrimp on tables, chairs and so on. In some circumstances where money has not been available, we have been able to provide something from the Public Buildings Department storehouse in response to a request from members for assistance. I do not recall the letter to which the honourable member refers, as I receive many letters from people, and I read them all. It is difficult to recall exactly what the honourable member asked for. If the

honourable member will write to me again drawing to my attention what is required (if he still requires those things). I will certainly look at the matter. I cannot give a definite answer at the moment, but if I can assist I will do so, because, as I said originally, I do not want members to be uncomfortable.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** First, I draw to the attention of the Chair the time remaining for this evening's session of the Committee, as I think we ought to spend at least some time on the capital works side of the Budget. I added up the allocation for salaries for the different categories in regard to last year and this year. I found that the total amount allocated for wages and salaries of departmental employees was lower in actual terms in 1983-84 than it was in 1982-83, even though during the intervening period there was an 8 per cent wage rise. Is that because a substantially smaller number of people is being paid by the department from the recurrent side of the Budget, or is it because people are being paid from the capital side of the Budget? How does the Minister account for what appears to be a fairly substantial difference in that regard? If that 8 per cent is taken into account, plus the other sums, it amounts to at least 10 per cent.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** First, fewer people are involved than there were last year.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** But not 10 per cent.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** No, but that has had an input into the situation. Secondly, last year the inflation component of wage costs, and so on, was added to the total sum. Thirdly, this year that component will not be put in there; it will be taken from the round sum allowance, and that will make a difference so far as the increase is concerned.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** The round sum allowances will come in on top of that amount, but, even if the round sum allowances were built into it (the 8 per cent, which is more than what the Premier said would occur), it would still be found that the amount would be less than that which applied last year. I suspect that payments are being made from the capital side of the Budget.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The increase in the capital payment is less than \$1 million—it is about \$500 000. There are probably three or four reasons for that.

**Mr LEWIS:** I was literally floored by the Minister's response to a question from the member for Hanson about the relocation of electorate offices within the new boundaries. We are elected by the people who live in an electorate for a certain term (the duration of which is to be finally decided by the time the next election is called). It would astonish me if the taxpayers of South Australia were asked to foot the Bill for providing campaign offices for sitting members of Parliament to enable them to shuffle around to convenient locations in their endeavour to secure a seat at the next election. That proposal leaves me cold, especially in view of the fact that I cannot get an assurance that funds will be made available to provide reasonable facilities for me, my electorate assistant and my constituents when they come to see me at my office. To me it is an incredible state of affairs. Not only is a matter of principle at stake as far as providing campaign offices at public expense is concerned, but also more importantly is the position which I consider to be an affront to the member for Mallee with facilities made available to other members being denied to me.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I think the member is perfectly right. The member for Hanson may have misunderstood what I said. I said that no consideration will be given to moving electorate offices before preselection has occurred. I did not mean to imply that members would be provided with a change of office. Preselection will have taken place before offices are provided in the new electorates. The offices will have to be placed after the election and not

beforehand: the honourable member is perfectly right about that. I was misunderstood, and I am sorry about that.

**Mr MATHWIN:** You would not want to upset the member for Mallee, would you?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** As I said, I think I have been fairly prompt with the member for Mallee over the years. He did write to tell me how prompt I was in replying to him. I like to ensure that I am prompt in replying to members, and that will certainly be the case with the member for Mallee if he writes to me tomorrow, or as soon as he is able. If I can recall in the morning, after this very cumbersome and very heavy day, I will get my staff to look at the matter to see what the honourable member requires, although I do not know whether he is still interested. I do not know what has happened in the meantime and what his particular needs are. Maybe he could write to me to tell me what he requires. If the member can decide what is best for his electorate, where he wants to relocate out of Parliament House, the Government would be happy to provide him with that sort of service, as it has done for other people. The honourable member has the right to choose his own place of abode.

**Mr MATHWIN:** In relation to the line 'West Terrace Cemetery administration expenses, etc.' the allocation is \$34 000, which of course is an increase on last year's allocation of \$30 000. Has the Minister been approached by the Department of Correctional Services with the object of putting community service orders into operation with voluntary work by offenders in that cemetery? Cemeteries are very good places for such a community service, because there is not much of a problem involving other people not because they are well underneath the soil, but nobody seems to mind having that work done in a cemetery, which of course is very costly to upkeep, and applies particularly in church cemeteries.

As this matter is costing the taxpayer \$30 000 or \$34 000 per year in maintenance, I would ask the Minister whether he has had any approach from the Department of Correctional Services to have such work done either by adults or, through the Department for Community Welfare, under community service orders including juveniles. With all due respect to the Department for Community Welfare, I think that it would more likely involve adults. This would be a great tax saving, as well as benefitting people who have strayed and who could well be given work to do within the community.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** As far back as 1976, the Government assumed responsibility for the care of West Terrace Cemetery at a time when it was in poor shape and the Government was getting many complaints about it. The cemetery was then placed under the auspices of my Department, which has done fairly well since then in this regard. We cannot spend as much money as we would like to spend on the cemetery: indeed, we could spend more than \$34 000 in maintenance.

Neither I nor the Director of the Department can recall an approach from the Correctional Services Department, but I have had approaches from Father Marinakis (a Chief Priest at the Franklin Street Church) and Darryl Blackwell (funeral director), who told us that some members of the Greek community desired to have some of their relatives buried there. On the recommendation of Father Marinakis, we have agreed, so long as he ratifies the procedure, to allow people to be buried there. If I were to receive an approach from the Correctional Services Department, I would see whether the cemetery could be fitted into one of its work schemes.

**Mr BECKER:** The sum of \$3 063 900 has been provided for administration. I refer to page 185 of the Auditor-

General's Report where, under the heading 'Major Contract Administration', the following appears:

Reference was made in the previous report to the high number of variation orders issued on some major construction projects.

Has the Minister seen that statement in the Auditor-General's Report and, if he has, will he say what action he, as Minister, or his Department has taken in the light of those remarks? I take the Auditor-General's comments as criticism of the administration of the Public Buildings Department. Although I realise that in a large department an auditor can come in and easily pinpoint certain problems, I am concerned that the Auditor-General should make this statement and highlight an administrative deficiency as he does in this case. Specifically, the Auditor-General refers to errors in plans prepared by consultants resulting in incorrect siting and storage costs for transportable buildings. He also says that some officers responsible for administering contracts have made errors of interpretation of contract conditions. Surely such remarks reflect on the administration. Can the Minister say whether the Auditor-General's comments are fair and reasonable and, if they are, what corrective action the Department has taken to prevent a repetition of such occurrences?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** About a third of the way down page 185 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

These matters were reported to the Department which advised that:

The reorganisation of the Department currently in progress is designed to clarify responsibilities and will place responsibility for professional quality with the principal professional of each discipline.

The Department will proceed with the preparation of a consolidated document for the briefing of consultants.

The contracts branch now has a sole departmental responsibility for interpreting contract conditions. Training sessions will be conducted for officers administering contracts to ensure a consistent approach.

I think that the department properly supplied the Auditor-General with the information that he required. Further than that, I understand that a letter has also gone from the P.A.C. to the department asking similar questions.

**Mr BECKER:** It has nothing to do with P.A.C. I am quoting from the document I have here. I do not want to relate anything to the P.A.C.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It states:

Reference was made in the previous Report to the high number of variation orders issued on some major construction projects. The audit disclosed that large numbers continued to be issued and resulted mainly from—

and it goes on and quotes omissions and so forth.

**Mr BECKER:** As I interpret it, the previous Auditor-General rarely put anything in his report unless there was some reason for so doing. He put in the report what the auditors found, and what the department advised him. I do not always accept what the departments advise, and if the Auditor-General put certain remarks in his report there was some reason for that. That is what I am trying to get at. I am a bit concerned that the Auditor-General has had to make a comment. We could get down to why comments were made about incorrect siting and storage costs for transportable buildings. We could get down to the nitty gritty but it is too late at this stage to do that, anyway.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** We are in a position of either coming to terms with the answer given by the department or we reject that answer. What the honourable member is saying is that the Auditor-General had some reason for raising these matters with the department. The department then, in turn, gave a reply to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General has not rejected that reply, he has merely made comment that those matters were raised with the department and the department came back in turn and said,

'These are the facts'. He has not rejected or disputed the fact.

**Mr BECKER:** To me he has left matters up in the air.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** It may be that the honourable member is a bit more suspicious than the Auditor-General.

**Mr BECKER:** No, I am not suspicious.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The honourable member made the point that he does not always believe what departments tell him; that is what he said a few moments ago. I just put to him that either one believes a department or one does not. I think the department has made an accurate statement there, and it would be foolish if it did not.

**Mr BECKER:** As long as the Minister is satisfied that this sort of thing will not happen again.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I am satisfied that the department carried out its responsibilities in that regard.

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

Works and Services—Public Buildings Department,  
\$69 550 000

**Chairman:**

Mr Max Brown

**Members:**

Mr H. Becker  
The Hon. D.C. Brown  
Mr D.M. Ferguson  
Mr R.J. Gregory  
Mr T.R. Groom  
Mr I.P. Lewis  
Mr J. Mathwin  
Mr K.H. Plunkett

**Witness:**

The Hon. J.D. Wright, Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour and Minister of Public Works.

**Departmental Advisers:**

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

Mr G.T. Little, Director, Administration and Finance, Public Buildings Department.

Mr L.H. Bates, Director, Client Services, Public Buildings Department.

Mr J.D. Jarrett, Assistant Manager, Programming and Budgeting, Public Buildings Department.

Mr R.R. Alwis, Manager, Management Accounting, Public Buildings Department.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** We have, in effect, 10 minutes left. As most questions asked on this capital works line seek information about specific schools, will the Minister allow, through you, Mr Chairman, written questions to be sent to him, to which he would reply after obtaining relevant information for members of the committee who may wish to ask questions on that basis? Such answers may not be included in the official report, so would the Minister be willing to answer questions on that basis.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** Do I understand the member to ask that, rather than giving replies tonight, I listen to questions that members ask and respond to them in writing?

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** No, I am suggesting that there may be questions that cannot be asked tonight simply because there will not be time.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Such a procedure cannot be allowed by the Committee. What the honourable member

for Davenport is now suggesting is that in some way we would close proceedings tonight at 10 o'clock, but that they would still go on because any questions that might arise the Minister would then answer in writing. That is completely out of order and will not be accepted by the Chair.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Mr Chairman, you did not hear what I said. I said that I appreciated that the answers could not become part of the formal proceedings of this Committee, but I asked whether the Minister would co-operate if members of the Committee who had specific questions were to write to him. Would he be willing to supply the information on a person-to-person basis? I am not suggesting that the proceedings of this Committee could continue after 10 p.m.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am not suggesting that the honourable member is suggesting that the Committee could continue after 10 p.m. The honourable member can put questions on the Notice Paper in order to get answers. Today, we are dealing with a particular vote. If the honourable member wishes to ask a question of the Minister, in view of the time, he ought to get on and ask it.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** For the benefit of members of the Committee, if I am unable to answer questions asked tonight, I am prepared to respond to them in writing. It is not reasonable to put forward a proposition, ask a series of questions, and expect a reply in writing. I will endeavour to answer the honourable member's question. If we do not have the detailed information tonight, I will forward it in writing.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair also points out to the Minister that any replies given at a later date would have to be in a form suitable to be inserted in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I refer to the allocation of capital funds. The total allocation of funds for schools in 1982-83 was \$26.7 million and in 1983-84 it was \$24 million exactly. That is a reduction in actual and real terms of 6 per cent to 8 per cent. On behalf of the Opposition, I record our complete dissatisfaction with that sort of run-down in the school works programme. I draw attention to the promise that the Minister's Party made before the election, namely, that it would increase capital works for schools. However, in its first Budget the Government has decreased the allocation. There is also a significant reduction overall if we take schools, Technical and Further Education and other Government buildings, and add up the figures. Although it shows an increase of \$795 000 in real terms, that is a reduction of 6 per cent to 8 per cent. The building industry is on its knees (and I am talking of building, non-dwelling) and it has probably never been at a lower ebb. The Government is interested in trying to stimulate jobs, but has neglected completely this part of the industry. We lodge the strongest possible protest on the basis on which the Government has decided to allocate funds in this area.

I note an allocation of \$990 000 for preliminary investigations and design, a substantial increase from the \$332 000 allocated last year. Could the Minister indicate in writing the reasons for that increase and advise which specific projects will be included? Could he list the number of individual projects and state what works are involved as part of that expenditure? I am referring to page 142, showing an amount for preliminary investigations and design under primary and secondary schools.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The difficulty I have is that those matters have been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, or will be referred to it shortly. In those circumstances I am not permitted to reveal the identification of those projects until the Public Works Standing Committee deals with them and, in fact, reports on them. That is the basis of the difference between the \$322 662 and \$990 000. If the honourable member wants that information at the

stage that it gets to the Public Works Standing Committee, he can have it as far as I am concerned.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Can the Minister supply this information when possible, because I am sure that some of the projects do not have to go to the Public Works Standing Committee?

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** The information I have is that they all do. I am not sure whether that information is correct. I can have that checked, and if some of the projects do not have to go to the Public Works Standing Committee then the honourable member can have them. I guess that he can have the others that do have to go the Public Works Standing Committee when they reach the committee.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Will the Minister supply information (in writing perhaps) about when he expects work to be commenced on site and completed on the Pinnaroo Area School; when he expects work to start on the redevelopment of Brighton High School; how much money is likely to be spent; when is that redevelopment proposal due to finish; and what is the anticipated cost of that redevelopment proposal? Will he supply information on the reason for the delay in the redevelopment of the Thebarton High School, in that the Government did not spend the funds allocated to that project in 1982-83? A recent article in the *Teachers Institute Journal* comments on the considerable delay that occurred.

I refer to the line 'Government office accommodation'. Will the Minister indicate which Government departments or divisions of Government departments are having money spent on their accommodation out of the \$628 000, why that money is being spent on them, and whether or not any relocation cost is involved? Will he also supply information on whether or not it is anticipated that any Government department is to move into the new building being constructed (I think from State superannuation funds) on the site of the old Grenfell Street Mail Exchange and, if so, which Government department is involved, and what costs will be involved? Am I right in assuming (and he can give an answer in writing) that the moneys spent on the Department for the Arts (\$5.3 million) will be spent on the redevelopment of the museum (as I presume it would be) and, if not, on what projects is that money to be spent?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before the Minister answers, because there is only one minute remaining, I can only ask the Minister to comment if he wishes in the time limit available to us.

**The Hon. J.D. Wright:** I would like to answer the first of the series of 10 questions. Obviously, time will not be available to answer all these questions this evening because the bell will ring soon. The redevelopment of the Pinnaroo Area School envisages a new building linked to the existing solid classroom block to form a single L-shaped structure. Stage 1 will provide four teaching spaces, a withdrawal room, staff preparation area, store rooms, and a cleaners' room. The Budget stated estimated cost is \$590 000. Expenditure to 30 June 1983 was \$42 000. The proposed expenditure for 1983-84 is \$85 000. The planned date of commencement is May 1984, and the date of completion is December 1984. I do not think that the honourable member expected to get an answer as good as that in relation to the first school, which will be finished by December next year, in any case.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the examination of the vote completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 29 September at 11 a.m.