

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 8 October 1981

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr E. S. Ashenden
 Mr H. Becker
 Mr K. C. Hamilton
 Mr J. K. G. Oswald
 Mr K. H. Plunkett
 Mr I. Schmidt
 Mr G. T. Whitten
 The Hon. J. D. Wright

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$7 438 000.

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr H. R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Are there any questions?**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** My first question relates to the line 'Administration and Research Division'. How many personal staff are employed by the Minister and how much will the salaries cost during 1981-82? I refer to page 42 of the detailed programme information for the Minister of Industrial Affairs. At the bottom of the page on the left hand side there appears under 'Minister and staff' the principal Ministerial officer, press secretary, two personal secretaries, a steno-secretary and six other officers included in the Public Buildings Department. If my mathematics is as good as it used to be, that suggests that the Minister has 11 personal assistants. Could the Minister authenticate that or give me the correct number and the amount of wages that that staff will be paid during the 1981-82 period?**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Can I highlight the fact that there is within my department or my own personal office a mixture of personal staff, staff who are employees of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and staff who are also employees of the Public Buildings Department? There are three different types of staff members. I think these figures are correct but I will get them checked out and if there is any variation I will certainly inform the Committee. We need to appreciate the rather unique style of the Minister of Public Works office. All electorate secretaries and electorate offices are personally run by the staff within my office. Anne McMahon is the officer who works virtually fulltime or a great proportion of her time is devoted to that activity.

It is fair to say that there is a fairly routine function carried out, which is a function of the public services in a broader sense, but is carried out from within the Minister's

office, as has been the normal practice. A number of people involved are people from the Public Buildings Department. Four staff members are almost full-time involved in processing the various documentation on the Public Buildings Department which requires Ministerial consent or authority, or use of the Ministerial seal. There has been a change in the audit regulations which requires the Minister's formal approval and I now approve schedules. It is up to the staff to process those schedules in terms of actually using the seal on individual documents, and also giving authority on individual documents. The staff (if it is 11, I will check that) are mostly involved in processing Public Buildings Department material.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Under the same category, can the Minister say who the replacement was for Mr Denys Pearce? I understand that Mr Denys Pearce has left the Minister's staff. Can the Minister say whether he has been replaced, whom he was replaced by, and what qualifications he had for the job?**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Mr Denys Pearce left to take up an executive office position with an employer association. He left during the first week in September and has been replaced by Mr Bruce Lindsay, who is an arts graduate and I think an economics graduate. He has had both teaching experience and experience in a Ministerial office. He was the principal private secretary to the Deputy Chief Minister of the Northern Territory for 3½ years. I believe that he is ideally suited to take up that position.**The CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed, I point out that we are considering Parliamentary Paper No. 9, page 45 and part of page 46, down to the figure \$7 438 000. It will be helpful if we follow each part in sequence. This will not exclude any member going back before we pass the vote to any of those other items. This helps us to get through them in sequence.**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** I now have detailed information on the division of staff between the Public Buildings Department and the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. There are three personal Ministerial staff as Ministerial appointees who are not public servants. There are two staff members with the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment; one is Mr Whiteway, who has taken the seat of Mr Peter Vickery, who retired earlier this year. There is also a steno-secretary. This leaves only two departmental staff in the Minister's office and there are five staff with the Public Buildings Department in the Minister's office.**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I want to now move on to 'Director'. In his final report to Parliament last week, the retiring Director of the department said that staff reductions meant that some tasks had to be reduced, eliminated or postponed. Can the Minister elaborate on what tasks were eliminated, reduced or postponed last year and what tasks might be affected this year by staff reductions?**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** For the first part of that question I will ask Mr Johnson to answer and, as the second part relates to the effects of this year, I will ask the new Director to answer that.**Mr Johnson:** The staff reduction is something that we have been faced with for some considerable time under both Governments and; it is not really appropriate to point immediately to specific reductions. What we have done in the department and what we believe to be good management style is to gradually reduce, where it seems to be appropriate, some of the things that have been carried on in the department for many years. That is something I guess that all good managers would do. We have transferred two officers from the Safety Division to the new Industrial and Commercial Training Division because it is our view that that is a more appropriate use of Government

resources. We have also had a very close look at the officers working in the construction safety area because of the unfortunate downturn in the building industry in this State and we have transferred officers away from there, and as positions have become vacant we have used the positions in other areas. For example, we have got one more boiler inspector than last year but we have got fewer people in the construction safety area. That might change as economic conditions pick up. We have not reduced in areas where we believe that there is a need for continuing the prime reason for the department's existence, that is, the safety, health and welfare of all employed persons.

Mr Bachmann: I propose in the next two or three months to be looking throughout the whole department to find out where pressures are and are not in a type of managerial review. I hope as a result of that I would be able to ascertain where some of those areas to which the Deputy Leader referred could be determined and made safe for the future, so to speak.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That leads to another question. Mr Bowes mentioneed quite strongly in his annual report that his report had been delayed because of staff shortages and the necessity to redeploy staff to more important priorities. Is that likely to occur again?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think one of the main problems, as I understand it, was the preparation of very detailed material for the programme performance budgeting and, seeing that this was the first full year the department had been involved to this extent, it did take additional resources from within the department. I do not see that same problem arising to the same extent in the future; therefore, I do not see the delays occurring as they apparently did this year. The other pertinent point I should raise is that the Director himself was overseas for a period (about six weeks) and one would appreciate that, as he was preparing for retirement, he had certain commitments on his time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Also in Mr Bowes' report he spoke of the difficulty in transferring new duties and most of the staff in the industrial democracy unit. He said; 'These people had been recruited specifically for industrial democracy work and they were unfamiliar with new duties in different areas.' Does the Minister believe that these staff are now fulfilling their duties satisfactorily from where they have been transferred to?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will ask Mr Johnson to answer that question.

Mr Johnson: It is very easy for me to say 'Yes' and leave it at that—that is the situation. What Mr Bowes was referring to were the obvious difficulties anybody would have when one gets almost overnight five or six people who are specifically trained and experienced in one particular area and it is then up to the management of that department to deploy those persons as best we can within the responsibilities devolving upon the department. It has obviously taken some time to do that and that is, I believe, what Mr Bowes was referring to. I am quite confident that those officers who were transferred from that unit to other branches of the department are now performing quite well.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have for some time been hearing of a certain reshuffle of duties and administrative programmes in the department. Is the Minister prepared to tell the Committee what the administrative plans are in relation to Directors, Assistant Directors, and so forth, and can he also inform the Committee what is likely to happen to the position vacated by Mr Rod Broughton, who resigned, I understand, some time in June? To the best of my understanding, that job still has not been filled. If there is a comprehensive review of the administrative programme of the department and if the Minister is aware of exactly what

is to be done, could he inform the Committee of those developments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It was identified earlier this year that there was a need to perhaps restructure the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, particularly in light of some initiatives that it had taken on, such as the new emphasis on training, technological change, and manpower planning. It was also known at that time that the then Director (Mr Bowes) would be retiring in September, and so it was decided by Mr Bowes, myself, and the Chairman of the Public Service Board that any significant review of the department would not take place until the new Director was appointed and took up his position in the department.

I can indicate that a major review of the structure of the department and the activities carried on, particularly by senior personnel, is now to commence. I can give no indication of what that review may find, because I expect that it will take some time for a detailed analysis of each of the job functions to be made. A number of senior personnel in the department have resigned. This was anticipated, and those positions have been held vacant or have had acting persons put in them until that review is completed. I believe that that is the best and most appropriate way to handle that problem while the review is under way.

Mr WHITTEN: I refer to the Technological Change Review Council, and I refer the Minister to page 28 of volume two, book 4. The second paragraph on the right hand side of the page states:

Establishment of Technological Change Office, Council and two Working Parties which has been successfully undertaken.

I notice that last year \$6 000 was allocated, and \$2 910 spent. This year \$16 000 is proposed. It appears to me that very little has been undertaken in 1980-81, yet the booklet states that the council has been set up. Can the Minister give some explanation of that?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The committee was set up and really did not start to operate until the beginning of this year. Although the council was formally appointed last year, the working parties have been set up only recently and are operating. Therefore, the fees for the year 1980-81 cover only a portion of the year and, in some cases with the working parties, no period of the year. Three working parties were set up, one dealing with manufacturing industry, one with commerce and one with the public sector.

The manufacturing committee has been working well and has already started to prepare recommendations to me. The commercial sector committee is also working well. The public sector committee has taken a little longer to establish, but I understand that it has been established and is about to begin operations. The fees for 1981-82 cover a full year, which accounts for the \$16 000, compared with the fee for last year of only \$2 900.

Mr WHITTEN: How many persons are involved in the review council who are receiving fees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will read out the members on the council, as it is appropriate that their names be recorded. The Chairman is Prof. Stranks from Adelaide University, and the members are Prof. Blandy from Flinders University, Mr Davis, who is from the defence research centre at Salisbury but who is now retired, Mr Sallis from the *Advertiser*, Mr Terlet from Fairey Australasia, Mr Gregory from the United Trades and Labor Council, Mr Meikle, representing a trade union, but also representing the U.T.L.C., Mr Bachmann, Director of the department, Mr Ian Kowalick, Deputy Director-General, Department of Trade and Industry, and Mr Bowes. I can indicate that Mr Bowes will continue to serve on that council after his retirement.

Mr WHITTEN: I was trying to establish whether the review council was representative of a broad spectrum, and it appears that that is so.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thought that the Minister said that the council was broken into three parts. Is that what the Minister said?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There is the council and beneath it there are three working parties which report to it. The council is not broken up into three parts, but the Chairmen of the three working parties do sit on the council. The Chairmen of the working parties are Mr Bachmann, Mr Davis and Mr Bowes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am still not clear about who makes up the grouping of the working parties. Is the membership comprised from the council or are other people co-opted for the working party groups?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Other members are on the working parties outside of the council. Each Chairman of a working party is from the council, but other working party members are appointed from outside. The other members include basically three bodies: the trade unions involved or most likely to be involved as representatives of the U.T.L.C., the manufacturers or employers likely to be involved, and then a group of technical experts, academics or research persons who would have a major contribution to make.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In thanking the Minister for the information, I am sure that he would agree that this is a most important area that we are presently discussing, and we will discuss it again later. Will the Minister undertake to keep Parliament informed on the progress and recommendations made by this review council? I believe its findings and recommendations are not simply, in my view, the property of government. I believe that the area is so important that not only members of Parliament should be aware of its findings and recommendations but also the State and the people are entitled to receive that kind of information. Is that the Minister's intention? If it is not, will he reconsider making the recommendations available to the public?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I would expect the recommendations to vary. In fact, the recommendations that have already been made to me vary in nature. Some are personal recommendations to a Minister, others are departmental recommendations, and others are certainly the type of recommendations that should be made available publicly. For example, very shortly we will be releasing a document giving advice to employers who are about to introduce word processors, on how best to introduce them, how to go through a process of consultation with the unions involved, some training details, and other problems that may be encountered. That type of document will be made available to Parliament and the publicly.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I refer to the Government Job Transfer Office. In view of the lack of success of the Government's policy in transferring positions from the public to the private sector, why is this office being maintained in its current form?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not think the honourable member quite appreciates the role of the Government Job Transfer Office. That office takes Government employees who are surplus in one area and assists in redeploying them in other Government areas where there is perhaps a need for additional manpower. As such, this office has nothing to do with relocating Government employees to the private sector. If subcontract work is done for the private sector that is arranged through the individual departments involved.

The Government Job Transfer Office has been extremely successful in implementing the agreement reached with the United Trades and Labor Council in late 1979 as a means

of relocating employees within the Government. I think the average monthly transfer under that system is about 35 to 40 employees every month. I draw the honourable member's attention to two points. It means that, although not all of those positions will become redundant, it is possible for the Government to relocate its employees. It has also substantially increased flexibility. Previously, each department tended to act as an individual employer. There was no chance, for instance, to allow a person to move from the Public Buildings Department in the weekly paid area to the E. & W.S. Department, with the assurance of security of service and employment, as is provided under this proposal.

The other important feature is that the employees themselves have acknowledged how much they appreciate the system; and a number have approached me. It allows them the chance to promote themselves, take on better job opportunities and get new job experience, even in the weekly-paid area. In effect, this office does for weekly-paid employees exactly what the Public Service Board does for public servants.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I assure the Minister that I am aware of the current activities of the Government Job Transfer Office. However, I understood when this office was established that the Government intended to try to redeploy Government employees in private enterprise. I do not have the Minister's statement to that effect at my disposal at the moment, but I recall that that was part of the plan at that time. That was the reason for the question. Is the Government Job Transfer Office currently in the form in which it was established in the first place? If the Minister says that the only reason for it being established now in its current work is to transfer people from Government department to Government department, why does he say, on page 36 of the yellow book (which substantiates what I was saying in relation to the question), under 'Issue/Trends', the following:

Redeployment of larger numbers of weekly paid staff (particularly 'building trade tradesmen') is difficult to achieve because of the general high unemployment levels.

I do not argue that point; of course it would be very difficult. Is the Government Job Transfer Office in the same form as when established and has it the same staff? Is it still the intention of the Government, where possible, to transfer people from the public sector to the private sector? Is the place overstaffed, properly staffed, does it need more staff, or what is the current situation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government Job Transfer Office has been set up in exactly the same way as originally intended. It was there to assist the transfer of people from one Government department to another. There has been no change in attitude or in the role of that office since it was first implemented. The number of staff in the office is three. I do not believe that it needs additional staff. The only area that I know of where they became possibly involved in any contact with outside employers was, as the honourable member would know, three to five years ago when a policy was adopted in Government that when apprentices were taken on they were notified in writing at the time that they would not be guaranteed employment at the end of their apprenticeship. Because of that and rather than wait until the end of the fourth year of the apprenticeship and push these people out on to the job market, half-way through the third year the Government has called for interested outside employers to get in touch with the Government through the Government Job Transfer Office so that if need be we can transfer the indenture of the apprentice just before the end of the fourth year. That will guarantee continuity of employment to the Government apprentices who finish their apprenticeship and then find outside employment.

That has worked extremely well. It has been appreciated by the apprentices involved, because it gives them a guarantee of employment. There is direct continuity from the Government to the private employer. To my knowledge, that is the only basic area where the Government Job Transfer Office is there as a contact point with outside employers. The other point raised is that the Government continually seeks ways in which it can use its surplus employees in certain areas for outside work. We are not there to directly tender and compete in the normal tendering process. If any person comes to the Government and says, 'We have a specific labour requirement, can you help us?' and we are able to put in a subcontractor or do it on a subcontract basis, we are only too willing to do so.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Minister explain what is meant in his own booklet where it states, in essence, that redeployment of large numbers of weekly-paid staff (particularly building trade tradesmen) is difficult to achieve because of the general high unemployment levels? Can the Minister inform the Committee as to whether or not at any stage it was the intention of the Government, where possible, to transfer public works employees—Government employees—to private enterprise? Was it ever the intention in the original setting up of the Government Job Transfer Office for Government employees to be transferred to private enterprise? I would like an answer from the Minister on that. It requires a simple 'Yes' or 'No' answer. I was under the impression that that was the original intention. I can recall seeing documents which indicated that that was the case and I put that question to the Minister.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The statement on page 36 of the programme performance booklet was made because the attrition rate from the Government, particularly for weekly-paid employees, tends to be less when there is less outside work and high unemployment in those areas such as the building trades. The attrition rate is less and the chance to re-deploy people in the Government is therefore made more difficult. In regard to the transfer of Government employees to the private sector, it was never the intention to specifically transfer them. The Government said that it would look at means of seconding Government employees to the private sector. That would be for a specific period. In our discussions with the United Trades and Labor Council, one basis on which they have indicated generally that they are willing to agree to is for Government employees to do outside work. Rather than secondment, we are looking at a subcontract-type basis in which we have a Government supervisor involved. The employees would be working under a Government supervisor—in effect the Government doing the outside private work.

We are willing to look at any scheme on that basis, provided we are not directly competing with the private sector in the tendering process. We have looked at that and it is quite unfair on the Government because it does not take account of overhead costs that any private company would be required to take into account.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for qualifying what I thought was the correct situation. Can the Minister tell me whether there has been any success with the secondment scheme?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There have been a number of cases. The most successful ones have been in the professional area. There were five or six engineers and professional staff seconded to a private consultant to do a specific job in the Middle East for a three-month period. They came back and they were very pleased with it. Those professional staff came from the Public Buildings Department. Half-way through last year we also had a request from the Northern Territory for its Works Department to take a number of people from here. Initially it was 20 people and

I think it was expanded to 25; it is in that vicinity without being absolutely precise about the numbers. They were seconded to the Northern Territory Administration for periods up to nine or 12 months. Although most of these people have returned I understand that some have extended their period of secondment. There are other areas (and we are actively negotiating a number at present) where we are looking at taking on subcontract work, using our surplus employees. There have also been one or two other schemes that we have looked at. We have successfully done work for outside groups, particularly charitable bodies, where we use our surplus employees to give the labour component. I can give some examples and the member for Hanson can verify at least one. The Epilepsy Association wanted some renovations and repainting done in its premises, and the Government supplied the labour by contributing surplus employees. I believe that the Epilepsy Association contributed the cost of the paint, and the task was carried out. Normally that work could not have been done except for the contribution by the Government. I understand that the honourable member's association was very pleased with the result. That is only one of a dozen or so cases where that has been done. We are currently assisting Bedford Industries.

Mr BECKER: Work undertaken by the Public Buildings Department staff, at Regency Road, Prospect, for the Epilepsy Association was first class and was appreciated by our association.

Mr WHITTEN: As it always has been.

Mr BECKER: Yes, they did a wonderful job and we were disappointed that they did not accept an invitation to the opening day. They were invited to come along, and I have nothing but praise for what they did with the use of resources and materials that we provided for them. I asked a question of the Minister along this line. I understand that this involved all Government employees. Would this also involve cleaning staff?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, provided the cleaning staff are Government employees on a weekly paid basis. There are some cleaners who are employed on a contract basis and it does not include these people. It includes all permanent weekly paid staff within Government departments and statutory authorities.

Mr BECKER: At the Marleston college in early June one of the cleaners was promoted to a senior position and another cleaner retired. That left a vacancy for two male cleaners out of three. The positions were advertised within the Public Service and nobody came forward. This meant that it was necessary to employ two cleaners to make up three male cleaners required at Marleston college. As late as two weeks ago those two positions were not filled, and I understand the request had to go to Cabinet. This is an unfortunate situation where it is essential that the college have three male cleaners. The male laboratories could not be cleaned satisfactorily. Three months later it had to be a Cabinet decision. Can this system be short-circuited?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is not always possible to fill vacant positions with a transfer person. There is no provision for a compulsory transfer unless that person has been notified for at least three months that he is surplus to requirements in his area. I am certain that in this case there were no declared surplus employees who could be compulsorily transferred to that area. In that case, because they had failed to find a person within the Government, it was necessary to go outside. You may recall that there was an instruction from the Premier's Department on 7 May which required outside appointments to be approved by Cabinet. This is the reason. There have been one or two problems brought to our attention regarding certain delays in these areas and, where it appears that it may be difficult to find

a suitable person within the Government to transfer to that position, we now advertise within the Government and advertise outside concurrently. This means that there is no delay by advertising first within the Government, and then advertising outside. We advertise concurrently and, if a suitable person is found within the Government, that person is transferred; if a suitable person is not found, immediately you can fill in someone from the applications from outside.

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister assure me that in future we will not have the problem of waiting three months to get someone to clean the lavatories at Marleston college?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The cleaning of Marleston college does not come under my responsibility.

Mr BECKER: It may not, but it is all linked up with this scheme. If this scheme is to work we must have some system within the Government to prevent long delays such as that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We have taken appropriate measures to make sure that there are no delays within the scheme due to the Government Job Transfer Office. We have also sat down and worked out suitable arrangements with the Health Commission, about how it can fill vacancies from either within or outside of the Government.

Mr BECKER: I wanted to ask a question about the three staff involved in this programme—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did give the Deputy Leader quite a latitude as far as questions are concerned, as he is the lead on my left. It has been the practice that the other members have about three questions on any one subject so that everyone has a turn. In this case I will call the member for Hanson, but afterwards I will be calling another member.

Mr BECKER: In relation to Volume 2, book 4, page 36, the allocation of \$107 000 was proposed last year, \$100 000 being spent, and this year \$115 000 is proposed; and then on page 45, the line we are discussing, 'Senior Project Officer, Project Officer and clerical staff, Government Job Transfer Office', \$59 000 is proposed. How does that link up? Included in the whole of the question are the three employees within this section and a fixed asset of one motor vehicle. I wonder whether it is necessary to provide one motor vehicle for three departmental employees or whether it would be more economical to use a car from the pool of the department.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I ask Mr Johnson to answer that question.

Mr Johnson: Regarding motor cars, what we do within the department is allocate the vehicles by a pool system, but for accounting purposes they are allocated to specific areas. In this particular case the car is obviously not used full time by this branch. As with the great majority of our cars, it is used by anyone when it is available, but it needs to be accounted for somewhere. This way was chosen in this instance. The other question related to the amount of \$115 000. I did not exactly understand what you were saying.

Mr BECKER: On page 45 of the Estimates of Payments, the line we are dealing with is 'Senior Project Office, Project Officer and clerical staff, Government Job Transfer Office, proposed \$59 000'. I want to know how that \$59 000 links up with the \$115 000 in the Programme Performance Budgeting book, page 37.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will ask Mr Bachmann to answer that.

Mr Bachmann: The first section of the Estimates, \$59 000, is the amount attributable to salaries. The programme has other costs included in that, amongst which are administration and production costs of the weekly job vacancy notices. That accounts for the balance of the amount between \$59 000 and \$115 000.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister advise how many employees have complained that they were unduly disadvantaged by transfers? I understand that it was the intention of the Government that no-one would be unduly disadvantaged by transfers. Can the Minister advise how many complaints have been received in this area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: To my knowledge there have been no formal requests for the appointment of an independent arbitrator because someone has been unfairly disadvantaged. To formally answer your question, if you are taking up the point of the agreement with the United Trades and Labor Council, I think the answer is 'No'.

Mr HAMILTON: How many compulsory transfers have taken place within Government departments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I cannot give that answer. There have been very few between departments but there have been transfers within departments.

Mr HAMILTON: Could you find that information out for me? Could the Minister advise how many country relocations have taken place and what expenses have been incurred in that area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There have been a number of voluntary country relocations that have taken place. The honourable member would be aware that under the terms of the agreement no compulsory transfer can take place between the metropolitan area and the country or vice versa, but assistance is given if a person volunteers to go from one position to another and that involves a relocation of his home. I will try to get that information. One of the problems is that it covers a broad area of Government. Some of these people relocated are in the Health Commission. It will involve a great deal of detail to be precise but I will get whatever information I can through the Government Job Transfer Office.

Mr OSWALD: The Commonwealth has its own school-to-work transition scheme, and I notice that the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, in conjunction with the Department of further Education, provides a programme as well. Could the Minister provide the Committee with details on his department's programmes and how many young people are involved and what is the cost to the State of this particular initiative?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will shortly hand that question over to Mr Johnson to answer in some detail. It is appropriate that I point out that the school-to-work transition programme in this State is administered by an inter-departmental committee that involves the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, the Education Department and the D.F.E. The Chairman of that committee is Mr Max Johnson, so it is appropriate that he answers the question. I should also indicate that the new guidelines from the Commonwealth Government require the money now to be spent for the year 1982 either in the Education Department or the D.F.E., so any programmes based on the Commonwealth funding cannot take place in another Government department, such as the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

Mr Johnson: Within the Youth Bureau of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment there are four programmes funded wholly by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth school to work transition programme that were recommended by my committee to Government for funding. There is no cost to the State for the operation of those programmes. The cost to the State would be the normal salaries that would be paid to the officers concerned. Some part of the amounts that are made available by the Commonwealth are, in fact, debited to the salaries line, but that is a very small amount. What happened last year was that about \$30 000 was allocated from the funds for those particular programmes. For example, the Youth Bureau

people are examining what happens to young people who leave secondary school and go into a TAFE institution for further studies. When they come out, what kind of jobs do they get? What we are looking at is to find out whether or not it is appropriate for them to go from secondary school to a TAFE institution and then to work, or whether there is some other way and whether the TAFE institution is just a way they see of filling in time until a job comes along; in other words, is the job related to the sort of study they are doing?

Another thing that is happening is that the people exiting from high schools have all been circulated by a questionnaire (and it is quite a detailed professional questionnaire that is given to them) in order that they can indicate the kind of expectations that they have got from the school they have gone to. This has gone right across the whole of the education system (both private and public schools). This is so that we can get some appreciation as to whether or not the youngsters have an expectation that cannot be realised from going from the school system to the work system. They are two of the programmes that come to mind. Another one that was funded through the department but not conducted by the department was a telephone information service run by the Service to Youth Council. Part of the Commonwealth proposal is that the school sector and the TAFE sector, as well as departments such as ours, and the general community can participate in the schemes if worthwhile proposals are put up and agreed to, and that was one we did agree to. So they are three of the main programmes that were funded through the department.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Can I add one point to that? Another scheme which was very strongly supported by the department, which assisted in its implementation, was the new pre-vocational training scheme. For the first time in South Australia in 1981 400 young unemployed people, who had been unemployed for more than four months, were given specific training in a vocational area using the D.F.E. facilities and using school-to-work transition funds as well as additional funds contributed by the State Government. I believe this is one of the most significant new initiatives to assist these people to take on vocational skills, and the early indications are that these people became highly employable at the end of the period, even though before taking on the study they were longer term unemployed people. The one problem has been that we found that people have been leaving the courses (and these courses are up to six months long—up to 20 weeks) to take on jobs, which has meant a fairly high attrition rate for those involved in the course. It is a major step forward and one which next year I hope will be further substantially expanded.

Mr OSWALD: Would the time spent in the D.F.E. establishment be credited as part of an apprenticeship later on to become an apprentice?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, the Apprenticeship Commission has given approval to the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman to grant up to four months accreditation for the people who take on this pre-vocational training in a specific trade area. However, the pre-vocational training does not apply only to normal apprenticeship areas; it takes in other areas as well. They can get up to four months off their apprenticeship training.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Johnson was also going to advise of the number of young people involved in that programme.

Mr Johnson: The number is about 300 in the survey of those who have left secondary school and have gone to the TAFE institutions or whatever. About 2 000 were surveyed of those in the group that were possibly leaving school. So far as the total is concerned in the phone hook-up arrangement, I have no idea, but it is a substantial number.

Mr WHITTEN: I would like to follow up with a question on transfers. I notice on page 36 of volume two, book four, that the number of voluntary transfers was 380 and that the number of employees who retired early was 188. I agree with the Minister about the quality of the work of the Public Buildings Department being of an exceptionally high standard, as the member for Hanson also has said. What concerns me is that a lot of work that should have been done by the Public Buildings Department has not been done by that department. Can the Minister say whether there have been long delays in work that should have been done by the Public Buildings Department but has not been done because of a lack of employees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The answer is 'No'. I suppose that, when we are looking at what work has not been done, the real question is whether we are referring to contract work or whether we are keeping up with our Loan works programme. We were right on target in the 1980-81 financial year with the Loan works programme, which includes that work done by the Construction Division, which is using Public Buildings Department employees. There is no shortage of weekly-paid people in that department. There is still a surplus.

Mr WHITTEN: I was not referring to the Loan works programme; I was referring to maintenance work that should have been done but which has not been done.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The amount of maintenance work done has substantially increased, because we have used surplus employees in the Public Buildings Department to carry out an upgraded maintenance programme. There is a scheme called the visiting tradesmen scheme for schools, whereby a significant number of surplus tradesmen, particularly carpenters in the Public Buildings Department, have been going to schools and doing additional maintenance work that is not done under the normal maintenance programme. We have been able to do that additional work because we have surplus tradesmen. I think I am right in saying that the school councils pay for some of the cost of the materials involved in that additional work. If anything, the situation has meant that additional maintenance work has been done compared to what the situation was before this Government came to office.

Mr WHITTEN: How does the Minister reconcile that with a statement by the Premier that there has been a backlog of urgent maintenance work at schools that has not been done in the past 12 months, and that it will be necessary now to get private contractors to do work that should have been done previously by the Public Buildings Department? I will explain that by reading from the Financial Statement by the Premier and Treasurer. He said, in part:

It is planned to also increase the volume of work to private contractors in order to reduce a backlog of urgent maintenance work for country buildings, particularly school buildings.

The previous paragraph refers to the 188 who had taken the voluntary transfers and the like.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There is absolutely no conflict in what I have said and in what the Premier has said. In fact, that is the point I have been pushing. I take members back three, four or five years, at least, and to a certain extent back as far as seven years ago when, as soon as funds started to tighten up, the first thing cut was maintenance work. For about four years there were virtually no significant funds allocated for maintenance work, particularly in country areas.

It has been the long-standing practice that, where maintenance work is done in country areas (not break-down maintenance work but routine maintenance work), it is done using contract labour. What the Government has done this year is to give additional finance to the P.B.D. so that some

of this backlog of maintenance work in country areas can be taken on as a matter of urgency, because there is a significant backlog of maintenance work in country areas. I am referring particularly to painting, but it is not only in the painting area. I have letters from a number of schools about the state, particularly about the painting, of their school buildings. That is the reason for the additional allocation. As I said, the problem goes back at least five years, because this was the first area to be cut. We maintained and in fact increased the maintenance expenditure for that type of work, but it was not sufficient to pick up the enormous backlog that obviously existed and presently exists. Members need to appreciate that there are two regions. The metropolitan area is where the visiting tradesman scheme is applied. In fact, a number of members of the honourable member's Party have written to me complimenting the Government on the excellent work done by P.B.D. employees in those schools. That has been a great success. However, there is still a backlog of some painting in the metropolitan area, and we are looking at how we can increase that, and again it means the allocation of additional funds.

Mr PLUNKETT: My question follows a question asked earlier by the member for Hanson concerning cleaning contractors. How are the contracts called for the cleaning of electorate offices?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This is really a Public Buildings Department matter, but I am happy to answer it now. In most cases, contracts are called by advertising. We try to allocate, say, three, four, or five electorate offices in one region to one contractor, so that he has more than just one job because, in isolation, particularly in the metropolitan area, one electorate office by itself tends to be insufficient, but that depends a bit on the location of the electorate office. Sometimes an electorate office is a long way from any other office, particularly in the outer metropolitan areas, and it is not possible to do that.

Certainly, in country towns they are called on an individual basis, but I think there are four or five contractors that we generally use in the metropolitan area to cover four or five offices, and we cover a region whenever we call tenders. It is generally done through the public tendering procedure, although I think that in some cases existing contracts have been extended because that person has performed well.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am referring to the western region, which is where my electoral office is situated. How are the contractors selected, and I am referring to contractors, not weekly-paid employees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Normally, a tender is called to clean the electoral offices. I am happy to obtain the specific details in relation to the particular electoral office involved. I will find out the name of the contractor, when the contract was let, for what period, and what other electorate offices are covered in that contract.

Mr PLUNKETT: When these contracts are let, is any preference given to South Australian contractors?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In these cases, we are dealing with very small cleaning contractors. Normally, it is just one individual, so, of course, they are let to South Australians. In relation to the broader area of preference to cleaning contractors generally, there are perhaps one or two companies which might be interstate companies. Government policy on preference is that no preference applies between companies in relation to Government contracts involving Victoria and South Australia. There is a bilateral agreement between the two States and the normal 10 per cent preference is abolished.

In the broader area, preference still applies in relation to other States. However, it is the Government's policy that

those preferences should be abolished. It is farcical to divide Australia into six separate States, with each one having a preference against a person coming from another State. I believe that is a very inefficient way of handling Government contracts. In fact, I raised this matter at the most recent meeting of Ministers of Industrial Development. Talks will now be held between State Governments for the whole of Australia to look at, in the preliminary stage, the abolition of State preferences.

Mr PLUNKETT: The contract in question is held by an interstate contractor. Therefore, I am a little surprised at the Minister's answer and his attitude, because South Australia has one of the highest unemployment rates in Australia. The Minister has said that he believes it is a little ridiculous to give preference to South Australians. The three cleaners in question come from Canberra; they are from one family and include schoolchildren and a housewife. South Australia has high unemployment, so I think the Minister's answer was a bit strange. I would like to follow this matter up—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I presume the people doing the cleaning are residents of South Australia and that they do not come to South Australia each day to do this cleaning. Whether they originally came from Melbourne, Canberra, Britain or anywhere else, they are migrants to this State. They are welcome and we will give them Government work.

Mr PLUNKETT: They moved to South Australia when they got the contract.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has pointed out that this question relates to public works. The honourable member will be able to pursue this point when we deal with that line.

Mr SCHMIDT: My question relates to page 45 of Parliamentary Paper 9, with a cross-reference to page 40 in the programme book. I refer to 'Manpower Forecasting Unit'. The yellow book states, under 'Delivery mechanism':

The Manpower Forecasting Unit, when fully operational, will disseminate to interested parties estimates of the present and future levels of demand and supply.

Is it fully operational at this stage and, if not, when is it anticipated that the unit will be fully operational?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am pleased to indicate that the Manpower Forecasting Unit is now fully operational, although we did have some difficulty in selecting a leader for the manpower forecasting team. The position was advertised twice but no suitable applicants were received. On the second occasion, the position was upgraded to a higher salary level with a higher classification, but still no suitable applications were received. Negotiations then took place on an individual basis with a number of people. Eventually a Mr Harding was selected. He was appointed to the position, but that appointment was interrupted. When he took up the position it was known that he would be going to Malaysia to do contract work for three months before returning to this position. Whilst in Malaysia, Mr Harding was accepted for candidacy to Harvard University, so he has not returned to this position. However, we have now found a suitable applicant for the position and that person has started work. The initial difficulties have now been overcome.

Mr SCHMIDT: The proposed expenditure for this line is \$63 000 for 1981-82, but according to the programme book the recurrent expenditure is estimated to be \$113 000 for the forthcoming year. The proposed staff level, according to the programme book, is four. On page 40, under 'Specific Targets/Objectives', it is proposed to fully establish the unit with a staff of two project officers and one clerical officer. Does that mean that additional staff have been appointed to the unit?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer that question to Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson: Earlier we talked about transfers within the department to areas judged to be more appropriate for the use off our manpower. What the honourable member has said is quite correct: the establishment was to be three, two project officers and one clerical officer. However, in view of the long delays experienced, the department has decided to deploy one of our research officers into the manpower forecasting area, and that is the reason for the extra employee. As far as the figures are concerned, it is a question of salaries, equipment and contingencies that make up the difference.

Mr SCHMIDT: The programme book also states at page 40, under 'Issue/Trends', that the guidelines for the unit are to determine where there are shortages and in what industries. It also states that there will be a shortage of skilled metal and electrical tradesmen unless remedial action is taken. Has any remedial action been taken and, if so, what is the nature of that action?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Action has been taken. Before referring to the details of that action, I refer the honourable member to a study carried out by each of the State Governments in Australia, known as the Dolac Report. It looked at the likely shortages in skilled labour in Australia because of resource development. That report reveals that in the three years 1981 to the end of 1983 there was likely to be a shortage of skilled labour within Australia, particularly in the building trades, metal trades and electrical trades. The report estimated that there would be an additional demand over and above normal supply for 4 000 metal tradesmen, 2 000 electrical tradesmen and 1 000 building tradesmen.

As a result, last year the Government took a number of steps. First, I sent out 4 000 letters to all employers in the metal and electrical trades urging those employers to take on additional apprentices this year. Secondly, the State Government itself looked at taking on more people in that area and in this year we took on 84 goya apprentices—that is, group one year apprentices. They spend the first year with the Government. Their indenture is signed initially with outside employers. The final three years of their apprenticeship are completed with the employer. These 84 goya apprentices have been taken on specifically in the metal and electrical trades areas. In addition, Government departments have been asked to concentrate on the areas where there is an anticipated shortage. I would like to add to that list those three trade areas I mentioned. Also, there is now a potential shortage of motor mechanics, especially in the diesel area.

In addition, the Government initiated the Group Apprenticeship Scheme. The Group Apprenticeship Scheme provides an agreement whereby the trade association or employer takes on apprentices. They are indentured with that association and work with a range of employers who are members of the association. The State Government made that feasible because of the introduction of the entirely new Industrial and Commercial Training Act this year and the abolition of the old Apprenticeship Act. The new Act allows far greater flexibility, and included in that is the Group Apprenticeship Scheme. Under that scheme we have given financial assistance to the Master Builders Association, which is taking on 90 first-year apprentices in 1981. All of them have now been taken on.

In addition, an agreement has been reached with the Metal Industries Association, and this year they are taking on 50 apprentices in that area. That means that 140 additional apprentices have been taken on in those two trade areas through that scheme, which the Government has assisted to finance with some extra assistance from the

Commonwealth Government. The result of this, which is the key part, I am delighted to report has been a 22 per cent increase this year so far in apprentices—a 24 per cent increase in the metal trades apprentices and a 62 per cent increase in the number of building apprentices. I think I am right in saying there has been a 19 per cent increase in electrical apprentices.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: An increase on what?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: On last year's figure. Last year's figure was about 10 per cent higher than that of 1979. So, the results are that last year we increased the numbers compared to the previous year, and this year we have further increased those figures by about 22 per cent. That is based on the first five months of the year which is the period when we get the most accurate indication. We do not have full figures for this year, as apprentices are taken on by employers during the year. The Government put a lot of effort into that area, and the results have shown that we have been very successful in the new training initiatives that we have taken, especially in these critical areas. In addition, I mentioned earlier that pre-vocational training is specifically directed at the metal and electrical trades. We are going to increase the number of people taking on those trades through that scheme. We will shorten their apprenticeship training by some four months.

The CHAIRMAN: While the whole of the Committee is here, there is a need for clarification. It is the intention of the Chair to be fair and to keep the business flowing. I would like to see uniformity between the two Committees. On the first day when we considered a vote we took the whole vote in this Committee. On the second day we came down to each bracket. Today, because the practice has been followed in the other Committee, we are going from line to line. It will be of assistance to do that. We will adopt that policy. To help in this I ask members to indicate if they wish to speak on that line. That will assist me in determining when the debate on that line is to be concluded before passing to the next line.

The other matter is that, when there is a change in the Committee personnel, would someone from either side pass that information on to the new member coming on to the Committee? Are there any questions?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I may be under a misapprehension, but I was of the understanding, when going through 'Administration and Research Division', line by line, as we have been doing, that I would be afforded the opportunity to lead the first question at the commencement of a new line. I have questions that were similar to those asked by the member for Mawson when he came in and asked about Manpower Forecasting Unit matters. It probably was apparent at that stage that we had finished the previous line. Obviously the member for Mawson had the call but I would have thought that that call would be on the previous line and not on a new line. Is that the situation or is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: In the interests of uniformity is that the procedure for Committee A?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Not really. It was done differently in Committee A. I thought that the system had been working well, and most members would agree. I ask that, if any member on the Government side has his name down, does that allow him to go on with any line in the vote and can he jump anywhere in that category?

The CHAIRMAN: Any member of the Committee has the right for the call. It is desirable and necessary to complete one line before we go on to the next line. If any member has a question on a line he should indicate that, as it is difficult for the Chair. If I call a person in turn and that person goes on with the next line, it may be that somebody else has a question on the line that we are currently discussing; it makes it difficult for the Chair.

Mr HAMILTON: I suggest that we go through as suggested but that each member of the Committee be given the opportunity, should he have another question, to go back to it before the vote is taken. Some members may have overlooked a question. I agree that we should have uniformity in our questioning but in some instances we may wish to refer back to a line.

The CHAIRMAN: If we move from one line to the next, before a vote is passed any member will have an opportunity to come back to any matter.

Mr BECKER: I agree that we should move from one line to the next but that the Deputy Leader has the right to the first question. We can then work down the lines.

The CHAIRMAN: The members of the Committee who have been here for three days have had different methods on each day. We have a better understanding now.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I wish to ask the Minister a similar question to that asked by the member for Mawson in relation to the Manpower Forecasting Unit. I will also ask some other questions. Looking at the yellow document, page 40, we find that under the heading 'significant initiatives, improvements, achievements' we do not see much there. We do see 'some minor studies undertaken by persons temporarily seconded to the unit'. I make no criticism of the fact that the Minister could not find the proper person to run the unit. It would have been stupid not to have waited until you got the proper person to do it. For that reason there has been very little, if anything, done within the unit. This is a tragedy, because it is an important area. I notice on the projection that it was the intention of the department last year to have an employment level of two average full-time equivalents. This was not achieved, and the average full-time equivalent indicated in those levels is obviously the new leader of the group. The projection is for four average full-time equivalents in 1981-82. What were the minor studies undertaken? Was there any tangible work of benefit to the department or State? When will the department achieve its proposal for 1981-82; that is, to fill up the unit to the four that is prescribed in this document?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The one position for last year is not the leader. The leader has only just taken up his position. The one there was one of the existing people within the department involved in this area. There are four people. The fourth person has been appointed and is due to take up the position later this month, so that there will be a full complement by the end of October. The minor studies so far undertaken include a general study of the likely shortages of skilled tradesmen in South Australia, and they also involve one or two specific projects, looking at helping other Government departments as to whether there was likely to be a shortage in their areas. One of the projects where these people were partly involved was looking at the potential shortage of manpower requirements for dentists in South Australia. There was a further project which involved looking at the manpower requirements and availability in the Iron Triangle area, as part of the Iron Triangle study.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Would the Minister give the name of the leader who has been appointed to this group, his rate of pay and his qualifications?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The leader is Mr Baker. His position is A03 and the salary range is between \$24 000 and \$26 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Has this person had experience anywhere else in manpower forecasting?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He has had considerable experience. First, he worked with the Bureau of Statistics, then the Department of Planning specifically on population forecasting, and then he was seconded to the Premier's Department to work on the Iron Triangle study. He has an economics degree. You will find from his own qualifications

and work experience that he is highly qualified to take on this position.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What is the availability of any studies or projections that are undertaken? Is it the intention of the Minister to make them publicly available? This is an important area and we are now getting into a situation where we have someone who is able and capable to take on the responsibility of leader and put the staff requirements up. It would be a pity if the projections and forecasts were not available publicly and if the information was confined to the use of the department. Everyone would have some use for it, whether it be the employers, Parliamentarians, the public or the departments. Is it the intention of the Minister to make those forecasts available to the public?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, it is. Some studies that the unit will do will be more specific ones to be used by Ministers or will be for specific projects. In all of those cases it may not be appropriate to release the details; for example, there might be a specific development project to be carried out in South Australia. As part of the project there will be manpower forecasts for every large project. Some of the information could be confidential or of a corporate nature and it would not be appropriate for general release. We intend to release the broad results of any study carried out by this group.

Mr SCHMIDT: In answer to an earlier question the Minister indicated that there had been a 60 per cent increase in apprentices for the building industry. This large increase is laudable. How does this relate to the fact that the building industry is so depressed in South Australia? Will this become an over-supply or has it been assured through the manpower unit that this is well within the demands that we will require in years to come, particularly in view of the fact that it will take three or four years for apprenticeships to finish? Will we find 60 per cent of apprentices at that time out of work?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: When talking of percentage increases it is appropriate to look at what base you are increasing from. In the case of building tradesmen, it was increasing from a very low base because of the general depressed nature of the building industry in this State since 1976. In 1976 there was a big demand and then immediately after 1976 that demand dropped off quickly. I have been concerned about the savage extent to which the taking on of apprentices in the building trades has almost come to a halt. It is pleasing to see that that trend has now been reversed, largely because of our Group Apprenticeship Training Scheme, which will allow 90 new apprentices in that industry this year. The other advantage is that in an industry that is renowned for its fluctuations and good and bad fortunes for individual companies, through the Government Apprentice Training Scheme it means that an apprentice is not tied to one employer. Should the workload of one employer drop, he can work for another employer without having to change his indenture.

Mr WHITTEN: Regarding the Manpower Forecasting Unit, what liaison does the Minister intend the Unit to have with other States and Federal forecasting units?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will insist on close liaison between our Manpower Forecasting Unit and similar bodies in other States or at a Federal level. We have taken the lead among the States. There is not the same unit in some States to liaise with. I expect a close liaison with the new Federal body, the Bureau of Labour Market Research. There will be close contact with the Flinders University Institute of Labour Studies, especially Professor Dick Blandy, who is Chairman of our Advisory Committee for Manpower Forecasting as well as being the head of that unit at the Flinders University.

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister had an opportunity to take notice of an article concerning a lecture at Flinders University yesterday concerning manpower and planning, where that person said that they could get bogged down on a multiplicity of bodies? I think that was the import of it.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have not seen the full context of that speech. My concern is that there must be liaison, and there tends to be a problem in this area, because there is such a wide diversity of opinion as to how manpower studies should be carried out, and what are the relevant and most accurate techniques. I refer the honourable member to the excellent report which I released publicly last year and which looked at the range of different study and techniques and the techniques we thought were most appropriate for South Australia. I can assure him that the last thing we want to do is to have an unnecessary duplication, and there will be close liaison.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Moving on to the Technological Change Centre, I note that the vote last year was \$65 000, actual payments were \$58 469, and there has been an escalation of some \$38 000 from the figure voted to \$103 000 for this year. How is that going to be spent? Turning to page 29 of book 4 of the Programme Estimates, and referring to the table in relation to employment levels, in full-time equivalents, the proposed figure for 1980-81 is shown as 2.5, while the outcome for 1980-81 is given as 4.5. The proposed figure for 1981-82 shows an increase to only 4.8, or an increase of .3 per cent of labour. It seems that that person would have to be rather highly paid if the reason for the escalation to \$103 000 is the payment of salaries.

I make no objection to that; let me make that very clear. I put on the record that I have no objection to money being used, and well used, in this area. It is of concern to me, as well as to everyone else in South Australia; that is, the worry of technological change and what that may or may not do to the work force, the workers, industry generally, as well as our trade prospects. I am not criticising the injection of money, but some explanation is needed of why such an amount is involved when there has been only a minor increase in the work force.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We need to appreciate that there has been an increase, and that the figure for last year, although it comes under average full-time equivalents, I think you will find was only for part of the year, because Mr Garry McDonald, the Chief Project Officer, was appointed only late last year and he has taken on most of his staff since then. So, I do not think that 4.5 for a full year is an accurate reflection, although it does reflect the number of people actually employed in that unit for that period. The main reason is that last year the accounts were for only part of the year and this year it is for a full year. The staff in that area comprises the Chief Projects Officer, Mr Garry McDonald, three project officers, and one clerk.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I accept that, but from reading the yellow booklet one would assume that the 4.5 applied to the whole of last year. The Minister says it has not, and I accept that. I understand that if staff are to be put on for the whole of this year the allowances will need to be increased.

Can the Minister give some details of the work done so far by this unit and what the plans are for the next year now that there is a full start in operation? I understand that there has been concern in this unit that there does not seem to be much leadership coming forward from the Minister or the department, and that there is apathy, discontent and concern in the area. That is only hearsay, but the Minister can say what has been done, what he intends to do this financial year, and what are the plans for the unit so that

the unit itself has some sort of working programme to adopt and to adapt itself to?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As I pointed out earlier, the council is there to lead the unit, and I think the unfortunate remarks of the Deputy Leader reflect somewhat on the capabilities of the Chairman of that council and its members. Really, they have been operating for only a very short time in a totally new area, and that is an unfortunate reflection on people of the highest ability and integrity in this State.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can assure the honourable member that that is not so. I have the greatest confidence in the Chairman, Professor Donald Stranks, and I have the greatest confidence in Garry McDonald who, in fact, worked for a time with the Myers Committee, the Federal body on technological change. He was originally with us, he was seconded to the Myers Committee, and he came back to this post, I believe, as one of the more experienced people in Australia and is a person for whom I have a very high regard. I would like to assure the honourable member that it is only hearsay; there is no truth in it, and I have not heard that accusation levelled at the unit.

It is up to the council largely to determine the projects and for the working parties to get down to the detailed work for the project. The Technological Change Centre is there as a secretariat to the council and the working parties. I have highlighted certain areas to which I believe it should turn its attention, but I do not wish necessarily to cut across what the council is also setting out as its programme. I think it would be wrong for me to do so. It has taken a number of projects which I have talked about already and I cannot give more detail on other projects. I can name one or two other projects: one is the introduction of word processors and the other is the introduction of computerised selling scanners at retail outlets. I think another project is automation within the banking area, and offset manufacturing is another project it has spent some time looking at. They are four of the projects on which considerable work has been done. Only last night I read one of its papers with some of its recommendations and I expect that more time will need to be spent on those projects.

Mr SCHMIDT: I wish to refer to page 28 of the Programme Estimates where, under 'Broad objectives/Goals' it states:

To facilitate the flow of unbiased and timely information on technological developments and their implications to known technical users . . .

and it goes on then under 'Issues/Trends' to state that certain bodies react to technological change in a negative way, and promote that negativism. I draw the Minister's attention to this. He must know very well the film *When the Chips are Down*, a film that was widely used in schools and other organisations to generate a negative rather than a positive attitude towards technological change. To what extent is the unit addressing itself to keep objective and factual information on these trends, rather than these negative emotional aspects?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The council is giving a great deal of attention to objectivity in this area. I think that will become apparent when the first publications are available shortly, particularly the one on word processors. I have also seen some of the work that the council has done on off-set manufacturing, and I think that that, again, is a truly objective sort of analysis of the advantages that can be achieved in that area. I think it is important.

Technological change can create fears in the work force and it is important that we tend to diminish or minimise those fears to give people, as accurately as it can be done, an accurate reflection of what the effects of any technolog-

ical change should be. I think that, in the past 12 or 18 months, our community has achieved quite a bit in trying to break down some of those fears and to introduce new technologies without that having an adverse effect on the work force. I highlight one company that has done that very successfully. Simpson Limited, by careful consultation with its employees, has introduced major new manufacturing technologies without retrenchments and without major industrial problems.

[Sitting suspended from 1.2 to 2 p.m.]

Mr HAMILTON: With respect to research into employment and industrial relations, in relation to supermarket scheming, the Minister said he had elaborated on four areas. Would it be possible for the Minister to elaborate particularly on the motor car industry, the implications of technological change, how much work has been done in that area, and the likely effect on South Australia? As the Minister would be aware, it is a very controversial issue at this time.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No work has been done that I know of by the Council on Technological Change on technological changes within the automotive industry *per se*. Most of the work on the motor vehicle industry is covered by the Department of Trade and Industry under our South Australian Industrial Assistance Committee, which monitors technological changes in the automotive industry, particularly what effect changes in technology are likely to have on the component manufacturers in the State.

As an example, the Government has encouraged the setting up of a major new plastics plant by G.M.H. at Elizabeth. The reason for that is that a significant change in technology is that plastics are rapidly replacing metals in certain parts of automobiles. It will not be long, I suspect, before we will have reaction injection moulding, in which all the front grille, the immediate front panels of a car, and possibly the entire back panels, will be produced in plastics, using reaction injection moulding. It is a mixture of plastic and fibreglass. I have seen that technique being used. I saw production of, I think, Pontiac fronts and backs and Cadillac backs in the United States or Canada.

That type of change is monitored by that committee, so it can react and advise component companies on what areas of production they should get out of and what new areas they should move into. Another classic area where we have given financial assistance is in suspension seats. We look, where new technologies are being developed, to the extent to which those technologies are available with existing manufacturers in Australia and, if they are not readily available, we encourage our manufacturers to get into those areas. I think that, in a specialised area like that, it is better to leave the matter with that specialised committee, which comes under another department, but I assure the member that we are carefully monitoring that and we implement it through the means by which we help companies in the motor vehicle industry.

Mr OSWALD: Could I have an indication from the Minister, regarding terminal leave payments, as to how many former public servants have taken the Government up on the termination of employment after reaching the age of 55 years?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think there is some confusion here. Terminal leave payments are not for the early voluntary retirement scheme but for employees of the department who leave and are eligible for long service leave payments, payment for annual leave not taken, and any other termination payments. I highlight the fact that last year the expenditure was \$103 000, because some long-standing employees have retired at the age of 60 or 65

years. That is the reason for that type of payment. Mr Rod Broughton and Mr Peter Vickery were two of those, and there were others.

The CHAIRMAN: We will move to the Industrial Safety Division.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I want to incriminate the Government very severely in this area. I believe that one of the concerns of any Government or any Opposition is to ensure the safety of work. That is one of the most important facets for those in Government or in Opposition. It is quite clear to me that there has been a real reduction in the allowance in this area of about 5.3 per cent. I want to know from the Minister whether he agrees with my assessment that there has been a decrease in the commitment of 5.3 per cent in real terms, and I want to know why the Industrial Safety Division has been cut back in such a manner.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: First, I will deal with the broad point and then perhaps ask departmental officers to cover certain details. I assure the Deputy Leader that this Government has the highest commitment to industrial safety. I think that that has been shown by our commitment in a number of areas, including taking on a contract officer to look at risk management. In this way, we are looking at the fundamental causes of accidents and trying to ensure that the circumstances or causes that lead to accidents do not arise and in that way trying to eliminate the need for claims against workers compensation and the human costs of injury at work.

There is a reduction in this line, for very good reason. The Government assessed what its immediate priorities were for this department. We believe that all areas of training have been largely ignored and allowed to run down in this State. We therefore assessed what we saw as the most immediate need for new attention by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. We put down three areas as needing either an increased effort or some effort.

The first was in the whole area of industrial and commercial training. We have substantially increased manpower and expenditure in that area. The second is in technological change, which we have been talking about at length, and I think all members have highlighted the high priority that that must have. The third is manpower planning, and again, that is of the highest importance with our high unemployment at present and the areas of significant trade shortage.

We therefore assessed what programmes in the department could have a lesser effort put into them or where, due to a change of circumstances, priorities had changed in the past 10 years. The Deputy Leader, who was a member, would remember a Select Committee that looked at noise control in this State. I recall, as a member of the committee, that we felt that it was important to go out on an education programme to highlight to industry in this State the damage that can be done through high noise levels in the working place and how employers can overcome that, either with protective equipment for employees or by altering specifications, design, and cladding on certain machinery. The Government has decided to reallocate resources.

Two positions in the Noise Control Unit have been abolished and those persons have been allocated to other priorities so that we can take on these new priorities. Our assessment is that, during the past five years, which is about the period that the legislation has been enforced and the education programme has been in operation, much of the educational role has now been completed and that new expertise has been built up through private consultants in that area. Quite rightly, we can take noise out as No. 1 priority and put in its place trade training.

That is exactly what we have done, and that is why there has been a reallocation of resources from this particular line. It is only a minor adjustment or a fine tuning, but

there has been a minor adjustment from this area to another area. The other point is that, in assessing this area and the Government's priority to it, people need to look at the miscellaneous lines, because the Government gives a sizable grant each year to the National Safety Council of Australia. This year the grant has been increased from \$81 000 to \$90 000, an increase of \$9 000.

That highlights the fact that the Government gives a high priority to that area. With the safety centre down on Port Road, we felt that the best way of administering it was to transfer the whole centre to the control of the council. The obvious reason for that was that the biggest user of the centre was the council, so we increased the size of the council's grant so that it could take over the administration of that centre. This then released some of our people who had been working in that area for allocation to new priorities, as I have already indicated. To add to that answer, perhaps I could call on the Director, Mr Bachmann, who can give specific details on individual inspectors available.

Mr Bachmann: These are subdivided under the Industrial Safety Division into several headings. The first of those is factories and the number of employees in 1980-81 was 18, and the number proposed in this coming year is 18. In construction safety, the relevant figures are 13 for 1980-81 and 11 for 1981-82. For boilers, there were five in 1980-81 and six are proposed for 1981-82. For lifts the numbers are five and five, for district inspectors—the officers in charge of the department's district offices—the numbers are 10 and 10, and for shearers' accommodation the numbers are one and one. The number of inspectors in the field was 52 for 1980-81 and 51 for 1981-82.

The CHAIRMAN: The Deputy Leader has wisely advised me that he has a number of questions on this line. I propose to call the honourable member several times. I have also had an indication from my right about certain questions, and then I will come back to the Deputy Leader. I have also received indications that a couple of other honourable members on my left wish to ask questions. If the Deputy Leader wishes to give way to them, I would ask him to indicate that to me.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It is all very well for the Minister to talk about increasing the grant to the State body of the National Safety Council by about \$9 000. Surely that is only keeping up with inflation, in any case. We have inflation between 10 per cent and 12 per cent. He is not giving much away there. What the Minister has not answered is my question about whether or not there is in real terms a 5.3 per cent reduction in the safety division. I do not know how many complaints I have received about this matter since the Budget was announced, but it is about 100. The Government has been incriminated throughout for its action. I believe this is an area in which more money should be spent rather than less money. I want to know from the Minister whether he agrees that the figures I have related to the Committee are correct. The Minister failed to do that in his reply to my question.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think that the figures are before honourable members and they can make their own calculations. I do not have a calculator here to verify the percentage figure quoted by the Deputy Leader. I reiterate that, when one is talking about safety on the factory floor and talking of whether there is a need to increase inspection, the Director has already highlighted the fact that the only change in that area of inspection has been a reduction from 52 to 51 inspectors. If one looks at the exact figures that he gave, the biggest area of reduction has been in the construction industry, and we all know that the amount of construction over the past three or four years has diminished. Thus, to maintain the same effort, there has not been

the same need for inspectors in that area. In fact, one can safely say that the amount of effort in that area per construction job has probably increased because of the reduction in the work and because for some time the numbers have stayed static.

If one looks at the evidence available, it certainly does not suggest, as the honourable member has suggested, that the Government is trying to reduce its effort on safety. In effect, there has been a retention of effort on the amount of work being done throughout all areas, including factories, construction, boilers (where there was actually an increase, and I highlight this because we see that there is likely to be an increased demand for boiler inspectors because of the construction work carried out in that area), lifts, district inspectors, and shearing accommodation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It may be all very well for the Director to tell us that there will be 51 inspectors instead of 52 used in the department's efforts in trying to control safety in this State. I suggest that it would be better if there were 61 inspectors instead of 51. I refer to pages 12 and 13 of book 4. I refer to employment levels and average full-time equivalents, which have dropped from the proposed 45.9 in 1980-81 to 43.9 in the same year, and the proposed figure for 1981-82 shows a reduction to 36.9. It is no good the Director, the Minister or anyone else telling the Committee that the inspectorate will be kept up and not explaining the rest of the situation.

It is clear from the departmental evidence that there is a reduction of 7 per cent in the equivalent number of bodies. I do not know what that means in real terms, but the Committee is entitled to information about what is happening in this area, where there has been a great reduction in funding. The Minister knows well what I am talking about when I say that there is a 5.3 per cent reduction in an area which can ill afford it. The philosophical stance of the Parties is clearly involved, and the philosophical standpoint of the present Government is being exposed in this area.

I want to know now from the Minister or, if he does not have the information at his disposal, then from his officers, exactly what the cuts mean. They are cuts in an area in which I believe there should be increased finance, personnel and therefore increased inspectors or whatever other means we need to ensure the protection and safety of people at work, whether they be workers or people passing by the work place. There is clearly a reduction in percentage terms as far as finance is concerned, and there is a percentage decrease of 7 per cent in the full-time equivalents. This needs some explanation.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If the Deputy Leader feels so strongly that there should be 61 inspectors rather than 51 inspectors, why did he not do something about it in the four years or so that he was Minister of the department?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Opposition is questioning the Minister—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to comment in a moment.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think it is a pertinent question to raise, because if the effort should have been with 61, 62 or 71 inspectors, why was that not done in the four years that the honourable member was Minister? He knows only too well that he is trying to create a major storm because of a reduction of one, from 52 to 51 inspectors. The honourable member has accused the Government of giving industrial safety a low priority. That is not true. I believe I have adequately covered that point.

I point out that page 13 (and this is the point raised by the honourable member) deals only with a portion of the total number within the division of industrial safety. The total number in that section is 98. There has been a reduc-

tion in that area, but there has been an increase elsewhere. The honourable member should check the figures, and I do not blame him, because there has been a printing error. The figure for 1980-81, which is what he used as a basis for comparison, should have been 43.9, so there has been an error in addition. The figure in the next column, on outcome, should have been 42.9. That does not completely remove the difference highlighted by the honourable member, but I point out that he is dealing with 40 employees, whereas the total number in that section is in fact 98. Those numbers have been partly adjusted elsewhere. For instance, I have already referred to the fact that two noise inspectors have been removed from that position, because that area is no longer the Government's highest priority.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not yet received a satisfactory answer from the Minister in relation to the cut in real terms, which he will not admit to, or, secondly, about where the bodies have gone in relation to prospective employment levels. I would have thought the departmental figures of 42.9 and 36.9 would be accurate. There has been a reduction in staff, and I want to look into the areas where this staff reduction may have occurred. First, what is happening to the health and safety group at Bowden? I understood that three people were employed in that section, but I have been informed that only one officer is employed there at the moment. Will the Minister confirm or deny those figures?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have already covered that point. If the honourable member was not listening I will repeat that the training centre at Bowden is being transferred to the National Safety Council. Of the three people employed there, two have been transferred to the Training Services Branch of the department. I said that that area, which was allowed to run down, now has a high priority. Because of that and because of those transfers we have been able to allocate staff under manpower planning to technological change and to training initiatives. I said that we transferred the safety centre at Bowden across to the National Safety Council. Discussions have taken place between the department and that council, which was delighted to receive the centre, because, after all, the council ran many of the training courses there immediately adjacent to it. The council also used those facilities and it has been prepared to take on the maintenance and upkeep of that centre. Because of that, we could release two of the safety officers involved.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the two safety officers transferred from Bowden be used in safety, health and welfare, or will they be used for technological change or in other areas?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I said that the two officers involved have been transferred to the Training Services Branch. That has meant that other manpower can now be used in technological change under manpower forecasting.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Have the two safety inspector positions at Whyalla been filled and, if not, will they be filled?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I understand that at present one is being held vacant. The department is partly assessing its needs in that region, particularly in relation to the potential massive development with the Stony Point liquids scheme, which is adjacent to Whyalla. It is also assessing what will be required in relation to industrial inspection at the new power station at Port Augusta. That position is currently being held vacant.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the Government intend to undertake a major reorganisation in the industrial safety area during this financial year and create an industrial safety division with wide ranging powers in the same way as the Government has created an Industrial and Commercial Training Commission?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Industrial Safety Division will be reviewed in the overall administrative review of the department that I referred to this morning. I assure the honourable member that all of the activities of the Industrial Safety Division will be dealt with in that review, including its administration. The Government does not intend to set up a commission. An Industrial Safety Division has already been established within the department and it has been there for many years. Of course, there is also an Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board. It is really splitting hairs whether it is called a board or a commission. If one looks at the composition of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, it is exactly the same in terms of representation and the numbers involved as is the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board. I think the honourable member's question is somewhat irrelevant because the statutory body dealing with industrial safety already exists.

Mr SCHMIDT: My question relates to pages 12 and 18 of the programme book. Page 12 refers to a reduction in industrial accidents from 1973-74, when there were 87 000 accidents, down to 64 300 in 1978-79. The section on 'Specific Targets/Objectives' states:

As employment increases in South Australia result from new manufacturing and resource projects then the numbers of accidents could increase as a consequence towards the numbers experienced in the early 1970s.

A fairly similar statement is made on page 18, dealing with inspectorial staff, particularly in registering manufacturing industries and again highlighting the fact that there could well be a trend towards an increase in this area. Is the Minister satisfied that the staff allocation for 1981-82 will be sufficient to meet the growing industrial development that has occurred in this State, particularly in the past two years, with employment trends having reversed in the previous four years?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes. My assessment is that a great deal has been achieved in industrial education in this State over a number of years. Although I do not regard it as good legislation in certain aspects, the 1974 workmen's compensation legislation forced employers and, to a certain extent, the medical profession to look at their methods of treating injured workers, and it particularly forced employers to look at industrial safety within their plants. I believe the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act has encouraged many companies to set up industrial safety committees, so it is a joint effort between the employers and the employees to collectively improve safety within the workplace.

I think the results highlighted there do reflect that there has been a reduction in accidents from 87 000 down to 64 000 from 1978-79. One would anticipate that the number of industrial accidents also fluctuates with employment: if employment goes up, the number of industrial accidents is likely to increase as well. I believe that the resources available are adequate. In a theoretical sense, none of us like to see any industrial accidents. In a utopian situation we would have so many people running around that they prevented all industrial accidents. But that is an unrealistic world.

Mr SCHMIDT: Further to the safety promotion aspect in the work force on page 13, to what extent does the department vet films which are allowed to appear on television and which depict people using machinery without safety glasses? Within the school situation, it is very strongly emphasised that children are not allowed to use workshop equipment unless they have such things as glasses or the right safety equipment. Something totally different is used in the media.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is appropriate that Mr Johnson, who is responsible for that section of the department, should answer the question.

Mr Johnson: On many occasions when such films have been vetted by my inspectors. We have pointed out that people are not wearing safety glasses or boots or that machines are not properly guarded. That is only when we learn about the films being produced. Possibly the honourable member is referring to films that come in without our knowledge. If he could give me specific examples, I could follow them up. We do vet them if we know about them.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I was unable to answer that question, because I do not get time to watch television.

Mr SCHMIDT: With the inspectorial staff, I know that there is some concern amongst smaller businesses, particularly mechanical workshops, panel-beating workshops and the like, that frequently D.L.I. inspectors come around and look at things that need fixing up. They tend to be a little heavy-handed in their approach towards some of the smaller businesses. What is of concern is the fact that they have so many licence and registration fees to pay in relation to equipment they have on the premises. What steps are being taken to bring this all under one umbrella to save the small business man the necessity to maintain and service a whole range of licence fees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Taking the first point in regard to the attitude of industrial inspectors, I have tried to stress the fact that they are there to assist employers and industry in improving safety. In most cases that is possible to achieve in a conciliatory manner. Sometimes there are employers who could not care a damn about that. Fortunately, they are very much in the minority. It is occasionally necessary for the inspectors to take a much harder line with these people who are willing to expose their own employees to significant risks, to the financial disadvantage ultimately. I think, of the employer. The prime objective of the inspectors is, through encouragement, to improve industrial safety. It is therefore done on the basis of conciliation and negotiation between the parties involved.

The honourable member raised a point about the number of licence fees. The Government has been looking at the introduction of a single billing system within the department. I think I am right in saying that there are about 35 or 40 fee forms that need to be filled out by people who deal with the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. I find that incredible. I believe there are about 240 different public forms that may need to be filled in by outside parties. We are attempting to introduce a single billing system so that, if any employer has to send in cheques and fee forms to the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, he will send only one once a year and that will cover all the different areas.

If he needs to pay a fee for having inflammable liquids on the premises, and if he has a boiler or lifts that need inspection, or industrial premises on which registration fees are payable, or industrial safety fees, and so on, he will pay one fee to the department and will have a slip of paper with all the different fee requirements on it. He will fill out what he requires, a bit like a breakfast menu in a hotel. He will add it up and will pay a lump sum to the department, instead of what has been the case of up to 20 different cheques.

This scheme has already commenced. I expect it to be completed within about 18 months. We are changing a number of the regulations because they need to be changed before we implement the scheme. Before long, and certainly before the end of this year, I expect a minor amendment to be passed to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act to allow this scheme to be brought in. With so many Acts involved (there is a list in the front of the yellow

book), it is not an easy task. I am delighted to say that it has already been started and the scheme is in train.

Mr WHITTEN: I am concerned at the reduced amount allocated this year compared to last year, especially in real terms. If we look at the amount needed to keep the situation as it is and then take into consideration inflation of approximately 10 per cent, my estimate shows that there has been, in effect, a \$153 443 reduction on that line. It is easy to understand why this is so—it is due to the reduced inspectorial staff. I take the Minister's point that there was an error in addition in the 1980-81 figure; it should be 42.9. There is no error of addition in this year's figure and thus there is still a 6 per cent reduction.

If we look at the reductions, we find that they relate to matters which affect the workers on the job. Safety promotion in the work force has been reduced by 33 per cent, occupational health has been reduced by 50 per cent, safety on construction and demolition sites has been reduced by 1 per cent, and safety within industrial premises has been reduced by 2 per cent. It concerns me greatly to read on page 13, under the heading 'Occupational health—hearing conservation—noise control', the following:

Administration of grant to University of Adelaide for noise abatement research.

My industrial life was take up with boilers and rivetting and I have lost a lot of hearing. It annoys me to see a reduction from \$70 000 to \$40 000 for noise abatement purposes. Can the Minister say why there has been a reduction in occupational health and other inspectorial positions?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I take issue with the honourable member's figures because he put in a calculation for inflation. Perhaps he does not appreciate that the allocation for 1981-82 is the wage commitment as at 1 July 1981. If there are wage increases that he allowed for in his calculation, they are not allowed for in the calculation here. If he remembers, elsewhere in the Budget there has been a fixed allocation for wage increases during the year. It is not fair to add another 10 per cent or 15 per cent as he did and say that the overall line had been reduced.

Mr WHITTEN: I only added 10 per cent, not 15 per cent.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is not fair to add another 10 per cent and accuse the Government of an even greater reduction of 10 per cent. I raised a point earlier when he was out but I am happy to mention it again, that when we looked at the figures there were about 37 within the division. This is only part of the overall manpower within the Industrial Safety Division of the department. The total numbers within that division are 98. Although there has been a reduction from 42.9 per cent to 36.9 per cent, some of that you will find picked up in other areas and you need to look at the total numbers rather than sectional numbers. The other point that the honourable member raised of the grant to the Adelaide University—

Mr WHITTEN: That was under the 'Miscellaneous' line.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is appropriate that I cover it now. This has been reduced from \$70 000 down to \$45 000, not to \$40 000 as the honourable member mentioned. The reason for this is that that programme has now been running for a number of years. Some benefits of the programme have been adopted by individual companies, in particular, methods by which saw noise can be reduced in carpentry shops. The Woods and Forests Department is an employer that has adopted the techniques involved.

Mr WHITTEN: They have done a good job, too.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I agree. I have been to the university and inspected the research they have done. I compliment them on what they have achieved. I stress the point that they have been operating for a number of years

and have achieved results and have convinced employers that those results are good enough to adopt on a commercial basis. They are now in a position to turn around and ask employers using the benefits of their research, to start making a financial contribution to them. I sent a letter to the Adelaide University telling it that this was our allocation for this year. I believe that employers have an obligation to start making up the difference between our \$45 000 and the \$70 000 we gave last year. To assist them in that way I have written to six major employer bodies (I think there are six within the State) who are likely to adopt the research and have asked those bodies to contribute to this fund to make up the differential.

Mr WHITTEN: Did the Minister say that there was an increase in inspectors on boiler work? Has it been increased?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, there has been an increase of one inspector on boiler work. It has gone from five to six this year.

Mr WHITTEN: Is this increase due to the work going on at Port Augusta as far as the new powerhouse is concerned, or is it to be used throughout the metropolitan area?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The increase in work has been in the metropolitan area so far. We are anticipating a further increase through the Northern Power Station, through the Stony Point development and possibly the Moomba gasfield development. That may require a further inspector in this area. I highlight to members present that the amount of work done in these different areas (construction, boilermaking work, factories, lifts and cranes, etc.) does fluctuate. It is not a static situation. You often have a reduction in one area and an increase in another. That is why it is important that the department has the flexibility to take people from one area and put them into other areas, depending on the work load and amount of work in that area. That is exactly what we have been doing.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In his answer to the member for Mawson the Minister said that he believed that the inspector's job was not to be terribly harsh on employers but to encourage them to do the right thing as far as industrial safety was concerned (and to a large degree I believe that is correct). Before I left office I tried to encourage delegates on the job to take a broader and stronger interest in protecting their own safety because an inspector or inspectors cannot always be on the job at the time an accident occurs, and it may take some time to get there when an accident is reported. It seems to me that in this particular area (and it has always seemed to me) we need to encourage worker safety committees on the job. It has been pointed out to me by not only one organisation, but most of them in the building industry at that particular stage, that there was a risk. You will recall that there was a downturn in the building industry then and that employers were victimising members of safety committees who took on this role. In the light of what the Minister said and what he believes and because there have been cut-backs in this area, would the Minister consider strengthening the legislation to give added protection to safety committee employees on the job?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I support the Deputy Leader in his comments. It is important that all people within the work place become safety conscious. If you are going to improve safety you must involve everyone from the Managing Director or the Chairman of the Board, right down through senior management to the people on the shop floor. Unless everyone has the same commitment, safety will not improve and industrial accidents will continue to plague our industrial society to the extent that they are. I am a firm believer in setting up safety committees within individual companies. Workers themselves must be represented on those committees to be effective. Where this has

occurred there have been beneficial results. The Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board has been encouraging safety committees to be established. We have run into one or two problems, not the least of which is the lack of interest or lack of enthusiasm from some of the shop stewards and employees themselves. I am not criticising them. It is an attitude developed through ignorance. When the honourable member was Minister he probably ran into the same sort of problems. We need to convince employees that there are merits in encouraging improved safety. I have no evidence that anyone who becomes involved in these safety committees is in any way victimised. Until I receive substantial evidence I see no need to amend the Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister has just contradicted himself. He supported what I said, and I thank him for that, but he went on to say that there was a lack of interest in those areas and then said that he had no evidence of people being victimised. I put to the Minister squarely and honestly that I believe that the lack of interest comes about because people are frightened of being victimised. I asked the Minister to strengthen the Act to give added protection to those people. I criticise these people to their face for not taking an active part in the role that they ought to be playing on the job site, but it is no good criticising them if employers take the view that they can get away with this if there are no safety committees and no inspectors coming around to the job. I believe that the Minister ought to be strengthening the Act, irrespective of who is in Government, to give protection to those personnel who have been elected to safety committees.

There was evidence with me that it was occurring, and I assured members (especially of the building industry, I must admit) that I was going to take some action to strengthen that Act. If the Minister has no evidence, no direct evidence of people or unionists coming along and saying that this job representative or job delegate has been victimised, I think the apathy and the non-interest in these areas is really proof that that is occurring. If we cannot get people to take on a job for the benefit of themselves and their work mates then there is something wrong.

Would the Minister have his officers examine that area to see whether or not the allegations I am making are correct? If he ascertains from such an investigation that the allegations I am making are correct, would he then give consideration to strengthening the Act, so that protection can be offered to these people and encourage them to take on the roles that they ought to be taking? In that way, I believe, the inspectorate could be reduced effectively. If we have self inspectors taking the role of inspectors on the job, with absolute protection, I believe the safety of work would increase and improve.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am prepared to ask the department to prepare a report on that matter for me. I certainly will ask my officers if there is any evidence that they know of. I know of no evidence. I think the main reason is one of apathy; I do not think it is a fear of victimisation. We know that apathy hits our community in many other areas as well. I point out to the honourable member that there is already protection against unfair dismissal under section 15 (1) (e) of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act which has provision for reinstatement where a person has been unfairly, unjustly or unreasonably dismissed. Certainly, if a person has been dismissed because he happens to sit on an industrial safety committee, I am sure that the Industrial Commission would find in favour of the worker who had been unfairly dismissed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think the Minister is being quite naive. I am not suggesting that, because somebody sits on a committee, he gets the sack. The Minister knows that sitting on a committee and taking no interest in that

committee will produce no effect from the employer at all; what produces effects is some activity on the job. That may incur the wrath of the employer, and that is the instance I am referring to. I know as much about section 15 (1) (e) as the Minister does, but it is difficult for someone working in the building industry (and I refer mostly in these circumstances to the building industry) to find himself dismissed on any account and then go along to the court. It takes 28 days to get the hearing on, and in the meantime he is out of work, and he probably finds some other job. Half of the people who are victimised in that way in industry do not bother about taking cases before the Arbitration Court. I understand that runs at about 50 per cent. I do not think that is the answer. I am looking for an answer in protection on the job. The Minister has given the assurance that he will get a report on the matter, and we are looking for some action in this particular area.

Will the Minister get the Industrial Safety Division in this financial year to make administrative changes to allow for more effective accident reporting and monitoring procedures? I called last year for a national monitoring service to be established in Australia. I am not convinced that we sufficiently understand how accidents occur, when they occur, and how they can be prevented from occurring. The only person last year who bothered to write back to me, or to recognise the call I made in this area, was Mr George Polites, from the Employers Federation. I wrote to several people around Australia, and George Polites, from the Employers Federation of Australia, wrote back a very sympathetic letter. He said that he believed in what I was saying and that he would support it at the Federal level. I am asking the Minister to commence at the State level and see whether or not it is possible to get interest from other State Ministers at his conferences in the next year, to see whether some interest can be generated to adopt this procedure nationally. I believe it is most important for the States to have the right to dig into the matter and find an immediate response to what is occurring. An accident recording bank could be set up and with all these new facilities available today I believe it would not take many years to establish such a monitoring bank, which would be worth while for everyone and every State in Australia.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am delighted to say that the Government has already taken an initiative in this area. At the March meeting of Ministers in Hobart the South Australian Government, through me, put forward a paper requesting that there be uniform reporting procedures for industrial accidents through Australia. A working party has been established involving each State Government and the work is already under way.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am delighted to hear that. If the Minister kept me better informed I would not have to ask these questions. He probably got the idea from me anyway.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I must say that we normally assume we have a reasonably informed Opposition. I see that we are quite wrong.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister say whether the latest statistics available to the division show that there are now more days lost through industrial accidents than through industrial disputes? The figures that I have been able to obtain indicate that that is so. The Minister has staff at his disposal to assess this and investigate those figures. If my figures are correct (and I consider they are), how does the Minister equate the present policy of the Government in cutting back in safety/health areas when there is clear evidence that my statements are correct?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Those official figures are available for the days lost through industrial disputes from the Bureau of Census and Statistics. I think they are released

quarterly, and I am sure the honourable member has just as much access to the Federal department bureau as I do. Figures on industrial accidents are reported in some detail in the department's annual report, as the honourable member has quoted from that already today, I assume he has a copy of that available. I think he has access to those figures and can make his own comparisons. As to any change in Budget or manpower allocation, I think we have adequately covered that this afternoon.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the Minister agree that there are more days lost through industrial accidents than through industrial disputes? That is the question I asked.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not have the exact figures before me.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I can assure the Minister that my allegations are correct. That is why I said when the debate started that I was incriminating the Government for its cut-backs in this area. I want to know whether the number of visits to factories and work places by Industrial Safety Inspectors was reduced last financial year compared to the year before, and whether the Minister expects any further reduction in inspections this year because of the cut-backs.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am not sure what the figures are or whether they are available. Perhaps I can ask my department to try to get some figures out but I think it would be extremely difficult to identify every single factory visited by industrial inspectors. I am sure the information is available in the department, but whether there is the manpower to get the figures out is another matter. If they are readily available, I will give them to the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would have thought that that was a reasonable request. There must be some compilation and judgment, surely, of the work that the inspectors are doing. It seems to me that the Chief Inspector would have that information readily available. It may require some collating, but someone must do some checking. Otherwise we could have inspectors running around and not doing their job. I am not suggesting that they do not do their job: when I was Minister, I found that they were doing their job. Is there likely to be a cut-back this year in the safety areas because of the financial cut-back? If the figures are not available to the Minister, will he give me an undertaking that he will get them for me so that I can be the judge of whether the cut-backs have the effect that I think they will have next year? That is the reason for the question.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have indicated that, if they are available and can be readily obtained, I will certainly get them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On page 12 of book 4, in the second column, under 'Safety at work', the following is stated:

Issues/Trends—The number of accidents is showing a reducing trend; 1978-79, 64 300 compared with 66 500 for 1977-78 compared with the figure for 1973-74 of 87 000. The cost of compensation for injured workers is increasing due to escalation of wages and medical expenses, and greater attention is necessary for rehabilitation of injured workers and locating injured workers in alternative positions.

I ask the Minister whether he could provide me with the actual investigatory figures and research done in that area. I am not disputing that the figures are correct. That may well be the case, but I would like to know how they are compiled. I know that the Minister will not have them at this moment but I would like to know the source from which he makes this judgment and whether the whole exercise can be made available later.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think that most of those figures are available in the annual report presented to Parliament. If there is information over and above that that could be

supplied, I will certainly look at it. I think the Leader will find that most of the information is available in the annual report, or from the Bureau of Statistics, which makes available, I think, annual figures on workers compensation. There is also put out a compendium on comparative costs of workers compensation taken out for the whole of Australia. I am sure that, from those three sources, the Deputy Leader will find out the information that he wants.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Director informed the Committee earlier that the number of inspectors who would be available in the safety, health and welfare area would be one fewer than last year, being reduced from 52 to 51. We have had an indication from the Minister that one of the two vacancies at Whyalla is not being filled at this stage. Are there any other areas that I am not aware of where inspectors have been active and have been located in the past where positions will not be filled because of the cut at this stage? We have had an admission about one not being filled at this stage. Will any others not be filled?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No. There was a District Inspector's position at Port Pirie. The department had difficulty in finding a suitably qualified person to fill the position and put an acting person into the position while it was training someone who would be suitable to take up that position. I know of no other position that is being held vacant, and the one at Whyalla has been held vacant for one specific reason, as I have mentioned.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: How many recommendations for prosecution by health and safety inspectors were subsequently not proceeded with last year?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am not sure that we can answer that. I think it would be more appropriate to try to give the information available on how many prosecutions proceeded. I have some figures that I can make available to the Deputy Leader. There were 37 prosecutions for breaches of Acts and regulations, prosecution complaints carried forward from 1979. There were 127 prosecution complaints instituted in 1980 and the number of convictions recorded was 114, which shows that there is a fairly high success rate. There was one prosecution complaint dismissed and there were 34 prosecution complaints withdrawn. As at the end of December 1980, there were 15 prosecution complaints pending.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister. Reports have come to me (and I will come clean about this) that the inspectors have made recommendation after recommendation in the past year for prosecutions and, for some reason unknown to them, the prosecution does not go forward. I am not saying that the Minister would have this information at his disposal but there must be some way of knowing, if an inspector notified on his report sheet that he recommended prosecution and that was not proceeded with. Surely that can be established. Will the Minister establish whether there were cases of that nature and why those prosecutions did not go forward?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That is an unfair allegation to make. I hope that the Deputy Leader would be man enough, where he hears it repeated, to tell the people that it is an unfair allegation. It is an allegation that to a certain extent was stated to me yesterday by a group of trade union people who came to see me. I think I satisfied them by pointing out that their allegation had no basis. It is easy to make allegations when the person making them knows that it is impossible to prove them.

The Government has adopted exactly the same policy as the previous Government adopted in terms of continuing with prosecutions and prosecuting people for breaches of industrial awards, industrial safety, or in any other area. There has been a number of cases where I have appointed independent arbitrators, as I have power to do under the

Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, where there is disagreement between the inspector and the employer involved and where it is felt that the best way is to bring in an independent arbitrator to arbitrate on what procedure should apply at that place. I think that procedure has been adopted by several Governments in this State.

I have used that provision, and I think it is a good provision, because it shows that it is not just the Government but also an independent person who is upholding that point of view if the decision happens to come our way. I can certainly assure the honourable member that there is no attempt by this Government to stop prosecutions from proceeding where there should be a prosecution. I know that there are number of occasions where a prosecution might initially appear feasible but, when Crown Law looks at the available evidence, there is insufficient evidence to back up the prosecution of that person, knowing that it will be defeated in court.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: First, I want to say to the Minister that he knows well that, whatever faults I have, I am at least man enough to carry out what I believe. If I am convinced of something I will certainly tell that person who raises it with me what my belief is in that matter. I did not make the allegation, and I want to make that clear to the Minister. I said that it had been reported to me that such circumstances were occurring, and I was merely seeking information for the Committee. To say that it is an unfair allegation on my behalf is incorrect, because I was not making an allegation—I was making it on behalf of somebody else who had reported it to me. As it has been reported to me, I may as well put this on the record as well, so that we can get the whole thing off our chests. Complaints were made about B.H.P. and the allegation here was that inspectors were told not to proceed any further with complaints against B.H.P. Perhaps the Minister might refute that allegation as well, if there is a refutation available.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I certainly refute that. No such circumstances have been drawn to my attention at all. Perhaps the honourable member might like to tell us who is making these allegations so that we can correct them and indicate the inappropriate information they are spreading about the Government. Is the honourable member willing to identify the people involved?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am sorry, but like a journalist I never reveal my sources, and in that way one does not get into trouble. I have one final question in regard to this safety matter. Is the Government restricting mileage allowed and car usage by industrial safety inspectors? I have been given to understand that inspectors and award investigation officers are now forced to share cars, and this is increasing delays in investigations. Can the Minister confirm or deny that allegation?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Can I pick up the point I made a moment ago about these allegations and their source? I know that it is a favourite ploy of some members of Parliament to stand up and make wild accusations and then when asked their source, without giving any evidence to back up the allegation, they claim that they have to protect their source. It is an easy ploy to use, and it is a way to throw mud around when there is no substance behind it whatever. If the honourable member is going to make these allegations he should at least, even if he cannot identify his people, bring up some evidence to substantiate the claim. It is appropriate in regard to the use of cars that I direct the question to Mr Johnson. The department has been looking at the number of vehicles available and how those vehicles can be better utilised. A review of vehicles stationary in the department's car lots suggests that there has been an under-utilisation of the motor vehicles available.

Mr Johnson has been looking at that and working out how to get better utilisation from the vehicles.

Mr Johnson: That is the position. Departmentally we had a good close look at the usage of our cars and found that in some of the district offices, for example, where we might have 10 officers we had 10 cars. We found that that was not economic because the mere fact that people are on annual leave means that there is always some spare capacity. We also found that in some circumstances we had industrial inspectors in the office during the day to take care of people coming in off the streets, so to speak. We found that in many of our district offices there is or has been in the past two or three years an over-capacity in the use of motor vehicles and, departmentally, we have moved to make better use of them. Yes, as the Deputy Leader pointed out, there are circumstances where two inspectors or officers from the one department stationed in the same office would share the same car. We do that deliberately because they are going in the same general direction and one officer could drop the other one off at his destination. We find that that is more economic and it saves duplication.

In some circumstances, particularly in district offices, we found that a factory inspector might arrange his itinerary so that he goes to a factory on one day and another inspector from the same office would go to the same factory on the next day. That is not conducive to good public relations. For a variety of reasons we moved ourselves to assist in helping the inspectors to do their job better and in a more economic way.

Mr WHITTEN: I would like to ask a final question about the Industrial Safety Division in regard to inspectors. I refer to volume 1, page 115, in regard to strategies. Paragraph 6 provides:

The problem created by the need to continue the inspectorial and regulatory functions of the department is undergoing investigation, and new systems requiring less routine inspections is being investigated.

Is it the Minister's intention to have inspectors call at factories only when requested by unions? What does he intend to do? Will the Minister expand on that matter?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The classic area that has been looked at is lift maintenance. I will go into some detail because the Government is examining how it can better use lift inspectors at present. The Act requires that an inspector be present once a year for a routine inspection of that lift; maintenance is carried out for the annual inspection by a qualified person or lift mechanic. I understand that the lift inspector stands there and watches that person do the work. He has to be present for the whole time while that person services the lift on an annual basis. That appears to us to be inefficient, time-wasting and may not reveal the real dangers that exist if there is inadequate servicing.

In other words, the inspector is going there only on a predictable basis, when people know that the inspector will arrive, and when the mechanic knows that there will be someone looking over his shoulder. It would be more effective if there were random unsolicited inspections of lifts. I believe that if people are suitably qualified they can carry out the annual maintenance without an inspector standing there, and that the inspectors should be released to carry out inspections on this random basis that I have referred to. It is a procedure that has been carried out satisfactorily in New South Wales, and I believe that the same procedure could apply here.

If that is the case, there will not be the same routine inspection which the honourable member referred to and which is referred to in this document, because it will become a random inspection. I highlight the fact that Australia probably has the best lift safety record and the highest safety standards or engineering standards for lifts of any

country in the world. It has been effective, because it means that no other country bothered to export lifts to Australia because it would have had to alter its entire lift manufacturing procedure to meet our much more rigid standards. It has meant that we have developed our own lift industry in this country. It also means that we have an excellent safety record to go along with it.

Mr WHITTEN: First, I do appreciate the Minister's answer, because I believe that that is what should happen. It should not be just a matter of an inspection, say, every 31 March or the like. I believe that random checks are the way to do it. However, I am concerned that some time ago the idea was floated that perhaps inspections may not be done by departmental inspectors but by crane servicing people or people employed in private enterprise. Does the Government intend to go away from department inspectors?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, there is no intention to abolish inspectors in that area. I believe amendments to the lifts and cranes and the boilers and pressure vessels legislation will be required. I expect them to be introduced into Parliament early next year, and I am delighted to hear that the honourable member will support those amendments. I expect they will be along the lines that I have mentioned. The present procedure is not achieving the degree of inspection or spot checking that we should be having. There is no suggestion that we will not need inspectors within the department. I think that is the point made by the honourable member. If we adopt the New South Wales system, we will require lift maintenance personnel from the private sector in this State—and I think there are about 50—to have sufficient qualifications to be registered. They will carry out the annual maintenance inspections, but the department will still do the spot checking on lifts.

Mr HAMILTON: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the comments by the member for Mawson about the allegedly heavy-handed attitude of some D.L.I. inspectors towards small business men. I discount the honourable member's statement, because those inspectors are doing their job in accordance with the Act. The honourable members seemed to be endeavouring to protect small business men from the need to reduce noise for workers. What liaison exists between the Department of Environment and Planning, particularly the noise control section, and inspectors from the noise control unit of the Minister's department?

I am well aware of a number of cases in which residents have bitterly complained about the decibel reading stated by the noise control unit which has been in excess of the reading allowed but no action has been taken in two cases that have been referred to me.

How many workers in that factory are being subjected to unnecessary noise control problems while working on machinery? The noise is even excessive outside of that factory. That noise can cause damage to the eardrums of many of the workers in those particular factories. I also refer to non-union shops where workers are frightened to complain to the management or to approach the Department of Labour and Industry for fear of their jobs. It is no good for the Minister to tell me that these workers can approach the appropriate body if they are dismissed, because the Minister would be aware that workers can be forced to resign because of pressure put on them in the work place. What liaison is occurring between the Noise Control Unit and the department's inspectors? Are regular checks made by those two bodies?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer the honourable member to the Noise Control Act, which contains specific sections dealing with noise outside factories, noise inside factories, and noise from specific pieces of machinery. I assure the honourable member that there is extremely close liaison between inspectors from my department and officers of the

Department of Environment and Planning who deal with noise. However, the honourable member must appreciate that the responsibility for administering different sections of the Act fall under different departments. My department is responsible for administering those sections dealing with noise within factories as it affects employees, whereas the Department of Environment and Planning deals with noise coming from the factory as it affects the outside community.

My inspectors have no grounds to prosecute employers for noise coming outside of a factory as it affects people in the community who are not employees. The Minister has power to grant an exemption under the Act. If the noise level is too high (and it should be no more than 90 decibels on an eight-hour average basis), the Minister is required to grant an exemption to the employer and require him to make hearing protection available for all employees within the designated area. If any employee believes that the noise within his place of employment is above that level, he should ring the Department of Industrial Affairs (he need not leave his name and address), and I will send out an inspector.

Mr HAMILTON: I understand that the Minister does not watch television, but he may be interested to know that a *Nationwide* segment dealt with the problem of industrial deafness this week. The reporter said that it would cost about \$300 000 000 a year to implement noise reduction facilities in factories. The employers are aware of this fact. The report pointed out that he believed that many industrialists are prepared to take a chance because of the delays in worker compensation cases. The cost of paying compensation and the cost of implementing noise control remedies is around about the same. Therefore, many manufacturers are taking a chance and are not taking steps to reduce noise levels. The Minister should ask his officers to look at that programme.

What research is being conducted in relation to stress factors in the work force? I feel sure that the Minister would also agree that there is a problem with toxic materials, not only in closed areas but also outside, particularly in relation to the spraying of 245T and 24D. They are just two examples, but there are many other toxic substances which cause considerable effects upon workers. What research is being carried out in this area, and how intense is that research?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am not sure whether it was the television programme *Nationwide*—

Mr HAMILTON: There were two.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I saw one programme which accused the Government of deliberately trying to reduce—

Mr HAMILTON: I have the transcript here.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Perhaps the honourable member will make a copy of the transcript available. I am not sure whether it was the programme which accused the Government of trying to reduce its work force by paying people off with lump sum workers compensation payments. I believe that piece of journalism on *Nationwide* was disgusting. I think it deliberately cut certain sections out of the interview with me which, if it had been revealed on television, would have shown how dishonest the claims were. There was this so-called Labor lawyer. They did not indicate that the man making the accusations is an A.L.P. candidate for Hartley and wants to discredit the Government as much as possible, whether or not it was an honest discreditation of the Government or whether there was any basis to his accusations, and I assure honourable members there is not. He made the accusations, one of which was that the Government was attempting to reduce its work force by using the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act. I pointed out that using lump-sum payments on a theoretical basis

would cost the Government somewhere between \$18 000 and \$25 000. If the Government was so concerned to reduce its work force why did it not use the early voluntary retirement provisions which cost substantially less than that. It could cost no more than \$10 000 to reduce our work force by one person. The lump-sum payments under the early voluntary retirement provisions is no more than one year's salary, and in many cases was substantially less than that.

The Government has not applied that right across the work force. If we had used the early voluntary retirement scheme we could have reduced the numbers in other areas. Yet, this accusation was made that we were trying to reduce numbers at what in real terms would be more than twice the cost, by using workers compensation. The reporter also did not indicate that I made available the contents of the letter which I had written to Government departments specifying exactly what I wanted them to do. I wrote to other Ministers and asked them to ensure that light duties be made available and that any workers compensation case would be dealt with in a sensitive humane manner. The one case that he put forward was that of a worker under the Health Commission.

The Health Commission does not come under the Government Insurance Office—it comes under S.G.I.C. Therefore, the one shred of evidence that he put up to substantiate his claim did not come under our jurisdiction.

That is how weak the argument was that was put forward by Mr Groom, the Labor lawyer and candidate for the next election. As the matter of a television programme has been raised, I express my disgust at what I call a piece of unfair and biased reporting by that journalist and the story he tried to project. I would appreciate a copy of the transcript of the television coverage dealing with noise, as I did not see it. I would be only too happy to read through it and look at the facts raised by the honourable member.

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister answer the question I raised in regard to stress factors and toxic substances in industry? What research has been carried out? How intense is that research and what effect will it have on employees in South Australia?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This is picked up under the National Health and Medical Research Council. The Deputy Leader would know that for some time we have been trying to achieve uniformity throughout Australia in this area, using that council. There is now excellent liaison between each of the State industrial departments and that council. When something is adopted or recommended on a national basis each of the States looks at adopting that so there is uniformity. We have a scientific officer here who is actively involved in this area and liaises with the council on a range of matters. The honourable member would also realise from the news media (as he apparently watches television more than I do)—

Mr HAMILTON: I only watch it on weekends when Parliament is not sitting.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The honourable member would appreciate that last weekend we released details that the new regulations for the Dangerous Substances Act have now been gazetted and became effective from 1 October. They cover the whole area of toxic substances, relating to how they can be transported, stored and used within industrial premises.

Mr HAMILTON: The Minister would be well aware that I have regularly raised one matter since I have been in Parliament. On page 12, the programme book states: Greater attention is necessary for rehabilitation of injured workers and locating injured workers in alternative positions.

As the Minister would be well aware, in October 1979 I attended the opening of a workshop in my electorate at which a request was made for a heated therapeutic swim-

ming pool for the rehabilitation by hydrotherapy of workers. Can the Minister advise me what negotiations have taken place between his department and the Minister of Health with respect to the provision of this pool in the western suburbs?

I have raised this matter with the Minister a number of times and I have received very little satisfaction. If the Government is sincere about the rehabilitation of workers, particularly in relation to the use of hydrotherapy, I believe it is essential for the installation of such a hydrotherapy pool in an industrialised area such as the western suburbs. I ask the Minister to pursue the matter with the Minister of Health so that hopefully we can have \$300 000 which is needed to erect the pool quickly.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have been down to the Western Districts Rehabilitation Clinic, and I compliment it on the excellent job it does. It is a difficult task to rehabilitate people who have been injured, particularly if they have been out of work and suffering from the injury for a long period. They are faced with more than just a physical problem—they are also confronted with a psychological problem in regard to returning to work. The need for the pool and how it fits into priorities in comparison with other needs for funds is up to the Minister of Health. It is inappropriate that I comment.

Mr HAMILTON: Has the Minister raised the matter with the Minister of Health, particularly with the statement—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that once the honourable member has asked the question he allow the Minister to answer. If the Minister has missed the point, the honourable member will have an opportunity to explain further.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have discussed the function of the centre with the Minister. I have talked about what I saw as its role. It was an informal conversation. It is inappropriate that I take the matter any further. The honourable member will have the chance to take it up with the appropriate Minister.

Mr PLUNKETT: I have two questions on industrial safety. Has the Minister instructed any inspectors to keep a check on the private contractors who handle a lot of Government work, such as Highways Department and E. & W.S. Department work? The Government has made clear that it is its intention to do away with a lot of Government daily-paid workers. It was to give the work to private enterprise in a lot of cases, whether it be for Government or local government.

I speak here of the area in which the workperson has to wear a safety jacket and safety boots and also have flagmen on roads where the road is being repaired and the worker is in danger of being knocked down by cars or trucks that do not slow down. Since the Liberal Government came to office, I have seen private contractors carrying out this work, and the safety devices are not nearly as good as those used by Government daily-paid workers. Many of these workers for private contractors do not wear safety jackets, and you seldom see flagmen on the roads where private contractors are doing the work. Can the Minister say what control he has over these private contractors?

The Labor Government found some workers refused to wear red and white plastic jackets so that a person in a truck or car could see them. They were threatened with the sack by the foreman, and the Labor Government found that they did not have the power to do that, and the legislation was changed to give that power. That power is there now. I ask the Minister whether his inspectors have any power to enforce people working for private contractors to wear safety jackets or the private contractors themselves

to supply safety jackets and clothing as is required in the case of Government daily-paid employees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Safety on the roads with a road gang does not come under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act; it comes under the Road Safety Act and therefore under the Minister of Transport. It has never been the responsibility of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. We have no power in that area. My answer to the honourable member would be 'No'. If he is referring to other works say construction work, then 'Yes', they are subject to the normal safety inspections that apply to any Government job or any other outside job where a private contractor was involved.

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister say whether the department has any control over toxic substances, such as tallow, grease or anything of that nature that may be accidentally spilt on the highways?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The transportation of toxic substances comes under the Minister of Transport. It is covered in the Dangerous Substances Act. The section of the Act dealing with transportation is the responsibility of the Minister of Transport.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am not speaking about the transportation of toxic substances; I am speaking about the removal of toxic substances from road surfaces when there has been an accident.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That also comes under the Minister of Transport and under that relevant section of the Act. New regulations for this Act were gazetted on 1 October.

Mr HAMILTON: I refer briefly to the *Nationwide* segment on 6 October, the transcript of which states:

The union guy said that even in Brown's own department, that is the Public Building Department, there is no provision for light duties.

Can the Minister answer this allegation? The response from the union official on that programme is as follows:

Either Brown knows that or he is a bloody fool or the managers of the various departments are pulling the wool over his eyes. If the Government's intention is to reduce public sector employment, and I have no doubt that it is, obviously it is cheaper for them to pay out under the Act than to rehabilitate people.

Can the Minister answer those allegations?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It was Mr Robert Morley who made that statement. As we all know, Mr Morley is prone to make slightly exaggerated comments. A case was drawn to my attention by a medical practitioner involved who had been dealing with an employee of the Public Buildings Department where light duties had not been made available. When this was drawn to my attention, I issued a specific instruction to the Public Buildings Department to make sure that light duties were available. If light duties were not available in that department (and I believe they could have been), they were to make sure they were available elsewhere. I understand that the department has changed its practice as a result of that. I think that occurred early this year.

I take issue with the point that Mr Morley raised that we all know it is cheaper to get rid of people under workers compensation. His accusation was something very similar to that. I point out that, if the Government wished to reduce its work force, it would use the voluntary early retirement scheme which is a substantially cheaper means of reducing its work force than by using workers compensation. The accusation of Mr Morley is a bland and general accusation without any evidence adduced to substantiate it. I was aware of one case where light duties were not made available. That problem has been rectified by a Ministerial instruction.

Mr HAMILTON: On the same programme, Mr Bob Morley points to the number of members claiming that the Government is contesting in the Industrial Court, and points out that in the past 12 months about 209 cases have been contested by the Government in the courts.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The policy of the Government has not altered in this regard. If our legal advisers and public servants involved in the Government Insurance Office advise us to challenge any application for workers compensation, then we do it. There has been no change in Government policy in that area. Owing to the high incidence of industrial accidents in certain areas of Government, I, as a Minister, have specifically asked departments concerned to look at their industrial safety record and why workers compensation claims have been so high. We take out annual figures on the percentage of the pay-roll for the cost of workers compensation for each Government department. The departments have to pay that as a premium to the Government Insurance Office.

We thus have an easy way of assessing whether or not departments are properly administering workers compensation in the best possible manner. There was a classic case with the Government Group Laundry, where the cost of workers compensation was astronomical, considering the number of people working in that area. My department carried out an inspection. In areas like this we try to obtain increased expertise, either from within the Government or outside the Government, to reduce the number of accidents and to look at how people are treated once they are injured at work.

I have a high regard for work done by the Industrial Accident Clinic at Mile End. This clinic has led the way, along with other medical clinics, in how to handle the problems of a person injured at work. I have encouraged the use of specialists like this by Government departments. It is better to use someone with experience in these areas, rather than throw it into the hands of a less experienced Government officer.

I also had an investigation made by the Government Insurance Office as to how different departments were handling workers compensation, and in certain big Government departments we have now adopted a practice of risk management. Mr Harrison, from the department, has been involved in advising those big departments, and the feedback we have had is that they have been delighted with what they can achieve and how positive that programme of risk management can be.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: At this stage, Sir, in the interests of expediting the work of the Committee, I ask whether it would be possible to bring on the Miscellaneous line ahead of the Department of Trade and Industry? I need officers from both departments to be available for that line. The officers who are here could stay and deal with the line, together with the officers from Trade and Industry, and then the officers from Industrial Affairs and Employment could be released.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I cannot accommodate the Minister although I would like to, because the Leader will be here for Trade and Industry, but he has other commitments after 6 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: At the first meeting of the Committees there was a substantive motion that the orders per day be adopted as set out. The relevant provision states:

Forthwith at its first meeting an Estimates Committee shall agree to a daily time table for examining the items of proposed expenditure. Such time table shall be notified to the Speaker and may not be varied without his concurrence.

Therefore, the Speaker is the one to whom the Committee is responsible. It has been the request of the Speaker that the time table as set out be adhered to. My ruling is that,

according to the Sessional Orders, and according to what has been adopted, we are obliged to adhere to the programme.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Turning to the Industrial Relations Division, will the Minister say how far advanced is Registrar Cawthorne's review on industrial relations? I know that a paper has been circulated around Adelaide. Can the Minister say when the final draft of that report will be available? Has he any idea at this stage what the actual cost of the review might be?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr Cawthorne indicated to me several weeks ago that he expected his final report to be with me some time early in 1982. As to how long it takes them to draft the legislation from that would depend on the nature of the report, but I think the honourable member can see that, if it is available in February-March 1982, it would not be possible to introduce legislation till the Budget session of 1982. Now whether that process can be speeded up at all, I am not sure. I have asked that that be done if possible, but it would appear that that is about the earliest he can report to me. The cost is approximately \$80 000 to \$90 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Am I to take it then that the final report by Mr Cawthorne to the Minister will be the basis of legislation? Will there be further discussion with the trade unions and employer organisations, the interested parties, after he receives that final report, or is that the finish of the discussions then?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is difficult to say at this stage, because I do not know what might be in the final report. As the honourable member would realise, Cabinet has the final say on any legislation introduced into Parliament. So, it would be up to Cabinet as to whether or not that report was accepted in its entirety, whether there should be any adjustment to it, and if there should be any further consultation with any outside party.

Before we proceed with further questions, I explain that I have the answer to the question raised by the member for Peake concerning the cleaning of electoral offices and I would like to have it inserted in *Hansard* so that it will be on the record.

The member for Peake asked three questions. The first was: how many individual and group contracts have been let for the cleaning of electoral offices? The answer is that there are six group contracts for electoral offices only and six group contracts for electoral offices and Government buildings. There are 10 individual contracts, making a total of 22 contracts overall.

The second question was: is the member for Peake's electoral office cleaned by individual or group contract? The answer is that the member for Peake's electoral office is cleaned by group contract. Included in this group are the member for Spence (Mr Abbott), the member for Ross Smith (Mr Bannon), and the member for Florey (Mr O'Neill).

The third question was: is the member for Peake's electoral office cleaned by a contractor from Canberra? The answer is that the contract for the member for Peake's electoral office was awarded to Mr Jankovic, of Prospect Road, Adelaide. No interstate cleaning contractors have tendered for electoral offices, to the best of our knowledge.

While Mr Jankovic is of European descent, he is believed to have previously lived in Canberra but now is a resident of Prospect. I think it appropriate, as I indicated in my answer, to say that he is, to all intents and purposes, a South Australian and, whether he has lived in Yugoslavia or in Canberra, we certainly welcome him to this State.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it would be better if the full Committee was present when I said this, but I will say it for clarification. Regarding the time table as far as the

votes are concerned, I would like it understood that the Committee makes this decision. The Deputy Leader has suggested a time, and I would hope the other members would concur. However, if someone wanted the call at 4.45 p.m., I would have no option but to call that member. I want it understood that any suggestion or any time for a vote to conclude must be the decision of the Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would like the Minister to comment on industrial relations policies and attitudes of his Government, because there may be confusion or fact: I am not sure. I quote from a letter I have received today, as follows:

In the recent dispute at Strathmont, the Minister of Health, Mrs Jennifer Adamson, slammed the staff through the media even though the membership gave the appropriate 14 days notice of the intention of taking industrial action. The bans that were brought into effect by the association did not have a major effect on the residents' care and in actual fact were the least form of action that the staff could take to emphasise their concern for the shortage of staff at the centre. The association would like an undertaking given that in future the Minister will not make press statements to the media unless she/he is prepared to intervene into the dispute within the 14 days notice having been served, not make press statements whilst the Industrial Commission are seeking conciliation on the dispute.

If this Government [the Liberal Government] is at all concerned about maintaining industrial harmony within the State Government departments whilst a dispute is in progress then not only should they take a leaf from the previous Government and seek to have proper industrial dialogue with the appropriate union prior or during the prescribed period as given under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act but refrain from making stupid press statements which only inflame the membership and in most cases escalate the dispute.

I think it reasonable that I ask the Minister what is the normal procedure, particularly when 14 days notice is given for dialogue to occur. Does the Minister set up that sort of programme so that consultation can be entered into with the possibility of settling the dispute before it is inflamed, and does he attempt (that is all he can do) to restrain other Ministers from inflaming the situation by making press statements while the dialogue is in progress?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think it appropriate that I ask where this letter and the allegation come from.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The allegation comes from the Australian Government Workers Association and, as I have said, concerns the dispute at Strathmont, evidently quite recently. I think that is all that the Minister needs to know.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am aware of the particular incident referred to by the letter and by the Deputy Leader. I will deal specifically with how such a case is dealt with where an association is required under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to notify me that it intends to take industrial action under that Act because of a dispute with a State award.

Where I receive such notification, I immediately notify the appropriate department involved or employer or, if such a letter came from an employer, I would notify the union involved. I have not yet received one from an employer, because I know of no lock-outs. But I would notify the other party involved, be it employer or employee. I would also notify the Industrial Commission, and I would see whether the matter could be resolved within that 14-day period.

That is the value of the period of notification, that if a potential dispute does exist, we should see whether, using the processes of conciliation and, if necessary, arbitration, that dispute can be resolved before the actual strike or lock-out occurs. I also refer to the specific case involved at Strathmont. The Minister of Health made a public statement as to the effect of that particular strike or the bans involved on the health care offered at Strathmont.

I think it is appropriate for a Minister, whether it is before or after the 14-day period, to be able to comment

publicly on how a particular dispute is affecting a particular area, work or activity of the Government. The Minister did that in that case. Surely the honourable member is not trying to suggest that Ministers should not have freedom of speech when it comes to commenting on industrial disputes. Just because industrial disputes are of a sensitive nature, and particularly sensitive when they are criticised publicly, and just because unions often become incensed over any public criticism of their behaviour, surely the honourable member is not trying to suggest that any individual should not have the right to pass comment on the nature of the dispute or its results.

My task is to see whether those disputes can be resolved, and I try to do that. I try to do it by getting the parties together and using the processes available, particularly through the Industrial Commission, to help solve those disputes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would make the point that I am not familiar with the incident, I do not recall it, but I consider that once notice has been given about a dispute taking place that all parties, including the Government or its Ministers and the unions, should refrain from making public statements during that period. Otherwise, it is obvious that the dispute will be escalated. That is quite clear. The allegation here of course is that that did occur. All I am putting to the Minister is that it may be better in those circumstances, during the cooling-off period, for no-one to make any inflammatory statements which could escalate the dispute. The Minister has given his version of that. I want now to go on—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Before we leave the matter, it is pertinent to say that it is common practice for both employers and particularly trade unions to comment on industrial disputes while they are before the Industrial Commission. That is where that dispute and any other dispute is that has been appropriately notified to me as Minister, and I pass it on to the commission—it is then before the commission. It then becomes an official dispute. Surely the honourable member is not trying to suggest that Ministers should not be allowed to pass public comment and yet the trade union movement, which is so vocal on disputes whilst they are before the commission, has a completely free hand to say whatever it likes. The honourable member needs to be even handed in this. If the honourable member is going to request the Government to adopt such a standard of behaviour, he should make the same request to the trade union movement.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the Minister has not got time to watch television, perhaps he can at least find time to read *Hansard* tomorrow and see exactly what my last statement was. My last statement was that neither side, the employer or employee side, should make inflammatory statements during that cooling-off period. I said that clearly and consciously.

Time is running out, and I want to refer to the position of judges in the Conciliation and Arbitration Court. The Minister is aware that recently I made very strong criticisms about this matter, and I reiterate my criticisms today about the long waiting list for workers compensation cases that are currently before the court. That is really a tragedy. I do not know whether the Minister responded on that occasion, but someone in his office did, saying that my allegations were true in those circumstances.

How many judges are currently operating in the Industrial Court? Have arrangements been made to replace Judge Haese (if they have, I missed the announcement) and, if not, will those arrangements be made following his appointment to the Family Court?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There are seven judges in the Industrial Commission. Last Monday morning I attended

the swearing in of the new industrial judge, Mr Justice Lee, who replaced Mr Justice Haese. That appointment went through Executive Council last week and was announced in the *Advertiser* last Friday morning. The official swearing in before a packed Industrial Court took place at 10.30 last Monday morning. Therefore, I am delighted to say that Mr Justice Haese has already been replaced. The Deputy Leader, in the Lower House, referred to the fact that there were problems in relation to the standing over of workers compensation cases, which are put down for hearing, particularly on Mondays. He highlighted a problem which existed.

That problem was certainly exacerbated by the fact that Mr Justice Haese had already resigned to go to the Family Court and had not been replaced, and the fact that Mr Justice Stanley was on six months long service leave and, therefore, was unavailable. Mr Justice Stanley is now back in the Industrial Commission and, as I said, Mr Justice Haese has been replaced by Mr Justice Lee. I believe that the problems have now been largely overcome. In addition, Mr Hardy was officially declared an industrial magistrate of the Industrial Commission at Executive Council this morning. He had been performing duties in an acting position. I also assure the honourable member that I had a long discussion with the President of the Industrial Commission about the delays and problems that have been encountered. I understand that the present delay is about seven months, which is almost exactly the same as it was when my Party came to office two years ago. I remember that there was also some concern about delays that were occurring under the previous Government. I will carefully monitor the situation, but I believe that the delays will now be reduced with the two additional available judges. However, if problems keep occurring I will certainly look at taking further steps to reduce any overloading of the industrial judges.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: When will the Government be in a position to make a public announcement about its attitude to the report of the tripartite committee on the rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work? I think that is a reasonable question, because that report has now been available for quite some time. It has had public consumption and has received censure, praise and criticism publicly. At the moment the trade union movement is in a quandary. I have not heard any commendation or condemnation about the report or the lack of activity in relation to it from employers I have consulted. There has been a strong adverse reaction to that report within the trade union movement, and there is concern about the Government's attitude to it. When will the Government make an announcement about that report? I believe the Government should do that as quickly as possible to clear the air. If the Government has decided to accept the recommendations of that report, that is the Government's business and it must then get about preparing the legislation and having the general consultations that will be necessary. However, to hold off any longer will leave the matter in a vacuum and will cause the trade union movement much concern. Is the Minister in a position to advise the Committee about the Government's final attitude? If he is, it will be appreciated by myself and the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I was not quite sure, from what the honourable member said, what he meant. I understood that he was saying that the trade union movement was opposed to the report?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is right.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Is the Deputy Leader saying that his personal view differs from that of the trade union movement?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not under questioning and I do not need to say where I stand on the report. I am asking the Minister for a date when the final announcement will be made. I will make up my mind about it when I see the legislation when it comes into Parliament. That is the first opportunity that I will have to see it. There is no reason for the Minister to know where I do or do not stand on the matter.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I point out that the honourable member can see the report before any legislation comes into Parliament. The report is now available. The report was tabled and released publicly just less than 12 months ago. We asked for public comment and allowed three months for such comment. I think the honourable member will realise that the report is very complex. As an employer said to me the other day, it was not until he read it that he realised the enormous ramifications of the report, how complex it was, and that there was no easy answer to the problems involved.

We called for public comment, and within the three-month period hardly a single person came back with a comment but all asked for an extension of time. A number of bodies asked for further and further extensions of time. The last comments were still coming in in May or June of this year. Some of the comments are really reports on the report—they are very detailed. The Law Society for one sent Mr Lee overseas to trace the steps of the committee, to interview the same people, and to come back and report its conclusions on the evidence presented.

We have found it an enormous task to sift through all the different recommendations. I think there is general community feeling that something needs to be done to assist rehabilitation, but I have not heard too much overwhelming support for the recommendations of the report. I say that because one of the recommendations is that the report's recommendations have to be accepted in their entirety. That means that all of the recommendations in the report must be adopted and supported if we are going to support the report generally.

I think the honourable member is right in saying that generally employers and trade unions have been opposed to it. The Law Society and the insurance industry are also opposed to it. I expect that the Government will make an announcement in the next couple of months as to its intentions about the report and the various recommendations in it. I assure the honourable member that he can get a copy of the report and pass comment on it. I would welcome any comment he has as to how he thinks we should amend the legislation in the light of that report.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for affording me the opportunity to comment on the report. I have looked closely at the report and have my views on it, but they shall remain secret for the moment. There has been a long delay (I am not blaming the Minister about that and do not want him to get perturbed about it, as the previous Government is just as responsible as the present Government) in amending the legislation in so far as disability allowances are concerned within the confines of the Act. The Minister will recall that last year I tried to amend the lump-sum payments provision on a basis more fitting for current financial arrangements, particularly when one looks at what is occurring in other States. In view of the fact that the Minister is not able to give an announcement for another couple of months (which could drag on to four months before the people of South Australia are aware of the attitude of this Government on the Byrne report), will he consider amending the legislation so as to adequately provide for those people injured at work receiving lump-sum settlements at least comparable to what is occurring

in other States? That is a fair and reasonable request. I tried to provide for this last year, as the Minister knows.

Workers permanently injured in South Australia over the past four years have received allowances much below those received by their counterparts in other States. The major reason for this is the Byrne Report. The Labor Government did not want to move on those allowances until the Byrne Report was handed down. I imagine this attitude was also taken by the Liberal Government. It has been a long time, and interim amendments should be made to the Act. Will the Minister consider doing this?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is the intention of the Government to deal with all these matters at the one time. Since we are close to making an over-all announcement, it is inappropriate to deal with the matters separately. I am aware of the point raised by the honourable member. The trade union movement has been to see me on this matter and has made representations. I have taken that into account.

Mr SCHMIDT: The programmes, book 4, page 8, under the heading 'Broad Objectives', states, 'The Government enacted legislation to provide portability of long service leave entitlements for defined building industry employers and employees.' Although my question is not directly related to the transferability of long service leave entitlements, it is related to the possibility of persons with minor ailments being able to obtain employment. There was an instance this year of a gentleman, a former Vietnam veteran, who formerly had dermatitis. This ailment was providing him with no problems at this point of time but he found that he was unable to obtain employment, particularly in the area of handyman work within Government departments because of the possibility of this dermatitis recurring and making him ineligible for employment. Can the Minister look at future legislation amending the Act to provide meaningful employment for persons who do not suffer harsh disabilities but suffer from minor disabilities?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The point that the honourable member has raised is most vexing and difficult. There have been attempts to tackle this in the Byrne Committee Report on workers compensation. If a person has a certain disability, whether it be dermatitis, a hearing loss or a permanent injury, how do you make sure that the employability of that person is not reduced in the future? The Byrne Committee Report came up with certain recommendations, but I am not sure that they are the only answers or the right answers. I have indicated that there is still considerable debate and differences within the community as to how to deal with these cases. I am fully aware of the situation. When I was a private member in the House, I introduced a Bill in an attempt to overcome those types of problem associated with hearing loss. My amendments have certainly improved the employability of those people who suffer from deafness, but have not completely removed the problem. However, that has been a major step towards removing the problem. I do not think that we can come up with any easy answer to solve this problem. We are aware of it, and if the honourable member has any suggestions I would be willing to listen.

Mr SCHMIDT: Programme book 4, page 8, states under the heading 'Specific targets/objectives':

Investigation officers investigated approximately 1 500 complaints alleging breaches of awards for industrial legislation and made a total of approximately 13 000 inspections in the investigation of those complaints and in routine checking, with approximately 90 per cent of all complaints being satisfactorily resolved.

On page 9, under 'Compliance with awards determinations, etc.', for 1981-82 an amount of \$539 000 is proposed. There is an increase in the employment level from 21.4, which was the outcome last year, to 24.3 proposed this year. Does

this indicate a higher priority has been given to the investigation of these complaints in relation to awards?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I draw the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to this. He was asking how many inspections have been carried out. You can see that 13 000 investigations were made of specific complaints. I am not sure whether that was the figure he was asking for. Is that the information you wanted earlier?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is all right.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You can start to see the magnitude of the information requested by the honourable member when we are dealing with 13 000 and have to go through the records of each individual inspection and add them up. I will ask Mr Johnson to give specific details on employment, and the reason for increases in the full-time equivalents.

Mr Johnson: The honourable member is asking why three additional staff are shown this year. The reason is that, for the past several months, we had a lot of staff engaged on matters to do with the Shop Trading Hours Act. There has been a lot of activity in that area. Now that the Government has moved to resolve the problem, we expect those officers will return to what is regarded as their normal duties. The equivalent of three persons was engaged on those duties over the past several months, and this year we expect to return to the normal average number which is shown as 24.3 per cent. The duties these people will return to will be ordinary everyday inspection work rather than special duties.

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister say whether there has been any increase in the number of industrial cases relating to harsh and unfair dismissal cases? Could this be as a result of checking with the award?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think I would be right in saying that there has been. We need to take out specific information.

Mr Johnson: There has been a slight increase, but I do not have the exact numbers.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We will need to get that information.

Mr WHITTEN: On page 6, there is reference to the end of wage indexation. With the abolition of wage indexation, can the Minister give details of new wage claims and possible waiting times for the cases to be heard? Does the Minister consider the present personnel of the courts and commission adequate to handle the applications within a reasonable time?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I understand that about two or three weeks ago there were 45 or 51 claims served on the Industrial Commission for variations to the State industrial awards with a variation of, I think, 2.4 per cent. In effect, it was a claim by a number of unions for a quarterly wage hearing with a flow-on for full wage indexation that would have occurred in the previous quarter; that was for the June quarter. It is too early to say, and it is not for me to say, how the Industrial Commission should specifically handle those, although I do understand that the Industrial Commission is likely to take one or two of them and turn them into test cases; it has already been indicated by the commission that that is how it will proceed. I presume that, depending on the outcome of those test cases, so the effect of that will flow on to the other 50 or so awards.

However, they are not the only cases for variation, and there is no doubt that, with the abolition of wage indexation, the task before the Industrial Commission is a much more difficult one, for a number of reasons. Each individual union is going to try to seek variations in different ways, and no longer will the commission necessarily sit down using the broad guidelines that it had previously and be able to deal with all the variations as quickly and simply

as it could under wage indexation. A significant number of disputes will arise because there are claims for variations to rates of pay outside of the Industrial Commission. There was a case involving R. M. Williams just recently, and I am greatly concerned at the extent to which one union is wishing to go outside of the arbitration and conciliation system and ask for wage increases, with no attempt whatsoever to pursue that wage increase through the normal channels of the commission. We invariably have the trade union movement and the Labor Party of this State highlight the virtues of the industrial conciliation and arbitration process.

Now if that is the case, then I think they should criticise their colleagues and the unions that are attempting to get all the wage increases outside of that system. I think it is unfortunate to have a number of different systems trying to operate at the one time; that is, we cannot effectively mix collective bargaining and a formal process of conciliation and arbitration with formalised awards. At the same time, some unions are now obviously pursuing, especially here in South Australia, a form of wage indexation.

So, we have three distinct systems of wage determination trying to be carried on all at the same time. I think that will lead to chaos and increased disputation. I would ask the trade union movement to see whether it can reach common ground on how it believes wage increases should be granted here in South Australia. I hope that it can come to the conclusion to use the process of conciliation and arbitration. I have always been a supporter of wage indexation in South Australia. There are one or two problems on how it applies, but the South Australian Government argued very strongly in the Federal commission for the continuation of wage indexation, because it believed that, until there is an alternative system available, then that was the best system.

I believe there needs to be an adjustment to how the guidelines apply and the breadth of the guidelines. I also believe that it is necessary to work out an effective way of penalising those unions which decided to go outside of the wage indexation system and tried to seek further increases over and above wage indexation. Unfortunately, on the guidelines laid down by the Federal commission there was an across-the-board discounting of all people, even though all unions involved did not go out and seek wage increases over and above wage indexation. I do not think it is appropriate to penalise everyone because a few are abusing the system. I have made a request to the trade union movement here that it looks at how it can devise a scheme of effectively penalising those who wish to go outside the system, without penalising those who are prepared to live with the system of wage indexation.

I believe that a form of wage indexation is in the best interests of Australia and this State. I believe it will lead to better industrial relations and less disputation, but what sort of guidelines should apply is also quite important. How are we going to manage wage increases that maintain real wages, without producing an enormous wage escalation like we had in 1974? The wage escalation of that year did immeasurable harm to our manufacturing sector, especially to our exporting sector, and led to a very significant increase in unemployment. They are difficult problems and I do not think anyone has an easy answer to them. It is going to need a great deal of co-operation, and it is not going to be made any easier by a union deciding to go outside of the system of conciliation and arbitration and simply trying to blackmail employers, through industrial pressure, into giving wage increases.

After all, that is exactly what has occurred with R. M. Williams and the storemen and packers; they are asking for \$20 a week or more and that is an effective 10 per cent

increase in wages. Some related unions are asking for a further 2.4 per cent through the Industrial Commission; added together that gives 12.4 per cent, and no doubt they will then be up before the national wage case asking for a further increase based on the escalation since the last national wage case, which I presume will be another 5 per cent. So we could be in the incredible situation, within a period of three or four months, of having a total wage increase throughout certain sectors of our work force of 10 per cent, plus 2.4 per cent, plus any national wage case, and it could be at least a 15 per cent to 17 per cent wage increase. That is the very type of wage escalation which will damage this State and which will lead to significant new unemployment. That is why I believe it is important and why the Industrial Commission has an enormous responsibility now as to how it is going to sort out those problems and why we have given the commission the additional power to take into account the effects on the economy and particularly the effects on inflation and unemployment, because unless it takes those into account I think it has one hand tied in trying to resolve the problems.

Mr WHITTEN: The Minister just spent 10 minutes answering one question condemning the trade unions and did not answer my question. I asked whether he considered there were sufficient personnel in the courts and the commission to handle the claims that may be coming forward. That was a simple question.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think I did answer that; I said that only time will tell and it depends on how trade unions wish to proceed with their wage increases. I believe the appropriate mechanism is that all wage increases be held off until the national wage case, and that wages be dealt with first at a national level and then, as a flow-on from that, at a State level. If that is done, then I am quite confident that there are sufficient resources, Industrial Commissioners, and judges in the Industrial Commission to tackle the task. However, if the various associations that have access to the commission wish to pursue wage increases by three totally different mechanisms, I believe we will have enormous industrial problems and manpower problems within the commission and general anarchy in terms of wage increases.

Mr ASHENDEN: The question that I would like to ask refers to a line on page 46. It is 'Chief Training Services Officer, Training Development Officers, Training Supervisors and Clerical Staff'. There will be more than one question and I base my questions on the broad objective given in the Programme Estimates, volume two, page 10, where this is stated:

Broad objectives/Goals

To achieve better co-operation between employers, management and employees, increased productivity, improved job satisfaction and quality of working life and greater organisation effectiveness.

I agree that that is an extremely worthy objective and, if it can be achieved, it will certainly lead to greater productivity that the department is seeking. Can the Minister tell me some of the projects and schemes that his department has in mind to bring about that objective?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The training area referred to on page 46 relates specifically to the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission and associated staff in the department. In other words, that is the replacement of the Apprenticeship Commission. The area referred to in what was read from page 10 of the Programme Estimates book relates specifically to employee participation, and I will briefly cover both matters. Regarding the training area, the main thrust is to increase the number of apprenticeships in the State and broaden the areas of training available (under the new Industrial and Commercial Training Act that is now possible), and to co-ordinate and monitor all training

programmes in the State that come under the jurisdiction of the commission. My assessment so far is that it is working extremely well, and that legislation has now become model legislation for the rest of Australia.

Mr ASHENDEN: I thought that the broad objective to which I referred would have come under that line. What I am more concerned about is the process, schemes and plans that the department has in mind to bring about the achievement of the objective on page 10 to which I have referred.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The objective on page 10 is that of trying to improve industrial relations within the South Australian working environment, particularly job satisfaction. The Employee Participation Branch of the department has three people involved. I believe that it has a responsibility in the broadest area of industrial relations. There are specific projects, many of which I think are quite exciting, that they are taking on.

I highlight one, namely, the new plastics plant of General-Motors Holden's. The department has been invited in by G.M.H. to look at the form of employee participation that should apply at that plastics plant. The plant at Elizabeth will employ a large number who have been unemployed for some time. They are young people, and many of them have not had work experience, and the company believes they need careful consultation and training to adapt them to the working environment. I think the scheme needs to be complimented. Particularly, G.M.H. should be complimented on taking that initiative. I know that officers of the department who are involved are quite excited about that project and what can be achieved.

Other schemes are being developed by companies. We have a general undertaking not to talk about those publicly unless the union and the company involved are in agreement about its being discussed publicly, so I think it inappropriate for me to take that further. The G.M.H. project has been discussed publicly.

Mr ASHENDEN: I accept the Minister's advice. I look forward to being advised on some of these schemes, because I know from my previous employment that, when this type of relationship can be achieved between management and the factory floor work force, there are undoubtedly gains in productivity. I would appreciate the Minister's taking on notice my desire to be advised of some of these schemes when information can be given.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will certainly do that, and I indicate my complete support and enthusiasm for these types of project. Good industrial relations must start in the work place, and that means a good understanding and consultation between employees, unions, supervisors and managers in the work place. I think we have seen in a number of factories in this State what can be achieved if that is developed. It needs constant effort, and I will certainly undertake to keep the honourable member informed of any scheme that is announced publicly or could be announced publicly.

Mr SCHMIDT: My question refers to page 20 of the programme booklet. I ask the Minister, in relation to the broad objective outlined on that page, which deals with obviating the need to import skilled workers from overseas, how he envisages the utilisation of older persons into this new industrial and commercial training.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The new Act, for the first time, allows the concept of adult apprenticeships to be practised in South Australia. I believe that it goes well beyond that and we need to look at retraining schemes for those adults who, for reasons of changes in technology, are no longer able to use the skills that they have and we need to see whether we can retain them.

They are longer-term objectives and they are very difficult objectives to meet. In the immediate future, we would be looking at trying to increase the number of people beyond the former apprenticeship age of 19 or 21 years, and give them skills. The best way at this stage is through the pre-vocational training scheme, although only people up to the age of 19 years are eligible for that. However, it allows some people who would not previously have been eligible to complete a whole apprenticeship to get at least some training. These areas are being looked at in the longer term by the new commission, and the commission has not yet come up with the answer.

Mr SCHMIDT: I take it this dialogue will continue with the educationists, trade unions, and employer groups?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Most certainly.

Mr SCHMIDT: Do you see any overlap between the specific targets on page 20, which are to establish Industry Training Advisory Committees and to develop new regulations to facilitate the operation of the Industrial and Commercial Training Act, and what we have referred to earlier as the Manpower Forecasting Unit?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No. The Industry Training Advisory Committees will advise the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission on the types of programmes that should be made available for a particular industry, such as the building industry, and will involve a broad cross-section of representation of both employers and employees in the industry. That is quite different from the Manpower Forecasting Unit, which will look at the broader aspects for the whole State. However, I believe there is a need for close liaison between individual industry advisory committees and the Manpower Forecasting Unit. If an industry advisory committee sees problems developing, it should notify the Manpower Forecasting Unit.

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

Trade and Industry, \$1 594 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr E. S. Ashenden
Mr J. C. Bannon
Mr H. Becker
Mr K. C. Hamilton
Mr J. K. G. Oswald
Mr K. H. Plunkett
Mr I. Schmidt
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. G. Rowe, Director-General, Department of Trade and Industry.
Mr I. J. Kowalick, Deputy Director-General, Department of Trade and Industry.
Mr D. J. Martin, Director, Assistance and Services, Department of Trade and Industry.

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

Mr BANNON: First, I believe that the Committee should address itself to a fundamental question in relation to the

functions of the Department of Trade and Industry, the role and activities of the Director-General and his staff, particularly as they relate to the Government's overall State development and industrial development programme, and in departmental terms the way in which trade and industry relate to the State Development Office, which is an increasingly burgeoning empire in the Premier's Department. As a preface to some of the questions that I wish to ask the Minister, I would like to say, whether or not it has come to his notice (it has not come to the Premier's notice, because he denied it when it was put to him) that there are many businessmen in our community looking for trade opportunities or the development of products or whatever who are in some considerable confusion about where to go and to whom they should talk as far as the Government and its promotion and assistance are concerned.

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. Are we continuing the practice of going through the vote line by line? That is what we have been doing. Is the Leader referring to the first line 'Director-General, Trade and Industry'?

The CHAIRMAN: To clarify the point of order, it was suggested that perhaps up to 15 minutes would be given to the lead speaker on a vote to outline the position. That is what the Leader is doing.

Mr BANNON: I hope that I will not take 15 minutes of the Committee's time, but I am acting in accordance with the ruling that the lead speaker can make some preliminary remarks. It does relate to the Director-General, because I am talking about his functions. I was referring to the confusion and the sense of frustration of people as they are passed from place to place, never quite sure where to go or who can render the best advice and assistance.

It starts at the Ministerial level: does one try to see the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Affairs? At the permanent head level there is Mr Rowe or Mr Tiddy, both well known in the business community and both active in various spheres. So it goes through the various functions. That is a fact of life, that there is this confusion. If one refers to the yellow book which details the programmes and functions of these two areas of Government responsibility, the confusion is heightened. I refer to book 1 of the programme dealing with the Premier and Minister of State Development. The Committee will see a range of moves and broad objectives which one would have thought would lie very closely within the purview of the Trade and Industry Department. It talks about planning for economic development and strengthening the State's economic base, development of natural resources and levels of investment, trade and employment opportunities aimed for by the Government. State development in these terms is given broad objectives to try to implement, initiate and design these development projects, providing promotion, advice, consultation, liaison with project promoters, private organisations and Commonwealth and State Government agencies. It has prepared a corporate plan for economic development of the State, and it has established various links and lines of communication. It has reporting to it and to the Premier an industrial council—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It has now been changed to the State Development Council.

Mr BANNON: I thank the Minister for that—the State Development Council, which is comprised of prominent businessmen in South Australia who voluntarily give their services to provide an advisory function in the planning of the Government's economic development strategies and looking at specific projects as well. They have been cited by the Premier on a number of occasions. If one stops at that point in the programme, it is clear that, if I was a businessman seeking advice, information or consultation, I

would go to the Premier and get his assistance in reference to his officers in State Development.

The confusion specifically arises if one turns to the Estimates before us and the detailed programme set out in Volume 4 and looks at the needs being addressed. While there is certainly some variation in words, by and large they are both the same. I refer to the overall aims of trade and industry, which relate to the maintenance and development of the long-term viability of South Australian industry; its ability to compete successfully interstate and on overseas markets; its objective to expand our interstate and overseas markets; assist industry in publicity exhibitions; provide some training opportunities; resolve specific problems; provide bridging finance, and so on. All of these things very much line up with what is said about State development.

I concede immediately that reference is made to co-ordination under the heading 'Co-ordination of the State Development Office'. In the trade and industry area reference is made to this other organisation of Government and its possible role. I suggest that when looking at these two books, their functions and mechanisms, one can either conclude that there are two departments duplicating functions (and that in itself is wasteful and confusing) or there are two departments pulling in different directions, which again is wasteful and confusing and it certainly does not help the economic development of South Australia.

I thought it was timely to read an article in today's *News* which reported the remarks made by someone described as a 'prominent Liberal businessman'. What he has said is something that we will hear from many businessmen. The article states:

Frustration with the Industrial Development Department was expressed.

The businessman compared the aggressive selling techniques of the West Australian and Queensland Governments with the operations of the South Australian department.

The other States had constructed high profiles overseas, he said, by constant travel by high-powered officials.

'Here they put out one bloody book and think they've done it,' he said.

No doubt the Minister will tell us about many more things that are being done apart from one book. I cite that article to put my finger on that confusion. For a start, that businessman referred to the Industrial Development Department—there is no such department. There is a State Development Office in the Premier's Department with all the trappings of a Government department but that is not its name. There is a department of Trade and Industry, which was formerly the Economic Development Department, which again has all the trappings, services and facilities and of economic development and advice.

The very fact that the businessman could not get the name of the department right indicates, I suggest, not the businessman's ignorance at all, but a total confusion in the business community about just who is doing what and where they are going. Will the Minister give the Committee some assistance on this matter? How does the Minister see the functions of trade and industry as being different from the State Development Office? What are the organisational differences and how should someone advise a businessman who is seeking assistance?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am delighted to answer the Leader's question, and I point out it is not the first time that he has raised this matter. He raised it about 18 months ago and then about 12 months ago. It seems to be one of his hobby horses. In fact, it seems to be a hobby horse that he is constantly trying to push. I do not think he is having much success. The one comment I have received from people I have explained the situation to is that it is perfectly clear. In fact, it is fair to say that there was some ques-

tioning when this structure was set up in relation to how it would work. Now that it has been in operation I have not heard any criticism of it for at least nine months, because I think people now understand how it is working and, in fact, they have been complimentary.

It is interesting to see that other States in Australia have adopted that same strategy in relation to their own States. The State Development Office, under the Premier (and, after all, the Premier is the highest office within Government), has the responsibility for the broad development of the State. That is why it is called the State Development Office. It deals not only with industrial development, manufacturing development, commercial development, but also tourist development, mines and energy development, retail development, agricultural development, and many other fields. A series of operational departments then operate below that level. Some of the operational departments within Government are the Department of Tourism and the Department of Trade and Industry, which deals with manufacturing industry, industrial development and commerce and trade. There is also the Department of Agriculture, which deals with agricultural trade and all agricultural development. There is also the Department of Mines and Energy, which deals with mineral exploration, mineral development and, of course, there would be some impact between that and industrial development. There are also other operational departments.

Therefore, there is a central core, and the State Development Office over-views all of it. Its prime responsibility, under Mr Tiddy, is to develop and co-ordinate a corporate plan or strategy for the whole of Government. I think that is essential, because the one criticism that could have been levelled at government in this State when my Party came to office was that there were a series of operational departments which, in a very conspicuous and obvious way, were pulling against each other and, therefore, pulling against the development of this State. That is a fundamental reason why this State experienced a decline of some 20 000 jobs in the period 1977 to 1979. If this State was going to have effective development it was important that we had an overall theme, an overall co-ordination and, most important of all, an overall development strategy for the State. There had to be one group of people responsible for co-ordinating and implementing that strategy. The operational departments are beneath that level. The Department of Trade and Industry, the Department of Tourism and the Department of Agriculture are just some of those operational departments.

If a person has a problem or if someone wants to get involved in tourism development he would approach the Department of Tourism. If a very substantial person from interstate is involved and if his first contact in this State, because he did not know anyone, was with the Premier or the Premier's Department, and Mr Tiddy would be present, that person would be directed to the Department of Tourism. There is nothing unusual about that. I know from personal experience that that applied under the previous Government because I would direct interstate visitors to Mr Corcoran, and I would make arrangements with Mr Corcoran to see those people. Those people would see Mr Corcoran as Premier of this State who would shake their hands, tell them that they would be most welcome to this State and then direct them to the Department of Economic Development, which was administered by another Minister, Mr Hudson. There was no confusion there. The Ministers and the Premier had their specific roles and tasks, and it worked well. I am sorry it did not work well because there was no development in the State during that period. I indicate that it is working extremely well at the moment.

I would now like to raise a couple of other points. The

Leader has suggested that there is confusion. I do not believe that is the case and I would like to see substantive evidence where there is confusion. When we have explained the corporate role and the co-ordinating role of the Premier's Department through the State Development Office and the operational role of each individual department, it has been clearly understood by people. Perhaps it is because the Leader has never been involved in an actual corporate body and corporate planning that he does not perceive what is now modern management practice throughout any large company in the world. The development of corporate strategy, particularly, is one area which the business world at least realises must receive top priority if one is going to be successful. Judging by what we have achieved in the two years that we have been in Government, one can say that both the corporate strategy and the operational achievements of the Department of Trade and Industry have been highly successful.

We can give a list of developments in the two years that we have been in Government which would put to shame what the previous Government tried to achieve in the previous 10 years. I would guarantee that we could put up programme for programme, project for project, and development for development a far more impressive list in the two-year period than the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments could in the 9½ years that they were in office.

To ensure that there is no duplication and no confusion, Mr Lincoln Rowe is a member of the State Development Council, chaired now by Mr Jim Rump. Mr Matt Tiddy is also a member of that council, as are Mr Webb and Mr Sheridan from Treasury. In this sense there is no difference between, say, the Mines and Energy and Trade and Industry Departments. Mr Tiddy has regular meetings with the departments that he is co-ordinating in our area to make sure that there is no confusion or duplication. We have a weekly meeting at which Mr Tiddy, Mr Rowe, Mr Kowalick, Mr Sexton and I sit down and talk about any matter that has come up and decide where and how it should be dealt with by the Government. If there are problems and if someone comes along with a matter related to more than one department (for example, with a mineral development which relates particularly to the Mines and Energy Department, particularly to the Trade and Industry Department and particularly to the Environment Department) the co-ordination is picked up by the State Development Officer through Mr Tiddy.

We have also very effectively established (and I will get direct quotes if the Leader would like me to) an international reputation as a one-stop-shop Government with the reputation for achieving things at a dramatic pace. I do not have the direct quote with me, but I will provide to Parliament a letter from the International Vice-President of the Abbott Corporation. He found that he got such service and response from the South Australian Government when trying to expand an operation at Elizabeth that he wrote to us from America on his return and said that he had not received such efficient service from a Government anywhere else in the world and that he would make known throughout the United States of America what the South Australian Government is willing to do.

I will also obtain for the Leader of number of quotations from the Raytheon Corporation, which recently established itself in South Australia. I am surprised that the Leader has not yet complimented that company for establishing in this State. It is a company involved in a high technology area. It is the first manufacturer and assembler of word processors in Australia. It had taken out an option for a factory in Sydney. This State Government asked the company to look at South Australia in the light of our industrial climate and the incentives that we offered. Our package

was so impressive that that international company which, at that stage, was making a decision to establish its first manufacturing facility outside the United States of America, decided to cancel its option on a factory in Sydney (which cost it money) and take out an option for a plant in Adelaide. It is in the old Philips-Hendon estate, which was left vacant largely as a result of the policies of the previous Government. The company will set up manufacturing facilities as quickly as possible. At the opening that company praised this Stage Government and praised what has been achieved through the Department of Trade and Industry and the State Development Office and complimented those officers involved on the excellent service provided.

As I move throughout Australia, particularly when Ministers of Industrial Development get together, I find that they are only too aware of what we have achieved in this State. We find in the Northern Territory that that Government has printed booklets similar to ours because it has seen how effective ours have been. We can go to Western Australia (which is mentioned by that businessman) and find that a number of their polices repeat what has been applied in South Australia in the last two years because they have seen how effective it is. The Western Australian Government is now looking at setting up a form of technology park—a direct take from what has been achieved in South Australia. I was saddened by the remarks of the Deputy Leader when he knocked technology park, because I know that the 300 people at the launching thought that it was a major initiative that this State needed. The *Age* writer who was in Adelaide for the launching said that it was a pity that South Australia did not make the move 10 years ago. I do not think that there is any confusion about the respective roles of the Department of Trade and Industry and the State Development Office except in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. I comment on the identical wording in some of the booklets between the State Development Office and the Department of Trade and Industry. I would be critical if there was not similar wording. In fact, they are describing the role of, first, the programme.

The overall programmes of economic development of both the State Development Office and the Department of Trade and Industry are similar. If they were dissimilar, that is the very point of the lack of co-ordination that I have talked about. Equally, if some of the other areas, including the programme sector, the programme and the sub-programme, were not similar in wording there would be something major wrong with the overall co-ordination that applied in the Government. The one thing we will find in looking through the programmes is that the same wording is picked up not only in this case but in other areas. Different departments administer overall programmes in the same area. That has been a common feature of this Government. We see areas of programmes picked up by the Departments of Community Welfare, Health, Industrial Affairs and Employment under the Youth Bureau, and the Department of Housing. The common wording is a compliment to this Government in that it does have one objective in regard to economic development.

Mr BANNON: I will ignore much of what the Minister said, because that can be judged by the facts without my commenting on them. There seems to be an air of bravado about the Minister's claims in this area. I would like to take up his comments about the rationality of these arrangements and his reflections on previous Administrations. Under Premier Dunstan economic development and overall development were very much within the Premier's purview and he acted as the central point and co-ordinator of that activity. Under the reorganisation by Mr Corcoran there was again a rational re-allocation. The difference was that, while the Hon. Hugh Hudson had economic development,

he also had the portfolios of Tourism and Mines and Energy—the two areas that the Minister referred to as being the areas involved. The Premier (and this is important) did not have a Department of Development within his office. Whether he shook the hands of visiting businessmen or not, that is fine. I am talking about the duplication of administrative and other functions. Let me pinpoint an example. Who is responsible, and how, for the overseas trade function? If we look at the programme books we find, in relation to State development, that a major part of that office's work is the expansion of trade opportunities, the proposal of initiatives in interstate and overseas markets, the co-ordination of Government and private involvement in trade fairs, and so on.

There is a strong emphasis on the overseas function. The Agent-General's office, which is within the Premier's Department, is our major and largest trading office. This may be a misallocation of resources, but nonetheless that is the fact at the moment. Looking at the economic development programme, we find that it also is providing assistance on interstate and overseas trade promotion. Can the Minister say to whom our overseas representatives report? Who is responsible for the development of promotion of South Australia overseas? Is it the State Development Office or the Department of Trade and Industry.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Premier and the State Development Office are responsible for the overall promotion of South Australia overseas. It should be no-one else. They have the responsibility, not only for industrial development, but also for tourism, mines and energy, agriculture, and other areas as well. They are the only people who can take a complete over-view of the entire State, and that should rightly lie with the most senior Minister. Regarding the position of the Agent-General in London, the difficulty was that before the rearrangement some staff in the office reported to someone in Adelaide and other staff reported to the Agent-General himself. This caused a lack of co-ordination, and there was a breakdown in communication between officers in London and the people in Adelaide in the Department of Economic Development to whom they should have been reporting. There are numerous ways to juggle this around. We believe, and recent history has shown, that the best method is having all the people in the Agent-General's Office report to the Agent-General, and that he then reports to the State Development Office. He is free to have direct contact with any department. The Agent-General regularly and frequently writes to me on matters. He also directly takes matters up with the Director-General of the Department of Trade and Industry. Regarding the channels of communication and responsibility, the people in the office in London report to the Agent-General, rather than having one or two of them report to someone in Adelaide, a system that did not work.

If someone comes to the State and is interested in industrial development, it does not matter whether they go to the Premier, the State Development Office, the Department of Trade and Industry or me. The lines of communication are effective, and we have an extremely good working relationship between Messrs Tiddy and Rowe. People are automatically taken around and dealt with by the appropriate Government department. The one hallmark of this Government and particularly of those two gentlemen is that many of the personal antagonisms that existed previously between the old Department of Economic Development and the Premier's Department, have now been removed. The Leader might not like to reveal this, but I know some of the problems that existed. I know there was break-down in communication between those departments, and that they kept working against each other rather than to the betterment of this State.

In the private sector, Messrs Tiddy and Rowe are held in high regard. Both are regarded as having a great deal of experience in and as understanding the private sector; they have a good reputation, not only in South Australia, but throughout Australia and overseas. When I am at interstate airports with my Director-General, I am amazed at the number of senior businessmen, up to chairmen of companies, who stop and talk to my Director-General because he is known on a national basis. He worked for a national company and was responsible for its national marketing.

Mr BANNON: Without in any way detracting from or reflecting on the talents of Messrs Rowe and Tiddy (I acknowledged that earlier), the last few remarks by the Minister were simply a way of papering over the shabby treatment accorded to Mr Bakewell in this area. There is conflict in the area that relates to economic advice provided to the Government. Under the previous Administration, an Economics Advice Unit monitored the economy and provided to the Government indicators for planning and a number of other things. This high quality advice was well recognised as being so. With a change of Government that group, which was in the Economic Development Department, would have been under the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Of late there have been real problems with the way in which economic indicators have been produced by the Government. A large credibility gap has developed between some aspects of Government publications and other submissions made. This was highlighted publicly and in an embarrassing way in the recent State wage case, when there was much questioning of an exhibit which set out indicators and which was apparently prepared by the Department of Trade and Industry. It seemed completely in conflict with other publications of the Government, particularly the one called *South Australia: An Investment Profile*, which was apparently also a Department of Trade and Industry publication. From reading the transcript of those proceedings, I felt sorry for the hapless witness from the Department of Trade and Industry when he attempted to correlate those statements and other statements made by the Premier.

There is a crisis of confidence (they were the words I used a minute ago) because of the way in which the Government is producing and interpreting economic statistics and indicators. The Premier either does not understand the figures or is prepared to fudge them. The Minister has not been involved in this area very often; perhaps he should be more involved in it. This all leads to a feeling that somehow the economic advice of the Government is not being properly co-ordinated and is not coming through clearly. It indicates that somewhere there are problems. This difficulty could be related back to the dismantling of the economics group about which I am talking.

We find in these lines that the economics division will exist no longer, and is to be within the general Assistance and Services Division of the department. In the *Government Gazette* of 23 December 1980 we read that, 'with the advice and consent of Executive Council, I do hereby amalgamate that part of the Department of Trade and Industry known as the Economic Research Group with the Premier's Department, that part of the first mentioned department thereby becoming part of the Premier's Department'. There is a transfer under that order in December of the Economic Research Group (which might relate to Mr Milton-Smith's economic unit) over to the Premier's Department presumably to service the State Development Office. There is a picture of total confusion. Can the Minister clarify who provides the economic forecasting indicators and assessment of information, the material that eventually goes into publications and speeches of the Government? Where are those officers located and to whom do they report?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Can I answer that question by bringing to the attention of the Leader that I well recall my six years in the Department of Agriculture, and in those days there was an economic research unit in that department which dealt with monitoring of agricultural conditions and prices. To a certain extent I presume that fed into a much broader group giving economic advice to the Government through the Premier's Department. Exactly the same type of situation occurs today within the Department of Trade and Industry: we have a group of people, headed by Milton Smith, an extremely good economist. The group has the responsibility of looking at the economic factors that come under the responsibility of this operation of the Department of Trade and Industry. They feed into a broader look at the economy under the Premier's Department, through the State Development Office. Incidentally, the Leader is incorrect about where the officers under Milton Smith, but including him, have been included in the department; they now come under the group called 'Industry Studies', and they have the broader responsibility of not only monitoring economic conditions related to industry and commerce, which is the responsibility of the department, but also looking at new industry opportunities for this State and identifying target groups that we should be trying to attract.

A classic example is the tremendous scope available in the high technology manufacturing area. Another area is offset manufacturing, and another is the processing of raw materials where an officer is working for a substantial amount of her time. By doing detailed research in those areas, they highlight the development potential, or the areas where the greatest development potential exists, and the types of company we should be attracting to this State. It is an area which was touched on once before back in what was called the gap study of 1972. Having identified 300 companies, it was not effectively carried through, and we are now making sure that it is done perhaps not on a more professional basis, but carried out in more depth in trying to identify the smaller number of areas but more effectively carrying them through as target areas.

Again, I think, to be honest, Mr Chairman, the confusion seems to be more in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition than with the Government; we have no trouble at all in linking together the economic advice from each of the operating departments under the overall responsibility of the State Development Office. To have given the example he did highlights the inconsistency of his own argument, with due respect, because the documents referred to (the one presented to the Industrial Court and the South Australian Investment profile), were produced by the same people, both within the one department, so how can it be claimed that there is confusion between these two areas of government when the very example used comes from the one section of government?

Mr OSWALD: My questions are in relation to the Office of the Director-General, and the Director-General for Trade Promotion. I would like to get some information on how the department, especially the trade promotion office, explores opportunities for development in overseas markets. What is the number of officers we have overseas who would alert companies in South Australia to trade fairs? How do South Australian companies become alerted, by what procedure? What help do these companies get from the Trade Promotion Office when there is a trade fair on overseas, first, in getting to know about it, and then getting the exhibit over there?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That type of broad area covered by the honourable member is, in fact, the area covered by the State Development Office. However, if it gets down to specific details—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Leader says that shows the confusion, but the point is that trade fairs are normally organised through the Agent-General's Office. Let me give an example. The type of thing referred to is the Milan fair, earlier this year, where the Premier went, accompanied by officers of the State Development Office. Mr Tiddy was with him. If they need any specific details relating to our area then the Department of Trade and Industry would help.

Another example is the Baghdad fair, of world reputation. We generally make it known to companies that they can participate. Frankly, most companies marketing overseas have that sort of knowledge at any rate, because these people travel overseas frequently and probably are more in touch with specifics within a country and what is going on in that country within their area than anyone outside could possibly be.

The other point that needs to be touched on here is that Australia, as a nation, has six States, but the prime responsibility for overseas trade and promotion of Australia, particularly at trade fairs, comes under the Federal Department of Trade and Resources. I have had discussions with officers of that department, and they are in a far better position, because they have literally hundreds of trade offices throughout the world. Our Government cannot afford those sorts of numbers of persons overseas when the cost to open up one trade office we estimate to be about \$1 000 000. That is covered at a national level. We have attempted to have a closer liaison between our Government and those Federal trade officers who are already stationed overseas and who are invariably in the locations where any trade fair would be. Most of the organisation of Australian participants in those trade fairs is done by the Federal Department of Trade and Resources. We have had discussions with departmental officers, and I must stress that they have appreciated the role taken by the Government here, because it is about the only Government that has expressed real interest in effectively using the overseas trade offices of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr BANNON: I think the honourable member did illustrate the problems, and describe them. If he had been a businessman wishing to exhibit in a fair that is the sort of query. He would know that Minister, that is who he would go to; he would not know that State development had overall co-ordination and was basically responsible.

I would like to pursue this question of the Economics Division. I do not think the Minister really answered my question. I want to know where the Government's advice is formulated. It appears that the economic material presented for the wage case came from the economic component of the Department of Trade and Industry. The Minister did not comment on the transfer of the economic research group or the priority that might have had in being shifted into the Premier's Department, presumably into State Development. I think he should be a little more precise about the role of his department *vis a vis* State Development in its economic advice to the Government.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I thought I had been quite clear, but let me repeat it. If there is any area that affects industry and commerce, which after all is the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Industry at an operational level, then we collect information on that specific area, in the same way as the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment collects specific data of unemployment and employment statistics; in the same way as if we want information on the state of the economy for agricultural industry we go to the Department of Agriculture. If we are looking at a specific area then we go to the operational department. If we are looking at the broadest possible area

for the entire State then we go to the State Development Office and Treasury. I think it is appropriate that the Premier has the overview. I find no difficulty at all, and I know that business people I have spoken to find no difficulty in appreciating that the Premier has an overview of the entire State, and he needs to make sure that operating department or one area does not get out of kilter with another, or that a problem does not get into another department.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would like to ask questions in relation to small business activities and the policy of the Government thereon. Does the Government intend to make more loan finance available to small business and, if so, what method does the Minister intend to use to do so?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The problems of loan finance for small business is one that we are looking at. It has been highlighted for a number of reasons. First, the recent merger of banks is perhaps decreasing the degree of competition between the banks and making it more difficult for small business people to raise finance. Also, the higher interest rates mean that banks are generally directing their available funds into the higher interest areas, yet you will appreciate that the interest rate for loans of \$100 000 or less is controlled, with a present interest rate of 13.5 per cent, so banks tend to put available funds into areas where they can earn 15 per cent or 16 per cent rather than into the area controlled at 13.5 per cent. Because of that, we are looking at this overall problem to find the best way of resolving it.

It is further complicated by the fact that we expect the Campbell Committee of Inquiry Report to be handed down any day. It was anticipated that it would be handed down early in September, but it did not show up. I undertand that it is now anticipated in October. It is difficult to know exactly where we are going until we know the recommendations of that inquiry, but I assure the honourable member that we are looking at that area.

The Government has available a system of loans and guarantees through the South Australian Development Corporation. They are handed out at the normal interest rate, and I think that is the best way the matter should be dealt with. In other words, they should be commercial loans assessed on a commercial basis by the banks, but it is important to make sure, if possible, that funds are available. I have not heard that the South Australia Development Corporation is so tight for funds that it cannot continue to give loans or guarantees. Perhaps Mr Kowalick could give more information, as he is a member of the S.A.D.C. I think it fair to say that the present sources of finance available were available under the previous Government, but we are looking at whether there should be some adjustment.

Mr Kowalick: The S.A.D.C. is continuing to receive applications and has made some loans in the past year, but its lending activity has not been directed to the small business sector. It has tended to be, of the smaller business sector, the larger ones and there has not been a significant amount of business for the corporation in the past 12 months. There was a large number of inquiries, but it is very difficult. A lot of inquiries relate to applications that could not qualify on commercial criteria.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: My question follows from what Mr Kowalick has said, namely, that he maintained that there had not been a lot of activity with the corporation. I wonder whether that was because the corporation is virtually a last resort for business men to go to, and is that why there has not been much activity on loan finance?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will allow Mr Kowalick to answer that question. Perhaps I may comment afterwards.

Mr Kowalick: It is true that the corporation requires an applicant to demonstrate that funds are not reasonably available elsewhere through normal commercial sources, such as banks or other financial institutions.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I agree with the assessment that the corporation has traditionally been a lender of last resort, and I have been somewhat critical of it in that role, because I am not sure that government, as such, should stand to be a lender where the greatest risk is involved. Why should we put public funds at risk and tackle only those areas in which the highest risk is involved?

That needs to be modified by the fact that I think we are looking at finance in two areas, namely, finance for small business operation, and small business finance specifically for venture capital, and I think small business finance for venture capital is different from the other more traditional area of finance for small business. In the case of venture capital, I think there is some role for the Government to look at what finance is available.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister has said that the Government could and should be looking at where finance was available. Will the Government have an examination made of whether arrangements can be effected for, say, the State Bank to acquire block finance from the State Government Insurance Commission and for the money to be retailed as finance for small business? It seems to me that we are not in total opposition to one another. We are looking for some method to assist small business, and I am putting forward a proposition which I believe has some acceptability and which is occurring in other States. I know that the propositions are acceptable, and it seems to me from the few inquiries that I have made around Victoria and New South Wales that there is more money for small business in those States than here. One may judge that on the economy of both those States but it seems to me that, if we are to aid small business to develop or, more important, to redevelop, or even commence, ready finance has to be made available.

I am not suggesting that the Government should throw its money around, or that the State Bank or the S.G.I.C. should do so, but there should be some method whereby small business gets assistance provided the ability to pay back is there. I am not asking that money be made available just for the sake of making it available. There are undoubtedly cases where stability is in the small business enterprise but finance is not available to extend. I think a method ought to be found to assist such businesses.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government is aware of a number of different options available. The honourable member has suggested one way. It is not quite as simple as he suggests because, when one is looking at loans, one is looking at low interest rates of 13.5 per cent, yet any large institution is likely to be wanting to lend its own money out at 15 per cent or 16 per cent. There is an interest-rate gap there, and I am sure that the honourable member realises that one cannot borrow at 16 per cent, lend at 13.5 per cent and come out on the positive side at the end of it. We will look, as we have been looking, at that along with the other ventures involved.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have a few propositions. That was one that I believe was worthy of consideration by whatever Party is in power at the time finance is needed. I have another one that I wish to put to the Government. Is it intended this year to review the role of the South Australian Development Corporation and the effectiveness of the Government's incentives, such as the establishment payments scheme to ensure that we all do what we can to get behind small business? I do not want to belabour the

Committee, because we still have much work to do, but since I have been the shadow Minister examining small business, it is remarkable from the speeches that I have made what feed-back has come from small business. It always refers to the inability to develop, to go on from where they are. Capital never seems to be available, although a business may be buoyant (at least that seems to be the situation of the people who have spoken to me). The problem could be described as a cash-flow problem more than anything else, and something must be done.

It has been pointed out to me that in many cases, if a small business could extend by about \$100 000 or \$200 000, it would involve one or two additional employees in those areas. I admit to the Committee and publicly that it is a new area for me to be studying, but there seems to be great potential for small business in South Australia. Ability is lacking only in areas of finance. Perhaps there is need for training and initiative development in regard to the control of their businesses, but that applies probably to the beginner. Much needs to be done. I would like to know from the Government whether it would give this last proposition of mine some consideration.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The honourable member referred to a review of the South Australian Development Corporation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: And I talked about incentives such as the establishment payments scheme to ensure that we get behind small business.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In regard to the South Australian Development Corporation, the Government has carried out a major review of the corporation. It is well known that the Government established a committee to look at that. Mr Rowe was a member of the committee which reported to the Government. If I remember correctly, I think we were in for some criticism in this State for carrying out that review, and I am delighted to see—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not think it was from me.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am delighted to see that the honourable member is now backing the fact that we need to review the functions of the corporation. I can assure him that that has occurred. Secondly, in regard to the establishment payments scheme, we reviewed the guidelines for that last year, and I announced new guidelines in about November 1980. Those guidelines are available to any company, irrespective of the size of the company. There are certain restrictions; for example, it is payment for an expansion into a new product which is likely to be sold outside of this State. It is specifically available to encourage interstate or overseas trade. I think a company must create a minimum of five new jobs to be eligible for the scheme, but I can assure the honourable member that many small businesses are recipients of financial grants under that scheme. I can think of a number that have gone through just recently where companies with a staff of, say, ten employees have decided to increase their employment by five or ten employees, and they truly are small businesses. Generally, it is in the area of manufacturing, where they have good products and can start to sell on interstate markets.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: As far as I can see \$84 000 is the total amount allocated to the Small Business Advisory Bureau. That seems to be a meagre amount. What other plans has the Government for the bureau? Has there been any consideration to establish an independent statutory corporation concerned with small business development? In Victoria such circumstances apply. When one walks into the South Australian office and compares it with the activity in the Victorian office, it is not nearly the hive of activity that exists in Victoria. In both New South Wales

and Victoria many things are occurring, including training courses, and sending officers to the country for education purposes. All sorts of opportunities have been established in those units to assist and develop small business. Does the Minister think the amount allocated is sufficient to properly advise small business? Is the bureau doing much to help small business, other than having someone sitting in an office and handing out pamphlets? It seems that there is no education programme organised by the bureau. Has the Government any intention of increasing activity in the bureau?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: First, the \$84 000 does not cover the full staff complement for a full year. Currently, three people are in the bureau. I will be making an announcement shortly concerning a new manager on a contract basis to take over the management of the bureau, and he will be starting work within a month or so. A fifth appointment is to be made shortly after he starts (he will need to select another staff member), which means that the full complement will be five. The honourable member will appreciate that we are already part-way through the financial year, so that the \$84 000 does not represent a full year.

If the honourable member looked at what existed in the Small Business Advisory Unit when I became Minister and we moved into Government, he would see that what we currently have is a fairly significant upgrading from two years ago. Then there were 1½ or two people in the unit. We had an assessment of what all the other States were doing. I personally went to Victoria and looked at its statutory authority. Mr David Mitchell from the department went to Brisbane, Sydney and, I think, New England University and Melbourne University, and another officer went to Western Australia to see what each of those States were doing in this area.

From that, and from their experiences, we have decided to adopt what is the New South Wales model, where a statutory authority has not been established: it is still part of the department, but it is a separate part—it is put aside. We are putting it under a manager on a contract basis, so we believe that we have all the advantages of a statutory corporation or authority.

We certainly have the advantage of being able to take an outside manager and appoint him for a specific task, rather than taking a career public servant and putting him into that position as a promotion. That is the sort of advantage that one gets from a statutory corporation and, in fact, it is the only one that we saw. A statutory corporation has a board to run it, and we have already established the Small Business Advisory Council. Mr Rowe is the Chairman of that council, which has been operating since about April or May this year. That council is responsible for looking at the activities of the bureau.

We believe that the other important feature is to separate the location of the bureau from the department. The Department of Trade and Industry will shortly be moving to the S.G.I.C. building, and the small business bureau will remain on the fourth floor of the Commercial Union building. I expect that before long it will be very similar to the Victorian body. It will not be quite the same size, but it will have its own location, its own manager and its own identity with an advisory council advising it on how it should be run. I think we have achieved all the benefits of a statutory corporation without having to introduce legislation, because it has been done within the existing framework of the Public Service. In a full year we anticipate that the total cost of running the bureau will be about \$176 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On what basis does the Small Business Advisory Council arrange outside consultants for small businesses? When I was in New South Wales it was pointed out to me that in certain circumstances consultan-

cies were subsidised by the New South Wales Government. That appealed to me very strongly, because it is quite obvious that small businesses cannot afford to pay the exorbitant costs sometimes charged by consultants. Are there any arrangements in South Australia, or if there are not, is there any intention to introduce arrangements, to subsidise consultancies for small businesses?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I refer that question to Mr Rowe, who is the Chairman of the Small Business Advisory Council and the key man in directing small business.

Mr Rowe: Consultancies are subsidised. The present rate of subsidy is normally two-thirds of the cost, although in some cases it is half the cost. We believe it is important that there should be a contribution from the company to get the full commitment, but it is certainly subsidised. Usually, the consultancy is given against competitive tender. It is not handed to an individual consultant on a plate, but it is based on a response to a brief and an assessment of the best offer. It is checked with the client as being satisfactory and then a commitment is made.

This year the consultancy grant allowance will be \$70 000, which is a significant increase over last year. We anticipate that, through the upgrading of the unit and the publicity, there will be an increased awareness and therefore an increased demand and we want to respond to that with an increased grant.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was also looking for the guidelines that apply before the subsidy is given. Are there any binding regulations which would prevent a small business, or any business for that matter, from receiving a subsidy for consultants? I realise that a subsidy would not be given to General Motors, Mitsubishi or similar companies. How does the department view small business applications? Do the criteria relate to finance or the number of employees working for the company—just what are the guidelines?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr Rowe will answer.

Mr Rowe: There are guidelines and they have become more precise recently. The basis of criteria for judgment is somewhat similar to the establishment payments scheme. The company or the individuals have to be of special significance to the State, and they must have employment potential. In other words, they must be a sustainable company with a future. We want to avoid giving a comparative advantage to one firm against another, because we are dealing with public money and one must be careful when making judgments of that kind.

Grants are available for identifying problems and recommending solutions, but not for things that should be within the normal business practice, such as market studies or the implementation of measures to resolve problems such as costing systems and other tools of trade which should be inherent within a business. It is really to help a business to help itself to identify its future and to ensure that it is potentially viable; otherwise, we would simply be supporting it over a hurdle only to fall at the next.

Mr SCHMIDT: I refer to the advisory unit, and according to page 55 of the yellow book the proposed allocation this year is \$176 000, as the Minister said, with a staff increase up to 4.6. That definitely highlights the fact that more attention is being given to this unit than has occurred in the past. My question relates to the trend in bankruptcies that has occurred over the years. I believe since about 1975 there has been about 162 per cent bankruptcies in South Australia. That includes about 26 per cent bankruptcies in 1978-79, 18 per cent in 1979-80 and I think that trend reversed in 1980-81 by -2.5 per cent. However, since we have 9 per cent of Australia's total population some would point out that we still have 19 per cent of Australia's business bankruptcies. To what extent does the advisory

bureau analyse the causes of bankruptcy, and what type of advice does it give to small businesses in that regard?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Small Business Bureau receives a very large number of requests. Since January this year the bureau has received about 1 016 inquiries from small businesses. That indicates the large number of people who have problems. These problems have been classified into different categories.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is not a lot in 10 months.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That is up until August. The main areas where inquiries are received relate to finance, details on how to set up a new business, general management and marketing operations. Areas of less concern were accountancy (because that area has plenty of outside expertise), taxation, production and education. There were also quite a few inquiries about legislation.

The Deputy Leader raised that matter earlier. He said that most people would be wanting information on finance. However, most requests came in for information on how to set up a small business. One has to be careful quoting figures on bankruptcy. A Federal member from this State got up in Parliament recently and made some bold claims that South Australia was the bankruptcy capital of Australia. I believe that his figures were out of date. More recent figures show that, as a percentage of the national total, the number of bankruptcies in this State has declined. More detailed information can be obtained from *Hansard*, where the Premier made a more detailed statement and actually quoted figures. I believe I am right in saying that no specific information is available as to the causes of bankruptcy. It would be difficult to come up with that.

The obvious cause of bankruptcy is the lack of finance or because the business ran out of finance one way or the other. However, it may not be the prime cause of bankruptcy. It could well be poor management or a marketing or production problem. From my experience (and this has been supported by the department and the Small Business Bureau) people put blame on the fact that there is inadequate finance available for them to operate or expand their small business and they eventually go broke. In fact, the real problem was not lack of finance at all. It was the way that they ran the small business, their marketing expertise (or lack of it) and a basic lack of accounting knowledge. What on the surface appears to be the main causes of bankruptcy may not be the real causes. That is why I think it is difficult to come up with an answer to the question.

Mr SCHMIDT: Is the level of employment monitored amongst small businesses so that, with the advice given, they can gauge whether or not programmes are successful and whether more employment is being taken up in the small business sector? I ask the question in the light of the comments tonight on the news that South Australia is the only State in Australia in the latest unemployment figures to have a reduction; the others had an increase. I wonder whether these figures have any relation to the assistance given to the small business sector.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is very difficult to isolate where people have obtained jobs. I saw some figures which indicated where this Government has been successful in creating 9 000 or 10 000 new jobs since it came into office. A substantial portion of these are self-employed people—small businesses. I agree that there is tremendous scope, but it is difficult to get accurate statistics on this. The suggestions are that we have been very successful in this area, and we can be much more successful. Despite the high bankruptcy rate amongst small businesses, the national figures show that something like 70 per cent of small businesses that fail do so within their first two years of operation. There are a large number of failures, but also a captive audience for actively and effectively employing people.

Mr SCHMIDT: On page 54 under 'Broad Objectives' it states that it is to protect, strengthen and assist the evolution of existing and new firms. Under the column on 'Specific Targets' it refers to the desire to promote the availability of these services and training programmes. What training programmes are offered by the Unit?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I see one of the prime roles of the Small Business Bureau as being an educational role. It is basically to educate small business people as to what they need to look at, how to manage their organisation, to educate them in accounting procedures, cash flows, where they can obtain finance and how to improve the marketability of their product. We have given some thought to what types of educational programmes should be put on. In fact, we have done it on a trial basis in the southern metropolitan area. It is a good place and we were delighted to receive the support of the Noarlunga Economic Development Board. We received its support and we also carried out a study into the availability of finance in that area. I would like to talk to the honourable member on the findings of that report.

The assessment of that board was that it was an area in which we needed to put a lot of effort in terms of small businesses because so many are available. We will be doing that. Coming back to the education programmes, some are available already. The Australian Institute of Management runs some courses, as do the Department of Further Education and the Workers Education Association. It is a matter of how we co-ordinate the existing programmes and link into those programmes. I do not think we should be setting ourselves up as a major education body. We should be making sure that small business people can use what courses are already available and to ensure that the right courses are available. That will be the role of the new manager when he takes up his position in the bureau.

Mr OSWALD: In relation to the staff that has been added to the Small Business Bureau, what is the total number of field officers (I use that terminology but I am not sure whether it is correct) in the bureau available to go out to consult?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The staff is currently three and it is about to be increased to four with the appointment of a manager. Shortly it will increase to five with the appointment of a further person. All of the staff are in an area where they can go out and be field officers, speak to the public and advise the small business man. They are specifically appointed on the basis of going out to help people. In the staff of five we are not including any secretarial assistance or anything like that.

Mr OSWALD: When we come down to the practicalities, will some be tied to the office structure and consult from there? To quote an example, I am aware of one small business man who had a staff of five, but the staff is now down to one. He is just keeping his business going and has no time to go to the city for consultation. He is relying on someone coming down to his factory. He had to wait many weeks for that to happen. I would like to see that time span shortened considerably so that people in the office can get out to that type of business, as it is those businesses that are teetering between success and failure.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: All staff need to spend some time in the office but equally need to spend time out in the field. They will not be successful in understanding the problems of small business if they sit in the office in the Commercial Union Building and wait for small business people to come and see them. They must get out and feel the environment so that they can understand the problems. There must be a mixture of both. It is inappropriate for me to pre-empt too much what the new manager might want to do in operating his bureau.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say how effective the Small Business Advisory Bureau is in the country and how many calls are received from country areas? Can he also indicate what country areas those calls were received from?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There have been 174 inquiries from the country as opposed to 790 from the metropolitan area. With a staff of only three it has been difficult to get out into regional areas but it is our intention to do so.

Mr HAMILTON: What assistance has been given to those inquiries from the country?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This depends on the nature of the inquiry; if it is one of advice, some of those may be included in the small business consultancy grants. I cannot be certain. They range in nature of activity. I will give the honourable member the classifications of the country inquiries: 16 in agriculture; 4 in mining; 51 in manufacturing; 10 in construction; six in wholesaling; 38 in retailing; nine in transport; five in business services; two in public areas; seven in community services; and 26 in food and entertainment. Without knowing the exact circumstances of each inquiry I cannot answer your question. This covers a broad cross-section of small businesses in country areas. The main assistance given is one of advice and direction as to where they can get further help. A lot of help is given in making sure that the small business person knows where to go and get more detailed and expert advice in the private sector. There are thousands of consultants who can help small businesses; they charge for their services but they can often more readily overcome the problems. It is really a matter of small businessmen finding out what people to go to.

The CHAIRMAN: There are other members who want to ask more questions on small businesses. It is my responsibility to acknowledge the calls. I again bring the matter to the attention of members that there are four more votes. If you continue with the one vote then you will not have time for any of the others.

Mr SCHMIDT: One of the activities of the Small Business Advisory Bureau is the executive support for the Small Business Advisory Council. Can the Minister highlight the functions of the Small Business Advisory Council and the make-up of the council? Can the Minister advise the composition on the Council of persons that would be giving advice to the Government on small business?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The role of the council is to advise the Government on the policies relating to small business; to act as a sounding board for the Government to go to in testing its policies for small business; and to act as a means whereby the Government can feed out to the small business area what it is doing by way of policy and what services it is supplying. They are the three or four main areas of its activity. The council represents a very broad cross-section of small business. It involves manufacturers, retailers and members of associations. The Chairman is Mr Lincoln Rowe, the Director-General of the department. Mr Frank Curtis represents the small business section of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Mr Ron Paddick represents the Mixed Business Association and is Executive Officer of that association. Mr Mark Mau represents the Federated Chamber of Commerce, which is a division of the Employers Federation and represents small businesses in outer metropolitan and country areas. Mr Jack Messenger is an accountant who specialises in the small business area and is, I think, on the Australian Society of Accountants small business policy body. Mr Chisholm is a small businessman involved in manufacturing, and is Managing Director of Alulite. Mr East is a small businessman from Kadina involved in both manufacturing and retailing. Mr Dennison is Executive Officer of the Australian Institute

of Management and takes and interest in this area. Mr Michael Sullivan is the Executive Officer of the council.

Mr OSWALD: What prior qualification and what past experience in the world of small business is required for counsellors?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In selecting the Manager for the Small Business Advisory Bureau we tried to select someone who has academic qualifications as well as plenty of experience in successfully running a small business. When the announcement is finally made I am sure that you will agree that the person is highly qualified and suitable for that appointment. There were 35 applications for that position, so there was good competition. It was difficult to select the best person, but I am confident that he will do a good job, especially as the person involved has experience in the role of educating small business people. He has had a part-time job in doing this. Perhaps the Director-General could give more detailed information on the background of the three staff members.

Mr Rowe: The Senior Counsellor is Mr Ron Manuel, who is an accountant and had experience in running his own business and was with Email for quite a time. He has been in this type of work for some years and is well received. The other member is a man who was at one time with the Industrial Research Institute and is now a counsellor for those wishing to start a small business. He lectures on that subject at the Workers Education Association on a part-time basis. The third member is a contact officer at the desk and is a charming young lady who is both sympathetic and understanding. She hands out on average over 220 check lists each month to those who are considering starting a small business. This check list has so many questions that, if you are capable of running the course and understanding them, then you have the qualities necessary to succeed in small business.

Mr WHITTEN: Under 'Contingencies', I refer to payments to consultants (on which there has been a deal of discussion tonight). I notice that in 1980-81 there was \$75 000 allocated but only \$68 965 spent. It is proposed this year to escalate some 300 per cent to \$195 000. What caused the escalation? Is it intended to use more consultants than have been used in the past?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The department found that it is important to get the right person to do a particular job, and a good way of doing this is to use consultants. Consultants pick up special expertise that normally would not be available in a department and would be difficult to maintain on a regular basis.

That covers a fair range of areas, but the biggest cost is \$125 000 for consultants for Technology Park, Adelaide, which is the high technology manufacturing area. These consultants were planning people. Hassell Planners was the group involved, and they have done a lot of the site analysis work for Technology Park along with, I think, some of the drainage work with Tonkin and Associates.

Mr WHITTEN: I am disappointed that the Minister has made an announcement about Technology Park prior to his getting any authority or any reference from the Public Works Committee. Am I in order, Mr Chairman, in following this line?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member wants to ask the Minister what is the procedure, or has a matter to come before the Public Works Standing Committee been pre-empted by an announcement.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you for your guidance, Sir. I am disappointed that the Minister would make such an announcement. The amount involved is \$4 500 000. He mentioned Technology Park. I am not aggressive, but I think that the Minister is wrong in pre-empting something that should come before the Public Works Standing Com-

mittee, and he made the announcement before that committee received the reference.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: As Minister of Public Works, and as the Minister who has the ultimate responsibility, I suppose, at Ministerial level for the Public Works Standing Committee, I am only too aware of the role of the committee and of the requirements of the Act, especially as I have been looking at the Act as requested by the committee; I have been looking at amendments.

To start with, the consultantcies I have referred to here were planning consultantcies in the broadest sense: they were looking at the scope, the style of management, and everything else; a concept of setting up a high technology park. The Public Works Standing Committee have a responsibility in terms of physical construction, and that is its sole responsibility; it is not responsible in terms of industrial development policy. That is outside of the scope of the committee, and I think the honourable member realises that. The requirements of the Act say that if money is to be spent on physical work then, before money is spent, it must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, if it is an amount greater than \$500 000. There has been no pre-emption of that; we have announced a concept, a marketing drive, and we have not gone out and started work. If we were pre-empting the committee, and therefore breaching the Act, we would be going up and starting work on site in which the honourable member would be quite right in criticising me, as Minister of Public Works. We have been very careful; we have not breached the terms or the spirit of the Act in any way whatsoever. Executive Council did refer the matter to the committee. I appreciate the fact that the committee has not yet had a chance to meet and consider the physical aspects of drainage involved in association with Technology Park.

I would refer the honourable member to a long-standing practice in which school committees and communities have been asked to make their contributions to schools and school planning for periods of two or three years before the matter has ever been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. I would take great exception if there was any suggestion that the announcement and the function held at Technology Park last Friday was an attempt to pre-empt the Public Works Standing Committee, because it was not in any way. That announcement was largely a launching of the marketing drive so that we could go out and bring this to the attention of companies outside of this State.

Mr WHITTEN: I apologise to you, Mr Chairman, for any embarrassment I may have caused, but I still believe that the Minister did pre-empt the function of the Public Works Standing Committee. I suggest we may leave it there.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Mr Chairman, I would still like to know in what way we pre-empted it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Sir. I think the matter ought to be taken between the Committee, yourself, and the Minister. It is only wasting the time of committee. This argument could go on and I have questions still to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: I would uphold the point of order, but I do not want to deny the Minister the opportunity of replying.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I am quite happy, and I think it is appropriate for the matter to be taken up between the Committee and the Minister. I would still defend this—and this has everything to do with the Department of Trade and Industry, which we are talking about. Last Friday we were launching the marketing concept of Technology Park.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Point of order, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule that the matter be dropped. Are there any further questions? There being no

further questions I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$10 180 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr E. S. Ashenden
Mr H. Becker
Mr K. C. Hamilton
Mr J. K. G. Oswald
Mr K. H. Plunkett
Mr I. Schmidt
Mr G. T. Whitten
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. G. Rowe, Director-General, Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr H. R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment.

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

Mr I. J. Kowalick, Deputy Director-General, Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr D. J. Martin, Director, Assistance and Services, Department of Trade and Industry.

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

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

Mr ASHENDEN: I would like to ask the Minister whether he has had any formal discussions with the officers involved with the Federal Government in relation to the possibility of CITY taking in the area presently covered by CYSS. I believe this could be a very valuable and useful marriage (I use that term in inverted commas) between the two programmes, which obviously provide tremendous assistance to the young unemployed here in South Australia, and I know the Minister's feelings in this area. If he has not had any formal discussion would he be considering such discussions to see whether such an agreement could be arrived at between the two Governments?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Yes, there have been discussions; there has been correspondence, and I have raised the matter at the Ministers conference. The South Australian Government would only be too happy to take over the administration of the CYSS programme here in South Australia, and to operate that through the CITY programme, which it already administers, provided the Federal Government was willing to give it the appropriate funds to do it. The Federal Government, as you would know, has decided to continue the CYSS and has said that, by February next year, it will come out with new guidelines for its operation. I will certainly be taking the matter up once again with the Federal Minister since he has made this announcement, although I have written to him since the more recent announcement, again putting the point that we are only too willing to administer this programme in this State.

We say that because we believe we have considerable experience in the CITY team. We believe that we have run

a very effective campaign. A recent survey of those who had been involved in CITY showed that 1 200 people have been involved in the scheme in the past 12 months and, furthermore, of those we could contact and who responded to our survey, 40 per cent had employment and a further 20 per cent had taken on formal training within a period of three months of leaving CITY. Obviously, because of that, the latter 20 per cent are more likely to get employment. We had taken a group of people who had been long-term unemployed and 60 per cent of them now appear destined to have a job or are about to get a job. I think that is a real tribute to the people who run the CITY programme, particularly David Turner, and, if the CYSS programme could produce similar results, I am sure that the Federal Government would be delighted. That is why we have offered to take over its programme.

I urge one word of caution to those who may say that last year we spent \$144 900 on the CITY programme here and this year we are proposing \$137 000. The total allocation for CITY has been increased but more has been allocated for wages this year than was allocated last year and, if we take wages and operating expenses and put them together, we see that there has been an increase, I think, from about \$300 000 to about \$317 000. Overall, there is an increased allocation to the CITY programme.

Mr SCHMIDT: The Minister has mentioned something to which I was going to refer, namely, the Budget allocation of \$137 000. Could the Minister point out where the other funds will come from to make up the \$317 000 of which he has spoken?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: These are specific grants for projects but the salaries are under the salaries line for the department. The figure proposed in 1980-81 was \$282 000 and we spent \$301 000. One reason for the increase was that I put a half-time worker in the southern metropolitan districts for the member for Mawson, and I also put a half-time worker in the northern metropolitan districts of Elizabeth and Salisbury. I know that the people in those areas, particularly the local councils, greatly appreciated that. I thank the member for Mawson for the role that he played in making sure that such a service was provided. This year we are increasing the total allocation, which is for staff and grants, from \$301 000 to \$316 000. I can assure the honourable member that his half-time worker will continue, this time on a 12-month basis.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I refer to page 32 of volume 2 of the Programme Estimates. In the left-hand column, we see the Minister's projections, telling us, in the second paragraph, that:

While some tradesmen are unemployed, elderly and disadvantaged people often have no means of carrying out minor repairs and essential maintenance on their homes.

Another comment in the second column is:

1980-1981 specific targets/objectives (significant initiatives/improvements/achievements).

The equitable and efficient distribution of funds for home handyman services to local government.

I commended that when I read it, but when I checked with the Budget, I found that the home handyman scheme, which I believe has served the disadvantaged people of South Australia who need some help, as it has been described by the Minister, has been almost abolished, if not abolished. From a vote last year of \$350 000, only \$286 000 was spent. This year, the allocation is \$15 000, which would hardly cover the cost of running the scheme. The Government had its priorities right when it first came to office, as it picked up the home handyman scheme, which was a product of the Labor Government and one of my ideas in the first place. I thought that the scheme had been well received by the community. I was delighted when I saw

the Government keep it going for the first two years, but now I am disappointed that the Government has decided to almost cancel the scheme. What has brought on this decision by the Government? Is it pure economics, or what is the purpose of almost abolishing what I would consider to be an extremely popular and well worthwhile community assistance programme?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If the honourable member looks at the top of page 32 of the Programme Estimates, he will find that the programme sector we are looking at is 'Employment development'. We did an assessment, therefore, as to whether or not (and this is the whole purpose of programme performance budgeting) the programme or the specific task being carried out by the department was meeting the objective for which it was established. The home handyman scheme was established to create employment for unemployed people, and it comes under the programme 'Employment development'.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: A bit more than that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: With due respect, the scheme as picked up by the department was a home handyman scheme to help employment. We looked at how many jobs it was creating. On a full-time basis, if all the participants involved were strung together in terms of man equivalent years we found that it created 27 jobs on a full-time basis. Frankly, in terms of return for investment, that was pitiful. An analogy is the groups apprenticeship scheme. For a contribution of, I think, \$25 000 from the State Government, with some Loan funds, it has created about 90 first-year apprentices. These people can go on and serve an effective role as tradesmen, yet under this home handyman scheme with an allocation of \$350 000, we were creating employment for only 27 people. Therefore, in terms of allocating priorities in the department and creating employment in our community, it did not rank highly.

We see a need to assist these elderly people, and the role of assisting them has been transferred from this programme and department to two other areas. The first is the community service order system, which has been established under the Department of Correctional Services and which has been implemented for the first time. Such orders do not relate to offenders who are not hardened criminals, as people like to suggest. They relate to people who have invariably been caught for driving under the influence. As the result of amendments to the Act such people are now required to serve the community under such an order, rather than go to gaol.

We are going to use those people to carry on the functions which were previously carried out under the home handyman scheme. Those guidelines, which applied to that scheme, are the same guidelines which we have used in negotiations with the trade union movement as to how we should operate the community service order system. So that need in the community as read out by the honourable member that elderly and disadvantaged people often have no means of carrying out minor repairs and essential maintenance to their home will be picked up by the Government under another area of the Government's programme, that is, correctional services and the community service order. In addition, the Government has now agreed to do the same type of community service order for youth offenders, and that will pick up the same area.

I would expect that the total contribution that the Government will make in that area, once the community service order system has been well established, will in fact significantly increase the amount of help available in this area to the elderly, particularly to pensioners and the disadvantaged, who do not have the financial resources to repair their own homes. I stress that we are using very similar guidelines. It was stressed that the community service

orders should not take away work normally done by paid employees, but rather should provide for community service work on projects that would otherwise not be done. I believe we have achieved through this readjustment of the programme and how it is done exactly the same effect and service to the community, but we are doing it far more effectively because here we are relocating our funds to areas that will have a far more beneficial effect in creating jobs and, at the same time, we are still assisting those elderly and disadvantaged people in the community.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I hope it works out as well as the Minister contends. I still think that the other scheme was excellent. Why was the actual spending on youth employment schemes in 1980-81 well below proposed spending? I understand the actual amount involved was \$591 000 compared with the \$646 000 allocated. These amounts include spending on three schemes: youth policy development, self-employment venture schemes and pay-roll tax rebate scheme. At page 112 of his report the Auditor-General referred to under-spending on pay-roll tax rebates for the second year in a row.

I must admit that I have had much difficulty in trying to obtain the amounts that the Minister is making available for incentives to industry. They seem to be bulked together. I refer to the following schemes: establishment payments scheme, motor vehicle industry assistance scheme, export bridging finance scheme, pay-roll tax rebate scheme for youth workers and rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax for decentralised industry. An amount of \$9 300 000 is proposed. Where can I pick up in the Budget papers the actual allowances for those items, because I cannot find them?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The specific answer to the question is 'Yes, the information is available in the Programme Performance Budget'. I draw the honourable member's attention to pages 49, 51 and 53. Those pages cover pay-roll tax and land tax rebates for decentralised industry, the motor vehicles scheme, the establishment payments scheme and bridging finance loans scheme. The youth pay-roll tax incentive scheme is dealt with elsewhere. All of that information is available in the Performance Budget Programme.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for that information, because I tried desperately to locate it.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In the bottom right-hand corner of page 49 of volume 4, reference is made to the motor vehicles scheme and it includes provision for grants to industry \$1 000 000 (1981-82). The one below includes provision for grants to industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: How did the Minister know that the first one dealt with the motor vehicle industry?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Perhaps I should put names to them. The first one relates to the motor vehicles industry assistance scheme. The one immediately below it with two stars relates to the establishment payments scheme. The one over the page relates to the bridging finance loans scheme, which is specified there. On page 53, there is provision for pay-roll tax and land tax rebates.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What is the amount of the youth employment pay-roll tax scheme that has been allowed this year?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The provision for the youth employment pay-roll tax scheme is \$400 000 and the provision for land tax is about \$20 000 of that \$5 500 000.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: So it is reasonable to say that the youth employment pay-roll tax scheme has been a complete failure, going from \$2 000 000 to \$400 000.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No. I do not know where the honourable member gets the figure of \$2 500 000 or whatever the figure that he quoted was. I believe that the pay-roll tax scheme, together with the other initiatives that we have undertaken, has been quite successful. To March this

year a total of 2 883 young people below the age of 21 were employed on the basis of that scheme. I think that any scheme that finds jobs for 2 800 people is a successful one. I will ask my officers to obtain a more up-to-date figure, because March is six months away, and I can assure the honourable member that the figure has increased substantially since then. The interesting fact is that, with regard to youth unemployment in this State, whilst we have still a major unemployment problem, the one area where there has been a very significant drop has been youth unemployment. I think I am correct in saying that there has been a drop of between 4 000 to 5 000 young people unemployed in this State during the last 12 months. I believe one of the contributing factors has been the incentive schemes offered by the Government. I know of one company which specifically took on a large number of young people under this scheme. I believe it is a very beneficial scheme which encourages employers to take on young people. When a success like that is achieved, that is, a significant drop in youth unemployment, I think the Government should be complimented on the various schemes used to achieve such a result.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: While the Minister is providing me with the up-to-date figure, will he also provide me with the names of people employed under the scheme, who they work for, whether they are still working for those employers or in fact what has happened to them? I do not believe that 2 800 people have been employed under this scheme. The amount of money made available and spent does not add up to that figure. There is no question about that. Has the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment done any analysis of the effectiveness of the Pay-roll Tax Refund Scheme for Youth Employment? If so, what is the department's view of the effectiveness of the scheme and will the Minister provide it publicly?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I point out to the honourable member that there are two specific parts to this scheme. The first is that employees taken on under the age of 21 are exempted from pay-roll tax, if they are additional employees and continue to be employed by that company—they must be additional: one cannot substitute by laying people off, employing other young people, and claiming a pay-roll tax rebate. There is also a specific cash grant for the first and second young person taken on by each employer under that scheme. The direct cash grant was, I believe, \$600 for the first person taken on and \$1 800 for the second person taken on.

With those two parts of the scheme, the total number of people who have been assisted is 2 883. The number of employers who have applied for exemptions under the pay-roll tax exemption part of the scheme is 545. The figure of 2 883 is the number of people who have participated in the entire scheme. That is a significant contribution. As to whether I will make the information available about who the persons were and who the employers were and for what period they were employed—of course I will not. The honourable member wrote to me and asked for that information. It would take literally months and a number of staff members to get that sort of information. It would be a waste of effort. I am satisfied that these people are genuinely employed. We were very careful in drawing up the original guidelines to make sure that the scheme could not be abused. This scheme has been in operation for almost two years. It is interesting that in that two-year period I have not received a single complaint that the scheme has been abused, even though we have helped that number of people.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not want to belabour this question but I asked the Minister whether the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment had done an analysis

of the effectiveness of the Pay-roll Tax Refund Scheme for Youth Employment. He has not answered as to whether the department has done that analysis or not. I want to know whether they have or have not.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment did a report on the scheme last year.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister make that report public? If not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No. We do not make public reports prepared for Ministers.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have no more questions.

Mr ASHENDEN: I refer also to the line 'Incentives to industry'. I would like to preface my remarks by saying how pleased I am to see such a large increase in the amount proposed this year over the amount actually spent last year. I was wondering whether the Minister could give the Committee some idea as to the area covered by the establishment payments scheme, as to where he sees the increased spending being allocated; in other words, the type of industry that he expects to attract to South Australia and the employment opportunities that he sees going with the investment that the South Australian Government will be putting into that area.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Because of the nature of the scheme, it does involve a payment after the company has made a commitment to expand. The problem has been that we get the company to establish. We will not actually make the payment for that until the next financial year in most cases. In some cases it may be a further year down the track. If I remember rightly, we make two payments—one after three months and one after 12 months. In 1980-81 actual assistance was given to 26 companies as grants. Funds approved amounted to \$2 157 000, and total estimated increase in employment through that scheme was 1 539 people. I think that is a very significant achievement, and I believe that under the new guidelines, the establishment payments scheme is proving to be a very beneficial scheme.

As to the type of company, I will quickly run through some of the companies involved that at least have had their expansions announced publicly. I do not want to give too much detail because in fact we have promised not to disclose specific information about any one company and assistance given, because it would give commercial information to their competitors. The companies include Abbots (Australia) Pty Ltd; Aunger Plastics; and Bowman Manufacturing, I think, has been announced publicly. Delta West is setting up a facility here in the medical supply area; Fasson has announced expansion. We have talked of Raytheon International, the word processing company. We assisted, partly through this and partly through the motor vehicle area, General Motors-Holden's in establishing its new plastics division in this State. Grundfos Pumps is a wellknown company that was established with assistance in this area, as is Gitcham Transport. I am being a little selective because I do not want to name companies that have not already announced their development. Omak (Aust.) is one company that has gone into producing steel railway sleepers, which will be used outside the State, particularly in the North-West area of Australia. Port Augusta East Motel is another one, as is Seeley Brothers, another case of a high technology instrument company involved. Another payment to a company in the building products area, involving 70 jobs, has also been approved. That is just a range of the sort of companies involved. As I said, a total of 26 companies has been involved all told in just the 1980-81 year.

Mr ASHENDEN: It is obvious that the Minister has a considerable degree of confidence in this area. As a member

of the Industries Development Committee, I am pleased to see that. However, I am concerned that a fellow member of the Industries Development Committee, who is a member of the Opposition, has stated in the House on two or three occasions that he is opposed to the increased allocation for the establishment payments scheme. He has stated that he considers it is not money well spent and mentioned a figure of \$3 000 per job for the jobs that have been attained. I dispute that, and say that, even if it is \$3 000 a job, it is money well spent. Will the Minister comment on the allegations, as I have briefly outlined them, that the Opposition member is making in relation to what I regard as an extremely worthwhile scheme?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I can give specific information to the honourable member on that. The cost in dollar terms per job created under the scheme, until the end of the 1979 financial year, was \$1 480 per job created. In 1979-80 the cost was \$2 386 per job created. In 1980-81 the cost was \$1 839 per job created. In 1980 we revised the guidelines, and that would be why there was a drop. In the financial year of 1981 the cost has been \$1 081 per job. Any claim that it is costing \$3 000 a job is not accurate. The current cost is about \$1 000 per job. This is only for the first few jobs established. It has been our experience that many of the companies involved will expand considerably after that. The record under the establishment payments scheme, especially under the new guidelines, has been one of tremendous success. Only one company which applied for an E.P.S. where approval was given did not meet its full commitment and went into liquidation or receivership. I assure the honourable member that no payment was made: that is one of the safeguards of the system, that companies have to meet their target before they receive any payment. It is excellent value for the dollar spent. Any other State would relish a scheme which, for the cost of \$1 000, created jobs which were oriented at marketing outside their State, and which were obviously just the nucleus of building on many more jobs within that organisation.

Mr ASHENDEN: I have an involvement with the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance Scheme. I realise the Minister cannot give specific details in relation to the companies or the projects the companies have in mind. Will the Minister give an indication of where he sees the major assistance by this Government, in relation to the motor vehicle industry in South Australia, which is the backbone of the availability of employment in South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The total commitment under the Motor Vehicle Industries Assistance Scheme during 1980-81 was \$843 511.28. A fairly significant list of companies was involved. The most significant area was in the alloy casting area. There is no doubt that our assistance to two companies, Castalloy and ROH, has been of immense value to those companies in upgrading their technology and then going out and winning substantial orders in Australia and, ultimately, I think, overseas.

Another substantial area is plastics development, and I mentioned the G.M.H. plastics plant, which is a very significant new step in terms of new technologies for the automotive industry. Another significant area is the development of new trim for vehicles, and I would not like to mention the company involved in that. There are other areas involving about 25 companies. I have the exact details. Twenty companies were formally assisted during 1980-81.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Minister would see this type of assistance continuing in the coming year?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Most certainly. The allocation this year is \$1 000 000.

Mr SCHMIDT: My question relates to the pay-roll tax rebate scheme for youth workers. What payments have been made in this respect and what has been the return for

that payment in regard to the employment of young people? Has the return been costed on a cost per job analysis? The group apprenticeship scheme involved \$555 per job, and CITY involved \$627 per job. How do these costs compare to the pay-roll tax concessions?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I did not give the cost per job. It was about \$1 000 under the E.P.S. scheme. I did not give a cost per job in regard to the other scheme. I gave some figures, and the honourable member should look at *Hansard* to see what they are. Until March this year, taking the combined scheme (and there are two parts), 2 883 people had been assisted under that scheme through 545 employers.

The CHAIRMAN: If the information has been given before today, the honourable member can obtain it from *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It would be very difficult to work out the cost per job, because of the nature of the scheme and because two parts are involved.

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

Public Buildings, \$52 940 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr L. M. F. Arnold
Mr E. S. Ashenden
Mr H. Becker
Mr K. C. Hamilton
Mr J. K. G. Oswald
Mr I. Schmidt
Mr G. T. Whitten
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

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

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

Mr R. W. Johns, Director, Programme Management, Public Buildings Department.

Mr F. E. Crosby, Acting Executive Director, Public Buildings Department.

Mr B. A. Morrison, Acting Director, Programme Management, Other Government Buildings, Public Buildings Department.

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

Mr BECKER: My question relates to rent on unoccupied buildings, and I assume that the Property Services Division looks after that area. Can the Minister say how much rent was paid to S.G.I.C. prior to the Attorney-General's Department calling it up for occupancy? I understand that the Attorney-General's Department and the courts moved in there recently (although I do not know whether all the courts are in there), and that the premises had been vacant for quite some time and also the courts are in there. I want to know when rental was first paid, when the accommodation was first occupied and why there was a delay.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think honourable members need to appreciate the sort of basis on which, first, we rent a premises and then do the appropriate fittings. It is not just a matter of renting the accommodation and moving in the next day. Where one is taking over a new building, such as the S.G.I.C. Building, one first rents the space and then has to commission it. The commissioning of a building like that, with a cost of approximately \$1 000 000 involved, is a very substantial job, and one runs into a number of problems. I will highlight some of the delays.

The first is that one needs to go to the Public Works Standing Committee to get its approval. We are prohibited from taking any action in terms of building work until that committee has actually reported. I am sure that the honourable member who was here earlier and who was protecting the legal rights of the Public Works Standing Committee would be the first to object if we moved in and started working. I am sure that you, Mr Chairman, as Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, would be the first to object if we moved in and started work. Another member of that committee has just entered the Chamber; he also would object (knowing that member) if we moved in and started any work before the Public Works Standing Committee had actually reported.

So, that is the first substantial delay, over which we have no power. Unless the honourable member is trying to suggest that we breach the Act or that we should abolish the Public Works Standing Committee and no longer be required to go through that provision, I am afraid that we are subject to that condition. Although we are paying rental for the building, we must face that delay. Contracts have now been let, and certainly we moved in with the Attorney-General as quickly as we could. I think I am right in saying that we could do the commissioning work on that because it was less than the total amount required to go to the Public Works Standing Committee.

For the rest of the contract work, that is not the case, and so it has had to be reported on. The contract has been let. It was let, I think, about a month ago. The other problem we have with this is that it is extremely difficult while you have a contractor on site or near the building, completing the building, as to how you let contracts for commissioning work. I have never appreciated the difficulties were so great in moving into a new building where you need to work out the design for the new building and the commissioning costs, let contracts, and get around all the restrictions you have because there is already a contractor on site and you cannot bring on a new contractor until the old contractor has left the site.

Mr BECKER: Can you answer the question, please? How much is the rental? When was the rental first paid? When was the accommodation first occupied and did the Public Works Standing Committee delay? Is this part of the bureaucratic process of holding up and frustrating your department?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I would object if there was any suggestion that the Public Works Standing Committee was a bureaucratic organisation that was deliberately trying to hold up my department. I would be the first to defend it. What I am saying is that Parliament in its wisdom has decided there is a certain legal procedure one has to go through, and there are certain disadvantages by having that legal procedure. We have to accept the disadvantages along with the advantages. I would be the first to say that I believe the Public Works Standing Committee has many overall advantages and that we should maintain the system, but there are some inherent disadvantages as well, and we have to be prepared to live with those. We do not have the information available that the honourable member is requesting, but I will certainly get it for him.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I note that the wages vote last year was \$25 900 000. There was an actual payment of \$26 461 000, and this year \$20 000 000 is proposed. Most wages bills throughout Australia at the moment, with inflation, wage indexation and pay increases, are going up, so one has to assume that there has been a very big reduction in staff. From what I have been able to learn, looking at the cut in personnel from properties and building construction services, it that that has been reduced from 401 to 295. What has happened to that staff? Where were they relocated? How many voluntary retirements or compulsory transfers were involved? Just what, in fact, has happened to the staff?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Are you referring to page 465 and the reduction from 401 to 295?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Two main areas have brought about the reduction in personnel and therefore the reduction in wage demand. The first is the significant reduction in the personnel, particularly weekly-paid people, within the department. That has been contributed to by a policy of no replacement unless it is absolutely essential, the early voluntary retirement scheme, and transfer to other areas or other Government departments.

The other significant area of reduction is that the maintenance services of hospitals have been transferred from the Public Buildings Department to the Health Commission, and those figures take that into account. I will get the Director to give the exact figures, but you are looking at the transfer of a considerable number of people who are actually physically located within the hospital and who have previously been on the pay-roll of the Public Buildings Department but who, under terms of an agreement negotiated with the United Trades and Labor Council, are now part of the Health Commission and come under the direct administration of the Health Commission. Perhaps Mr Roger could give the exact figures of the number of persons who were transferred there.

Mr Roeger: Right at the end of the last financial year, we transferred all personnel in Government hospitals apart from Glenside and Hillcrest to the Health Commission. There were 290 weekly-paid employees and 21 salaried employees. Towards the end of this calendar year, we expect to transfer the employees at Glenside and Hillcrest also to the mental health institutions, and there is a figure of 11 salaried people and 159 weekly-paid people that will transfer then.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I caution members that, when they are looking at changes in personnel levels, before jumping to too many conclusions, they should be aware of a number of significant changes that have occurred and that the reduction is due to a number of factors rather than only one.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I take it from the example that the Minister has given that the majority of these people who, for whatever reasons, have gone off the pay-roll of the Public Buildings Department, are in the main wages employees, not salaried employees.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Weekly-paid, yes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Could I get some idea of how many people actually left the employment of the Government? I am not talking about people transferred from one department to another. I am trying to get at how many people have left the employment of the Government, whether it was a choice to leave through the voluntary retirement scheme, or by natural attrition, or for whatever reasons. How many wages employees have left in the past 12 months?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Under the early voluntary retirement scheme, 188 people left the department. As to those

who left for other causes, I would need to get that exact information. It is not available.

Mr BECKER: It may help the Committee to know that at page 158 of the Auditor-General's Report, it states that there is a reduction in salaried staff of 32 and of wages staff 579, making a total of 611.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That is correct, the number in the department reduced by 611 during 1980-81, but we need to take into account some transfers to other areas of government, some early voluntary retirements, and some leaving the Government service altogether.

Mr BECKER: On the line 'Wages', I am referring to page 158 of the Auditor-General's Report. I assume this is the area that the employment of private consultants comes in. The Auditor-General states:

In order to meet the demands of the building programme the department also engages private consultants—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Before the member proceeds, I say that employment of consultants does not come under 'Wages'.

Mr BECKER: It comes under 'Professional services', does it?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Most of the consultants are employed under the Loan works programme, because they are employed on specific projects.

Mr BECKER: You are telling me it does not come anywhere in this at all?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It comes under the Loan works programme, which we are yet to come to. That is not absolute but the majority would be under the Loan works programme.

The CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the honourable Minister (the member for Hanson has asked a question) whether it would come under 'Professional services'? Would there be consultants' fees?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There are some under that area, because we employ some consultants. For instance, one is looking at an asset register. That would certainly come under that professional area. There is another under the organisational review but, if you are referring to the normal professional fees for architects, quantity surveyors and engineers, that comes under the Loan works programme.

Mr BECKER: I do not agree with that; I cannot see that at all. It relates to the overall administration of the department. Someone has to be responsible for the overall administration of personnel employed in the department.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I do not quite know what the honourable member is confused about. You have asked where we pay the fees for consultants from. From the line you picked out under professional services we pay \$149 000 for consultants, but the major line for consultants, in terms of architects fees and consulting engineers, comes out of the Loan works fund for specific projects.

Mr BECKER: I was referring to page 158 of the Auditor-General's Report, and I was reading out the preliminary of the Auditor-General in relation to what he has here relating to the employment of private consultants. He then states that the 1981 figure includes the law courts project, particulars of which were: architects \$448 000; engineers \$52 000. Are any of the personnel of the department involved in this law courts project and, if so, how much is concerned? Will there be reimbursement from the client in this case?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: This is difficult, because one staff member from the Public Buildings Department was seconded to the private architectural firm for the period of the project and, as I understand it, all costs associated with that will be reimbursed to the department. They will be reimbursed by the private architects back to the P.B.D. There are other P.B.D. professionals involved in the law

courts project, who are not included in these amounts here. For instance, the project manager was paid for by the Public Buildings Department, as well as structural engineers, mechanical engineers and quantity surveyors, but they are not included in those professional consulting fees there. They are repaid to the department from the law courts project; in other words, we act as a consultant and we get paid the normal consulting fee.

Mr BECKER: Are you able to say how many staff from the P.B.D. have been seconded to the law courts project, and what classifications are involved?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I ask Mr Roeger to give that answer.

Mr Roeger: Our structural engineers, mechanical and quantity surveyors have been involved during the process of the project. I would think the maximum would have been about fifty at any one time, but the number would vary in accordance with the work being done at the time.

Mr BECKER: In other words, the situation changes as the work goes on.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If the work load varies.

Mr BECKER: But you could be fully reimbursed by the Superannuation Fund for the whole cost involved.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further questions, I declare the examination of this vote completed.

Works and Services—Public Buildings Department,
\$64 600 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr L. M. F. Arnold
Mr E. S. Ashenden
Mr H. Becker
Mr K. C. Hamilton
Mr J. K. G. Oswald
Mr I. Schmidt
Mr G. T. Whitten
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

The Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works.

Departmental Advisers:

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

Mr N. R. Nosworthy, Manager, Programming and Budgeting Services.

Mr R. W. Johns, Director, Programme Management.

Mr F. E. Crosby, Acting Executive Director, Public Buildings Department.

Mr B. A. Morrison, Acting Director, Programme Management, Other Government Buildings.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I have about ten questions, and I may be pushed for time. Some questions can be easily answered by information printed later in *Hansard*. I am willing to receive the replies in that way, if the Minister is willing to give them in that way. My first question is not such a question. Acknowledging that student numbers have declined in the past few years from 233 000 in 1977-78 in the primary and secondary systems to 212 000 at the start of this financial year, there is still a decline in the per capita involvement of capital Loan funds from \$188.63 to \$122.53. That seems to fly in the face of the recommen-

dations of the Schools Commission Report for the forthcoming triennium, which makes that point in section 11.23, as follows:

On the basis of detailed planned capital expenditure programmes it is apparent that States have not provided in public schools needed capital facilities valued at \$1 030 000 000. The commission believes such a shortfall over the past triennium is unacceptably high, particularly in the light of the hiatus in enrolment growth. The opportunity should be grasped in the 1980s to make significant inroads into the backlog of capital works needed to modernise a large number of Australian schools.

While I acknowledge that the numbers have declined and that must of necessity reduce facilities, we still have a great many facilities that need upgrading and replacement by Public Works Committee acknowledgement, yet there has been a significant drop in the per capita amount spent even for those students still in the system.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There are a couple of points I would like to make. The quotation that the honourable member has used is in fact a very general remark by the commission for the whole of Australia. It is not a specific comment about the capital facilities here in South Australia.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It does make some references to that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It is fair to say that the capital facilities that we have here in South Australia are as good as any capital facilities in other States in the education sector. One needs only to go around some of the other States to see the standards. I refer to some of the inner city schools in Sydney—they are a disgrace. One needs to take into account that the report refers also to the other five-sixths of Australia and the other nine-tenths of Australia's population when making that comment. The honourable member will also realise that there is a substantial reduction in real terms, and there has been for a number of years, in the loan allocation from Loan Council.

That is beyond the control of this Government. The honourable member can jump up and scream and yell as much as he likes, but this Government has no control over what the Loan Council allocates to us as a Government. All we can do is take that allocation, which has been reduced, and divide it as best we can between the various priorities that we see here in this State.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Supplementary to that question, I accept the problems regarding Loan Council funding, but that would not itself impinge directly on the ratio or proportion of the Loan funds available that are allocated to education buildings. From a peak of 54.5 per cent in 1979-80 they have fallen this year to 40.2 per cent, so there has been a reallocation within the funds that are available.

The Hon. Dean Brown: I do not deny that for a moment. When we came to office we were left in the unfortunate plight that a number of capital facilities in this State outside the education sector had been allowed to run down to an appalling state.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Like what?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Like the Adelaide Gaol, which is an absolute disgrace, and it is a disgrace on the former Government. It is a disgrace that for nine years the former Government did absolutely nothing in terms of physically altering, upgrading or providing new facilities to replace the Adelaide Gaol, except to come up with grand announcements and plans.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: You have done nothing.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That is not correct. We have, for the first time, referred plans to the Public Works Standing Committee. It is well known that the Government intends to proceed as quickly as possible with this matter. A site has been selected, and it is our intention to build a new remand centre as quickly as possible. I know why that occurred. It happened because the previous, long-standing Labor Premier in this State said that there were no votes in criminals and housing criminals. It reached the point

where it was an absolute disgrace to the extent that the Industrial Commission said that the conditions were not fit for people to be employed there. When it said that, the commission was referring to prison officers.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: How has that affected you? You have not spent any money there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Salisbury has the call, and the Minister is answering a question asked by him.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If Opposition members are foolish enough to lead with their chin, they deserve to have it smashed well and truly. That is exactly what is occurring, because they decided that those capital facilities outside the education sector should be allowed to run down, because there were no votes in that area, to the point of an absolute public disgrace. This Government has had the difficult task of having to re-direct funds, partly away from education and partly from other areas, to make sure that some of those public disgraces can be corrected as soon as possible.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister has implied that the relative needs of the Education Department have fallen compared to other needs in the system. I am not sure that the amount of money that has in fact been diverted away from capital works and education has, in fact, gone to the other demands that the Minister has indicated. If he is prepared to give those figures as to where it has gone, I may accept his point. In 1970, the Karmel Committee of Inquiry found that, regarding new places required in the education system over the period 1970-81, 41 200 new places were needed in the primary sector and 21 400 needed in the secondary sector. As to the replacement of obsolete and temporary buildings, an ongoing demand in the education system, as, I am sure Mr Johns would agree, the figure was put at 100 000 places for the primary sector and 30 000 places for the secondary sector.

I realise that the Minister will probably have to provide the answers to my question later, so that it can be inserted in *Hansard*, and I am prepared to accept that. What is the present state of need for new school accommodation and replacement accommodation, and how many places in each category have been provided over the period 1970 to 1981? In other words, following the Karmel Committee recommendations in 1970, how did we do in the 1970 to 1981 period in meeting those needs. What is the residue still left over to be met, and what is the current state of play in 1981 for the next 10-year period?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I will have to get that detailed information, if it is at all feasible to get it. I do not know how difficult it will be to get that sort of analysis over a 10-year period.

I would imagine that it would be extremely difficult to do an analysis for the next 10 years. The honourable member asked me to produce evidence as to where the Government has redirected these finances. I draw his attention to the 'Other Government Buildings' programme where the allocation has been increased from \$18 670 000 for 1980-1981 to \$25 700 000 for 1981-1982.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister is still \$3 000 000 short.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If ever there was proof of a reallocation, that is it. In relation to being \$3 000 000 short, I have already made the point that the funds just were not allocated by the loan works programme.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is \$3 000 000 in relativity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Salisbury will have an opportunity when the Minister is finished.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I have finished, Mr Chairman.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I have a further question in relation to building proposals. Is it proposed to proceed with the redevelopment of Linden Park Primary School, Pinna-roo Area School and Rendelsham Primary School? If so, when is it anticipated that the Public Works Standing Committee will give them consideration; and when, subject to Public Works Standing Committee approving them, can it be expected that work will commence and the projects be completed? I am sure that the Minister is aware of approaches on this matter.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Government is attempting to reassess the list of priorities in terms of where the greatest need exists. Up until now it has basically been up to the individual education region to assess its priorities. There has been no assessment of priorities between regions. For the first time we are now looking at a list of priorities in relation to the entire State. Even though a need is within a region, the Director of Education would assess what he saw as the immediate need. His information would then be fed into assessing the State's overall priority. I am only too well aware of a school like Linden Park, which is in my own electorate.

When I sat down and talked to people from that school I found that they were disgusted because, in fact, their school had been put off the priority list for the last eight or nine years. They understood that they were second on the priority list back in 1971-1972. However, they are still not on the priority list. I find it incredible that the previous Government for seven or eight years apparently put them No. 2 on the priority list, but never managed to give them any new school buildings. Perhaps that is because the school is situated in a safe Liberal electorate. In relation to Linden Park, I have instructed the Public Buildings Department to look at the facilities available to see how we can at least do some upgrading if at all possible, and officers from that department are currently assessing the assets available. I will obtain the information on the other schools mentioned.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I refer to the Angwin Avenue campus of the Blair Athol Primary School and the fact that its future is being considered. Indeed, there is a question about whether or not it will be sold. Information has been given to that school council that, if that campus is sold, the funds will be earmarked for the upgrading of the Stuart Road campus of that school. Is that information correct and under what authority does such an allocation of funds take place?

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I think it is appropriate to obtain a written answer for the honourable member, because some consultation with the Education Department will be needed. I stress that it is now the responsibility of both departments to sit down and assess the priority. There has been a very good working relationship whereby the Minister of Education and the Minister of Public Works now sit down and assess the final list of priorities recommended by the two departments. We were somewhat disturbed to find that, although that practice had applied some years ago, it somehow disappeared and I am delighted to say that we have re-established that principle.

The CHAIRMAN: As it is 10.00 p.m., I declare the examination of the vote 'Public Buildings Department, \$64 600 000' completed, and the vote 'Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous, \$50 000' also completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.00 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday 13 October at 11 a.m.