

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 30 September 1983

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
The Hon. Peter Duncan
The Hon. B.C. Eastick
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J. Mathwin
Mr W.A. Rodda
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

The Committee met at 9.45 a.m.

Mr KLUNDER: I move:

That at 8.45 p.m. this Committee adjourn until Tuesday 4 October.

In doing so, I point out that, having started 1¼ hours earlier, it is reasonable, to maintain parity of time with all the other Committees, that we should finish 1¼ hours earlier.

Motion carried

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding, although the Chair believes that over the past two days it has failed dismally in getting this message across, nevertheless the Chair would appreciate being advised (as it was advised yesterday by the member for Mallee) of the approximate anticipated time of completion of examination of each proposed expenditure. The Chair intends to proceed on the line previously adopted: that is, the lead member of the Opposition will be given leave to ask the first three questions and then we will alternate between questions from Government and Opposition members, if necessary.

I point out again that questions must be directed to the Minister, not to officers of his Department, and members outside the Committee will be recognised by the Chair only after it appears that the in-depth examination of the Estimate is coming to a conclusion and, more importantly, only at a time agreeable to Opposition members. Finally, the Chair does not—and I repeat does not—intend to allow members of the Committee to enter into a second reading debate or a grievance debate. I do not know whether the honourable member for Murray would like to refer broadly to certain aspects of the Department. I will allow him, if he wishes, to do so, but if not we will proceed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to seek clarification: does the line for proposed works and services under 'Police Department, \$400 000', deal only with communications equipment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Works and services for the Police Department comes under a separate line, and the sum is \$400 000.

The Hon G.F. Keneally: Could we have some idea of how long we may spend on various departments because, as members are aware, lines under the Police Department, the Auditor-General's Department, the Fire Service, the Department of Correctional Services and the Department of Tourism will be considered? If we have some idea as to when each of these departments would be considered, I could then advise the officers—except, of course, we cannot give them any definite time.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair appreciates the point. The matter is really governed by the Opposition, and I ask the member for Murray whether he can give us some idea.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not in a position to say exactly how long questioning will take, but I presume that we would be considering the Police line for at least two hours, or perhaps even until lunchtime. I suggest that perhaps the officers from the Department of Correctional Services should be available later.

Police, \$105 742 000

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr F.E. Bowring, Acting Senior Finance Officer, Police Department.

Mr D.J. Hughes, Director, Administration and Finance, Police Department.

Mr J.A. Humphries, Manager, Resources, Police Department.

Mr R.E. Killmier, Deputy Commissioner of Police.

Mr R. Lucas, Administration Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that there is a proposed increase in expenditure of 2.85 per cent, which represents a reduction in real terms. I would like, before giving more detail on that, to refer to a statement that was made by the then shadow Chief Secretary prior to the last election, which stated:

Because we live in a period of high crime levels, society is placing ever-increasing demands upon our Police Force. Labor rejects the Tonkin Liberal Government's 1982-83 Budget, which provides for a reduction in real terms in resources available to the South Australian Police Force. A Bannon Labor Government will ensure that the level of resource commitment by Government to the Police Force is returned to the appropriate high priority.

I would like the Chief Secretary to explain his Government's change of heart. From page 5 of the programme estimates we learn that the proposed increase in expenditure is 2.85 per cent which, as I said earlier, represents a reduction in real terms, a practice previously condemned by the Chief Secretary. Inflation during the financial year 1982-83, we are told, was something like 12.3 per cent. Therefore, the Minister is in fact proposing that expenditure be reduced in real terms to the tune of 9.45 per cent, which I suggest is a severe blow to the Department's operation.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, prior to the election the comments that the member for Murray quotes were presented either to the Committee at the last hearing in 1982 or in our pre-election policy.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It was in the policy.

The Hon G.F. Keneally: The comments are correct. This Government is committed to returning the Police Department's budgets to the high priority that is required to enable the Department to perform the role that the community expects of it. It would be of interest, I am sure, to members of the Committee that the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, has almost completed a three-month overseas study tour, and one of the major areas that he is studying is the application of resources within the Police Department. It is appropriate for the Government to await the return of the Police Commissioner and to see the recommendations that might flow from his study tour before we move into the area of resources.

It is a decision that needs to have the technical input of the Police Department. I am certain that that will flow from the Commissioner's study tour. I would argue that some incorrect percentages have been quoted by the honourable member. I can understand this, because there is a sense of *deja vu* about this: last year, when I put the position that the honourable member is putting now, the then Chief Secretary explained that in terms of funding and manpower for the Police Department the situation is not always as clear cut as it would seem. A comparison of funding between actual expenditure in 1982-83 and proposed expenditure for 1983-84 reveals a 2.85 per cent actual increase, but a 4.65 per cent real reduction. This assumes a 7.5 per cent inflation rate in 1983-84 (which is in accordance with the statements made in the Federal Treasurer's Budget speech, at page 33).

I would put to the Committee that this is not a true comparison, and that other factors need to be taken into account because of the Budget system. For example, in 1982-83 actual funding included expenditure that has not been catered for in the 1983-34 allocation at this stage. Of course, salaries and wage increases granted during the year amounted to \$1.875 million. Other salaries and related payments increased owing to increments of normal overtime, bushfires, floods, and the Royal tour. They are all one-off expenses, in a sense. Also, a cost of \$897 000 was incurred during that period due to the increments caused by those events, and there have been price increases above the 4 per cent allowed, and other unavoidable expenses for specific items, which include activities associated with the bushfire, which amounted to \$1.488 million. In effect, \$4.260 million was spent on unavoidable during the last financial year on things that are not likely to occur this financial year. Funds for the types of purposes that I have just mentioned are not provided in the initial allocations, but are included in the round-sum allowance. Page 4 of the Estimates of Payments provides an explanation for this. These funds are released to departments during the year on a claimed basis. Therefore, to bring about a true comparison these amounts need to be taken into account, that is, added to the 1983-84 allocation, or deducted from the 1982-83 actual expenditure.

In addition, savings resulted from the revised 12-months training period for cadets. The figure involved is \$12 000 per cadet trained. We are not employing cadets for training at the same level: I expect that further questions will be asked on that matter. There will be real savings in that regard this financial year. Further, the Department purchased a replacement aircraft in 1982-83 at a cost of \$240 000. That expense will not be incurred again this year. Therefore, those types of non-recurring expenditure have to be offset in the calculation made by the honourable member. Taking those and similar factors into consideration, the outcome in 1983-84 should not result in a reduction in funding in real terms. The exact position at this stage will require a further and more detailed analysis.

It should be noted (and I think this is a very important point) that the 1983-84 allocation provides sufficient funds to maintain active police strength above the 1981-82 level. I shall provide the Committee with some more information about that. The active strength as at 30 June 1982 was 3 241 officers; the active strength as at 30 June 1983 was 3 286. We have allowed for an active strength as at 30 June 1984 of 3 267, which is a reduction of 19. Various factors have caused that, on which I am sure members will want to question me. Those strengths should be related to the approved active strength for the Department in South Australia of 3 242, which was the level set by the previous Liberal Government.

Currently, we have an additional 44 above strength active police officers on duty in South Australia. At the end of

this financial year we propose to still have an additional 25 above the active police strength established by the previous Government. In terms of police strength, we are above the approved police strength established by the previous Government. Another point I should make is that we have allowed in this financial year \$400 000 for work to start on the implementation of a new communications network. As the member for Victoria would point out to us, that is a vital element in the Budget. I will give just one other factor to indicate this year's expenditure, because an additional \$1.4 million will be spent for vehicle replacement this year. I have provided that information to give some background and to explain to the member the real meaning of the figures that he has quoted.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the member for Murray, I point out that the Minister at one stage referred to a capital line, and that is not really open for discussion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The information that the Chief Secretary has just revealed to the Committee will provide a basis for many more questions on matters already raised, but I still come back to the fact that anyone can do anything with figures. When one takes into account Commonwealth moneys and a few other matters, then I believe we are looking at a reduction in real terms of about 9.45 per cent, and I will follow that up later. The Chief Secretary indicated that the Government is maintaining the present level of the force. As I said earlier, the Government's election promise was that it would return it to an appropriately high priority. Of course, we do not know what the Government means by 'an appropriate high priority', but from what we have just heard in relation to the Budget figures it seems that that will not happen.

I understand the need for technical input on the part of the Police Commissioner. It is appropriate that that should be the case. As a result of his trip, I understand that he will be able to come back with many suggestions about technical input in regard to staffing. The Chief Secretary did refer to the training programme and I would like to go on to that because, again, if one looks back to what was said by the Chief Secretary before the last election, one can see that a different situation now appears as a result of these papers. In the same policy statement to which I referred earlier, the Chief Secretary stated:

Labor notes with dismay the actions of the Tonkin Government in reducing police manpower numbers during the year 1981-82 and their proposal that further reductions should take place in 1982-83. Labor undertakes to maintain present manpower numbers and where necessary return to levels appropriate to meet community needs. Increased levels of cadet recruitment will be established under a Bannon Labor Administration.

Where is the commitment from the Government? Can the Minister explain where is the commitment to the expected cadet programme promised? Will the recruitment programme be expanded in real terms and other matters relating to that programme? Particularly, where is the commitment from the Government and the Minister to the expanded programme promised, and when will the recruitment programme be expanded in real terms?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have already pointed out to the honourable member that there is a considerable increase in active strength numbers now above the strength approved by his Government. So, there has been that increase, and at the end of this year there will still be a significant increase in active police strength over and above that approved by his Government. So, the honourable member's criticisms that there has not been any increase in active strength are wrong when one looks at the figures. However, I do understand his queries about cadet training because here again, as I said, it is *deja vu*.

I raised these matters last year when I did not understand them, and then the Chief Secretary spent a considerable

amount of time trying to explain the system to me. I now know it but I was not all that clear about it then. There is an approved police strength and the recruitment programme and the training of cadets have to be tied in with that approved strength.

There have been changes made in recent years. There used to be a three-year training programme for cadets, so that one had three years of recruitment training at the one time. In 1978-79 the three-year training programme was reduced to a two-year programme so that we had only two years of recruits on the strength of the Police Department. That has been reduced to one year. There is now a one year training cadet programme.

This decision was made by the Police Department and enables it now to recruit into the Force, more mature, better educated and better equipped people who know their own minds and who have made an adult decision that they want to go into the Police Force. So, we are getting a better standard of recruit, and the 12-month training programme is being effective, so there is no reduction in the quality of the cadet who is introduced into the Police Force.

However, as we only have one year's training at any one time the number of cadets at any one time, looking at the figures, is reduced because of that one-year programme. If there was a three-year programme it would be three times one, and for a two-year programme it would be two times one. We have only a one-year programme, so the people we currently have training are from that one year. Therefore, the figures are obviously reduced.

I can give some specific details to the honourable member. At the beginning of the last financial year 160 personnel were in training. During the course of the year, 93 personnel were recruited and 151 trainees graduated to active police strength, leaving a balance of 99 personnel in training as at 30 June 1983. The average number of trainees was 152 for 1982-83. In 1983-84 it is planned to recruit a total of 82 personnel. Graduations to active police strength are estimated at 105. This leaves a predicted balance of 76 trainees as at 30 June 1984. As a result, the trainee average for the year is expected to be 77.

This reduction in trainee numbers results from a revised cadet training scheme of 12 months duration introduced in March 1983. This replaced the existing training programmes for cadets of two years duration and the six-monthly courses for adult recruits. The revised 12 month scheme has significant advantages including the following: first, it allows the department to respond more readily to police strength variations in order to maintain the active strength of the Force; second, fewer personnel need to be in training than would otherwise be the case. Finally, the cost of training a cadet is considerably less (the average total cost per cadet is \$20 358 compared to \$32 573—a saving of \$12 275. The savings in cadet salaries is about \$4 000 per cadet).

Recruitment is planned in such a way as to ensure active police strength is maintained at the approved level. The current number of recruits in training, together with the planned intakes, during 1983-84 will ensure that active strength is maintained. I am not suggesting that the funding for the Police Force is as good as it could be if all the resources were available. All the resources are not available in times of economic stringency, but there has not been any reduction in the capacity of the South Australian Police Force to do the work that is required of it.

I accept the honourable member's agreement that we need the technical input from the Commissioner. He has had an extensive overseas study tour. I do not know whether the honourable member has seen his itinerary, but it is frightening. He is working very hard. I will be waiting until his return to see what recommendations with resource implications flow from his report.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister explain the meaning of the following strategy statements on page 4 of the programme:

Major surveys are undertaken regularly and results are implemented, which allow for more productive deployment of manpower. In doing so, some levels of response for service to the public are varied.

Does the Government intend, as a result of that statement, to deny the public services or to reduce others because of its failure to maintain expenditure in real terms? If not, will the Minister give an unqualified undertaking to the Committee that the present level of service to the public by the Police Department will be maintained?

The Hon G.F. Keneally: Certainly, the level of service provided by the Police Department will, at the very least, be maintained, and there will be a continuing desire to improve the level of that service. That is the very reason for that item appearing under 'Strategies'. When we say that the response for service to the public is varied, it means not that it will be reduced but rather that it can be improved. To cite an example of what might happen, a decision has been taken by the Police Department that response to normal police inquiries will be met by uniformed personnel in areas where such inquiries were previously being met by plain-clothes detectives. The Police Department has immediately to determine the importance of a complaint—whether it needs to be responded to immediately, shortly or the next day.

In determining response time, it must also decide on the appropriate level of officer to respond. Where previously plain-clothes detectives, who are experienced and relatively senior people within the Department, responded to a minor complaint, it seemed to be a fairly unreasonable use of the resource. That can be dealt with by uniformed police, as they are trained and skilled and are able to respond to those complaints. That might be regarded by the complainant as a reduction in the service provided: it is not. People will still have the police response. At the same time, plain-clothes detectives are used in a more appropriate fashion in matters relative to their level. That means that a service of the Police Department has been varied more effectively but has not been reduced.

The nature of the demands upon the Police Force are changing continuously. It has to be able to respond to such changes and needs in order to vary its priorities, and it requires flexibility to do so. That does not mean that the service will be reduced. The priorities are continually changing and there are constant reviews within the Department to enable it to cope with modern-day demands. It is sensible for it to do so and is doing it effectively. I assure the honourable member that, when we vary the response, it is varied with the intention of improving and not reducing the level of service.

Mr KLUNDER: I am interested in the cost of the operation mounted at Roxby Downs some time ago. Has the Police Department been able to cost the exercise at Roxby Downs? Is the Minister able to comment on the benefits of the exercise as well as its cost?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have what we regard as a fairly accurate costing of the exercise mounted at Roxby Downs. It is certainly not a final costing, because some of the bills have yet to come in. However, we are fairly close to a final costing. I will provide some figures that the honourable member can regard as being close to the mark. The honourable member might recall that, when we knew that the exercise would be required, I announced that a figure of about \$600 000 would cover the anticipated cost. That was the early estimate; the revised estimate of the cost was \$544 150. In the event, the cost that we have been able to identify to date, which will be fairly close to the final

cost, is \$508 455. That cost should be offset against the normal cost of employing those police officers in their normal duties elsewhere, that is, \$250 555. Therefore, the additional cost to the taxpayer of mounting the police exercise at Roxby Downs amounts to about \$258 000, which is considerably less than the figure canvassed at the time of the exercise, either as the total cost or as the additional cost.

Considerable reductions have occurred in individual costing items, and that has been welcomed. However, there have also been increases in other items. By and large, the final cost is considerably less than was first anticipated. I give due credit to the Police Department for its work at Roxby Downs in ensuring that people were able to protest peacefully. The police had four responsibilities to fulfil: to ensure that people were able to protest peacefully, that property was not damaged, that there were no breaches of the peace, and that people could go about their normal business without interference or undue harassment. I am sure that honourable members will agree that the police ensured that those four factors were met.

At the end of the protest the spirit at Roxby Downs amongst the protesters, the police and, I expect, amongst many many members of the mining community was very amicable. I think that is to the credit of the Police Department. The honourable member also asked whether the exercise resulted in any benefits to the Police Department. I expect that he means in terms of training and whether the exercise itself was of benefit to the Police Department. The Acting Police Commissioner, Mr Killmier, will report to the Committee about that.

Mr Killmier: The Roxby Downs demonstration was unique in terms of the problems facing the police. It occurred in an extremely remote area. It was far from normal police resources in a logistical sense. Most of the people engaged in the exercise had to come from the metropolitan area. It was certainly unique in our experience in those terms. The scale of the operation was something that we had not encountered before and it provided particular problems. Certainly, normal work had to continue. Considerable planning went into the exercise. A wide section of the Department contributed to the operation in personnel resources and expertise. We saw it as a very valuable training exercise, in addition to it being a vital operation to maintain the peace and safety of the area. At the same time, the operation was conducted in as low key a manner as was possible. The operation provided a testing ground in the performance of standard operating procedures, particularly in the setting up and maintaining of headquarters, forward command and support areas in an adverse and unfamiliar environment.

I point out the not generally appreciated fact that over the past two years the Department has been putting considerable effort into developing the police expertise and skills required for large-scale operations that we seem, inevitably, to be facing in the future—hopefully they will be few. The specialised areas of training included command and control, logistical support, administrative support, intelligence management, negotiator and media liaison skills and communications, to mention some. The importance of this sort of training to the Roxby Downs operation is that skills which are implicit in that type of operation are central to a wide number of potential, large-scale police operations. These include such things as counter-disaster operations, counter-terrorist operations, search and rescue, demonstrations and gaol riots, to mention a few.

The problem in the past has been that training in these areas has necessarily been fragmented because it is difficult in the normal course of events to take a large number of people like that and exercise them in a combined way so that all the elements are tested over a protracted period—it was a 14-day period—involving realistic circumstances.

Although we perhaps deplored the necessity of the Roxby Downs operation it did, in a professional sense, allow us to test our organisation in a way which had not been possible before. It would be difficult to convince people that an operation of that size should go on as an exercise. It was useful in that sense, that we had a combined service exercise of that scale, and the elements, processes and methods were tested. I believe that valuable lessons were learned from this exercise, and junior and senior personnel were able to be exercised and tested in an effective way. I believe that we gained considerable experience from that exercise, experience that will help us in the future.

Mr RODDA: The Minister's answers to my colleague's question seem to indicate that he finds himself in a position of *deja vu*, although I am sure he is not insensitive to the responsibilities involved with maintaining law and order in this State. In his preamble to the Committee the Minister pointed out where he finds himself at the moment. We are looking at an appropriation of \$105.742 million in this line, which is little enough for the needs of his Department. Bearing in mind the tragedies of this year such as the bushfires and flooding, for which the State Government paid out large sums of money in compensation, as did the Commonwealth Government, what are the Minister's priorities in maintaining law and order that he feels must be addressed using the funds now available to him?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think it is fair to say that the priorities in the Police Department are twofold and involve communications and manning. I know that when asked a similar question the Police Commissioner said that the prime priority of the Department was communications. I think that we all realise that the police communications system is not of a standard that departments ought to expect in this day and age, and that was shown up at Roxby Downs. This Government has moved to start funding a new communications system, so that is the main priority. As the honourable member would know (and he would have discussions with the Police Commissioner), priorities are always a matter of debate. If one wishes, agreement would be a better word.

The other priority is manning and the appropriate deployment of the manning resources that one has. We have not varied the approved strength established by the previous Government. However, as I pointed out earlier, we are employing an active strength above that approved by the previous Government. Therefore, we acknowledge that there is a priority of manning, but the appropriate use of the manning resource depends upon the priorities established by the Police Department, the Police Commissioner and his senior officers. That is certainly something with which the Government and I, as Minister, will not interfere. How the resources are used in terms of manning and policing is a matter for the experts, and we leave it to them.

In answer to the honourable member, the priorities are communications (and that is a capital item, so I appreciate that we can talk about that later) and the deployment of the manning resources that we have, and I repeat that that is one of the major subjects being considered by the Police Commissioner on his trip.

The honourable member will note that the first item under 'Strategies' relates to increasing the use of technological aids in the areas of communication and computerisation to ensure police function with the greatest efficiency and consequent morale. Both honourable members would know that the Government is looking at the Justice Information System which was started some years ago in terms of research and planning. That is still very much in the forefront of Government planning for the various departments and authorities that would tap into a Justice Information System of the type that operates in New Zealand, I would expect,

namely, the community welfare area, the courts, the police, and so on. However, there are many problems that need to be addressed before a decision is made on the Justice Information System, of which I expect the previous Government was aware. However, technological improvements and computerisation are areas that the Police Commissioner is considering and, as I said, he has a very heavy programme.

Mr RODDA: I thank the Minister for his comments. He referred to 'Strategies', at page 4 of the yellow book. I note that it is also stated that moves are under way to decentralise the crime prevention function thus encouraging both public and police to be more positive in preventing crime and providing assistance to the police. I could not agree more with that statement. In my time, crime alert was a very useful function and it involved the public in assisting the police. However, there is (as I am sure the Minister and members of the Committee would be aware) often a reticence on the part of members of the public to involve themselves in areas where they can assist the police. Will the Minister or his officers enlarge on what that strategy addresses in that statement?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I accept the comments of the honourable member. It is necessary for the community to co-operate with the police and, unless there is that relationship between the community and the police, the police cannot do their job. A good police standing within the community is essential so that the police can expect that level of co-operation. Fortunately, by and large in South Australia that co-operation is forthcoming. However, to fulfil that strategy, we acknowledge that crime prevention is a community activity and it requires co-ordination and direction from a specialist central control. It must be aimed at all sections of the community and must be relevant to the community that it is designed to assist.

An officer has been assigned to the Henley Beach Police Station to investigate the feasibility of providing a co-ordinating specialist crime prevention officer. The brief of this officer at the Henley Beach Police Station is to report within 12 months on the following: how all sections of the Henley Beach community can be involved in crime prevention activities; school liaison at primary and high school levels; the introduction of a community-based and organised crime prevention scheme which can be directed by a police liaison officer; how to involve members of the community in identifying their own property; and any short-term special needs-related projects peculiar to this community. We hope that this report will be presented to the Police Commissioner within about a month.

The Acting Police Commissioner has pointed out to me that this is another aspect of the Police Commissioner's very hectic study tour. He is looking at the involvement of the community with the police in crime prevention. The aspect raised by the honourable member is a very important one and, I think, one to which Police Departments throughout the world are paying closer attention now.

Mr RODDA: I notice that under 'Strategies' it is also stated that amendments to legislation are still being pursued to provide the facility for detection of crime. Will the Minister inform the Committee what legislation is to be amended, and what is the nature of the proposed amendments that will aid the maintenance of law and order in this society?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government is looking at bringing in a Bill hopefully this year to amend the Police Offences Act. As the honourable member would know, that work had progressed to some extent when the Opposition was in Government. We are still considering that, and we are now close to having discussions on that legislation with some of the parties interested in the Police Offences Act. Of course, there has been a request that that Act no longer

be described as the Police Offences Act, because that in itself seems to suggest that it is a major piece of Government legislation.

That seems to suggest that that Act is concerned with police offences, but, of course, it is not: it is concerned with summary offences (if you wish) not police offences. That is a major piece of legislation, as the Opposition recognises, because it introduced its own Bill to amend the police powers. We are looking at that matter and we hope to have legislation before the House this year.

Mr RODDA: Supplementary to that, do I understand that the Police Offences Act will be renamed?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No. I am just canvassing the view that is held by some people that the Police Offences Act might more appropriately be described as the Summary Offences Act. I am just saying that there is a view amongst some serving officers that 'Police Offences Act' seems to suggest that the Act is a control of police offences—offences committed by police. It is just a small point.

Mr RODDA: It is a very big point. It is something that should be looked at.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member agrees with that view. It is certainly something that we are looking at. Representations have been made to the Government to do this, and we will consider it. The question of strategies and what the legislation will mean in terms of combating crime are more important issues, as the honourable member would agree.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is having difficulty counting the questions when honourable members have supplementary, supplementary questions.

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister comment on the breeding programme for the replacement of horses for the mounted section of the Police Force, which has been discontinued, and could he also advise the Committee of the savings from that action? Will he assure the Committee that the special type of horse that has been required for the mounted Police Force will be maintained?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The mounted police are an important element of police operations in South Australia, and they are operational—they are not ceremonial. The purpose of the police greys is to be used in policing operations. There is a belief within the community that the police greys perform as a public relations exercise and that they are ceremonial. They are very good at ceremonies and, certainly, they generate a great deal of good public relations for the Police Department, but the fundamental purpose of the police greys is a policing activity: they are quite effective at that.

There certainly is no intention at all of reducing the number of police greys in South Australia. What we have done is to change the breeding programme, to which the honourable member has alluded, for a number of reasons: one, I suppose, is for economy. The Police Department has looked at the economies involved in having its own sire or having the mares let out to sires when the occasion arises and when it is necessary. There is no shortage of good quality bloodstock available to ensure that the quality of the police greys is maintained. There is no problem there. It is cheaper to hire the services of a sire rather than to keep a sire or number of sires at Echunga.

I will point out to the Committee, to highlight the fact that the police greys are a functional policing service rather than ceremonial, that they were at Roxby Downs during the demonstration; they were not at the Royal Adelaide Show. That is where they ought to be—where the police work is required.

I think that I made a point that there was not a desire to reduce overall numbers, but I should explain that. Horse strength has been reduced to 64, and it will be reduced

further soon when four brood mares and two unsuitable horses are sold. The reduction is in line with the decision made by Commissioner Giles to reduce overall police horse strength from 71 to 55 and to abandon the breeding programme on mainly economic grounds. In future, replacements will be sought on the open market. When I said that there is no intention to reduce the number of horses, I was referring to the number of horses needed to provide for the requirements of the Police Department. There is no point in having horses additional to those required for back-up. A decision was made by the Police Commissioner that the complement should be reduced to 55, and that is a decision that the Government supports.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the recommendation was made by the Police Commissioner that the number of horses should be reduced, that is fine. I believe that the mounted police have proved to be very effective, apart from all the P.R. activities in which they have engaged, as the Chief Secretary said. They have also proved to be every effective in the detection of problems associated with the breaking of the law.

I want to refer again to the Police Offences Act. The Minister today, and his colleague the Attorney-General, have said publicly that the present Government intends to introduce its own legislation. I would like to know how much negotiation has taken place in regard to that legislation between the Chief Secretary and the Police Department since the present Government came into office, and what the Chief Secretary would see as the significant differences between legislation that the Government may intend introducing and the legislation that has already been introduced by the Opposition.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is a good try, I would say. The legislation that we will introduce will be made known to the Parliament when I introduce it. I do not think it would be fruitful for me to discuss the details of legislation that will eventually come before the House. When it is before the House, the Opposition will then have an opportunity to make judgments on its contents. The first and most important aspect of the honourable member's question was whether there has been any discussion between the Government and the various interest groups. The prime interest group is the Police Department. All the documents are now back with the Police Department. I do not know whether the Commissioner has actually received them but, if not, they would be very close to him.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They did not have them prior to the introduction of the legislation by the Opposition.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member ought to know what the system is. The original submission made, on which we are basing our decision, was received from the Police Department. The Police Department drew up the amendments to the Police Offences Act, forwarded them to me (and the former Chief Secretary) to enable the Government to have a look at those amendments and make a decision about whether it would approve of the Bill in that form or whether amendments needed to be made. As always, in matters of determining the law, the Minister responsible for the police has a duty to see that law is maintained but does not have a responsibility for writing the law. That document was referred to the Attorney-General. It is now back with the Police Department, with the Attorney-General's comments, for consideration and response. The Police Association has had discussions with me, as I expect it has with the honourable member. The Association is aware of what we are doing and it will be given an opportunity to make whatever comments it wishes to make about the matter. Other groups have expressed an interest in amendments to the Police Offences Act, and their viewpoints will be canvassed. I do not need to allude to those groups here. There

will be the widest possible discussion with the appropriate authorities in determining the contents of the final Bill which will be brought before the House and which, no doubt, the honourable member will have an opportunity to debate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At this stage I do not want to waste another question, although I point out that I find that answer most interesting. I will refer to that matter again later. In regard to the Police Pension Fund, I understand that at least one submission has been received by the Chief Secretary outlining a number of significant changes that need to be made with the appointment of the Board of Trustees and an Investment Board, and it also refers to a few other matters. Will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to amend legislation to facilitate some of the changes suggested in that submission? If so, when will those amendments come before the House? In particular, will the changes be made without seeking an increase in contributions from members of the fund?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: A meeting will take place between the Police Association, the Public Actuary and me, probably next week or the week after. A preliminary meeting has already taken place between the Police Association and the Public Actuary. I think that was an amicable meeting, and they all got on very well. The matter of police pensions will be considered at a further meeting. Here again, I do not think that it would be appropriate for me to make any statements about the Government's view on this matter, or about the view of the Police Association or the Public Actuary's recommendations. The most appropriate place for those discussions and for the making of statements will be at the meeting that I will be having with the Police Association and the Public Actuary, which will take place either next week or the week after.

I can assure the honourable member that that meeting will take place within that time because the Police Association is most anxious to have this whole matter cleared up to its satisfaction. I would expect that within a short time a decision will be reached. Again, the honourable member will be given every opportunity to debate any legislation that may result. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to make comments about the Government's attitude, the Public Actuary's recommendations, or about the Police Association's requirements. That will be more appropriately discussed at the level that the matter is at now, namely, that involving the Police Association and the Government.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Chief Secretary prepared to indicate what is the Government's attitude following the meeting, whenever it is to be held?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government's attitude will be determined when the responsible Minister having studied the submission from the Police Association and the recommendation of the Public Actuary, takes a submission to Cabinet. The honourable member, having been a member of Cabinet, would understand that it is not appropriate to canvass these matters in Committee before they have been before Cabinet.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would like to ask the Minister a question, in light of the fact that the Victorian Government has abolished the Special Branch in Victoria. I understand that the South Australian Special Branch was reduced last year by two officers. Can the Minister (or the Acting Commissioner through the Minister) give the Committee an assurance that police resources in South Australia are not being used on political surveillance, except in those cases involving terrorist acts?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the honourable member please speak up so that the Committee can hear?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I always find that if I speak quietly people pay more attention: but if the honourable member is hard of hearing, I will speak more loudly.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Special Branch is still part of police operations. The operation of Special Branch was changed as a result of the White Royal Commission. Previously that Branch had been involved in political surveillance and with the keeping of files on people—mostly of the one sort of people, I might say. As a result of the White Royal Commission a decision was reached by the Government at the time and the nature of the Special Branch operations was changed. Special Branch is to be involved (and I think the Commissioner would support this, and I will ask him to make some comments on it) almost entirely in the protection of the V.I.P.s on visits to South Australia. For instance, in the past 12 months there have been a number of visits. There were two royal visits as well as a visit of the East German Ambassador. A fair scope is canvassed: many people are involved, from the Prime Minister to people from politically unstable areas of the world. We cannot assume that political terrorism will not occur in South Australia, Australia, or anywhere else. We hope that it does not occur, although we cannot be sure that that will be the case. So, the primary function of the Special Branch is to provide the necessary protection. Therefore, they need to obtain intelligence, etc., about what might possibly happen to these people.

A component is required for developing police procedures for international airports, and now that Adelaide has an international airport this is something that Special Branch is required to look at. The operations of Special Branch are monitored now by Justice Hogarth, who, of course, is retired. Also, there is a requirement on the senior officer of the Police Department itself to monitor very closely the operations of the Special Branch.

Very strict guidelines have been laid down by the Government and the keeping of any information has to be balanced against those strict guidelines. If the guidelines cannot be met the information cannot be kept and will be disposed of by Justice Hogarth. I can certainly give the honourable member the undertaking that he has asked for that there is no political surveillance as such. That is not and will not be the function of Special Branch. I ask the Acting Police Commissioner to add to my comments.

Mr Killmier: Certainly, I endorse the Minister's remarks on the latter matter and given an unequivocal assurance in regard to the fears expressed by the member: I can lay them to rest. That kind of information is not kept: we are not interested in such information. We conform strictly to the guidelines, and the degree of inspection and control ensures that. The guidelines are strict and rule the basis on which information is stored or retained. Culling procedures are being adhered to.

I emphasise that the role and direction of the Branch is as the Minister indicated. I refer to the questions of violence, disorder or other offences directed towards overthrowing, weakening or undermining by unconstitutional means the Government of the Commonwealth, or any of the States or processes of democratic Government, and the promotion of violent behaviour within or between community groups, threats, menaces or acts of violence against the safety or security of visiting dignitaries or other persons, and acts of sabotage, and particularly the protection of individuals or groups who are or who can be reasonably believed to be the subject of threats of terrorism or other actions, as I have described.

To elaborate on what the Minister has said, the Branch basically has considerable input in advising operational people in terms of safety programmes directed towards that end. It has a role in the terrorist and counter-terrorist com-

bating organisation of the force, and it assists and advises in that kind of way. It is engaged in planning in that way and updating plans, for example, in relation to Adelaide Airport, and the like. I can only give an assurance to the best of my ability that the guidelines are being adhered to. The Administration Department is concerned that they are kept and maintained.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Liberal Party supports strongly the continuing need for Special Branch. In answer recently to a question in the House, the Premier indicated that the Government had no plans to make any changes at this time to the guidelines of the branch. I hope that there is no significance in the words 'at this time', because it is a matter that we are watching closely. Can the Minister provide the Committee with statistics indicating the number of assaults on police in the past two years? I seek the latest statistics, which I do not have. Also, I indicate the Opposition's concern at the increase in the number of assaults on police. What specific action are the Minister and the Government taking to combat this problem? Has the Minister any other information that he can provide to the Committee about this serious problem?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In regard to the member's initial throw-away comment, whether or not the regulations applying to the Special Branch will be changed, I find it interesting that the member seeks an assurance that the regulations will not be changed because one of the first things his Government did on coming into Government was to change the regulations.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They were changed the right way.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It seems that the honourable member believes that the only people who can change the regulations relating to Special Branch are members of his Party. I point out that there can never be an assurance given by any Party (my Party or the member's Party) in Government or an unconditional guarantee that there will never be any changes to legislation, and that applies to Special Branch as much as anywhere else. That is not in any way canvassing the possibility of such a change. I am merely pointing out that it is rather strange that the member seems to suggest that such a change in regulations is a prerogative of his Party only. Assaults on police are a matter of concern. We do not have the statistics, but we will try to get them for the member.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Minister has to get any information, will he ensure that it comes back to the House in a form suitable to be included in *Hansard* as a reply to a question?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We will, but I am advised that it is unlikely that that information can be made available today, so I will bring it back in a suitable form. A bone of contention among serving police officers is that the penalties for assaults against police have been too light. In the protection of the community, officers place themselves in difficult and often dangerous circumstances, yet they are not provided with the protection to which they are entitled under legislation. Certainly, that is one area of the Police Offences Act that I can confidently inform the member will be changed. As to the extent of that change, we will have to wait until the legislation is introduced to the House. I know that it was the intention of the member's Party to amend that part of the Act, and it is certainly ours.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that efforts have been continuing over some time to find a solution to the accommodation problem in the city. I understand a number of administrative and support units in the Police Department are housed in several leased premises. Can the Chief Secretary indicate what specific moves are being made to bring the Police Department together? I recognise that there have

been some problems with the executive being on Greenhill Road and other sections of the Police Department being located in Angas Street. What is being done to overcome this problem?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We do have an accommodation problem, and I will ask the Acting Commissioner to respond. Certainly, we are looking at alternative accommodation. We have not been able to satisfactorily resolve the problem, but it is a matter of importance to us. I would argue that there have not been any problems in regard to the executive being located at Greenhill Road.

Mr Killmier: The decision to go to Greenhill Road was the result of a space limitation at headquarters. We took the option of moving the administration rather than operational police allied to the courts and such facilities. I can only say that I am not aware of (nor have I heard anyone rationally able to state any) disadvantage in relation to our being at Tara Hall, and it can be argued that there are some advantages. I know of no practical disadvantages to our being at Tara Hall.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: But you do recognise the problems associated with other sections of the Police Department being there?

Mr Killmier: Yes, we have space problems, and that is being looked at. There is one possibility currently under active investigation. We have been looking at it actively for some time, but each potential initiative, for various reasons, has not become available or has not been suitable.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Amendments to the Evidence Act in regard to unsworn statements have been in this House in the time of the present Government, and were brought before the House on a number of occasions during the period of the previous Government. The abolition of the unsworn statement has not been successful, but we continue to see evidence brought forward by people who understand the problems associated with the unsworn statement. The Police Association has come out very strongly indeed suggesting that the unsworn statement should be abolished. Since this matter was last raised in this House, when the Government refused to amend the Evidence Act to abolish the unsworn statement, has there been a change in the Government's thinking, and, if not, why the Chief Secretary cannot see the need for the abolition of the unsworn statement?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This is quite clearly the responsibility of the Attorney-General. I pointed out earlier that the Attorney-General is the lawmaker in South Australia, and this is in his purview. To the best of my knowledge, I see no reason why the Government would have changed its view. The view expressed by the Attorney-General remains the view of the Government.

My involvement in this matter has been merely to facilitate the Police Association which, as the honourable member has said, disagreed with the Government. I have facilitated its discussions with the Attorney-General so that its view was able to be put to him. It is clearly a matter for the Attorney-General whether we continue with or abolish the unsworn statement; it is not a matter for the police Minister, and I can therefore add nothing further.

Ms LENEHAN: My question relates to conditions of employment within the Police Force. Is the Department looking at developing a policy which will give active encouragement and support to members of the Police Force in pursuing higher education which will further their career? Earlier in the year a case was brought to my attention of a police officer who had applied for a year's leave without pay to undertake higher education studies which directly involved work in respect of the Police Force. Indeed, her thesis was to be directly related to stress within the Force. This application was subsequently denied and she had to

tender her resignation, which cost the Force a considerable amount of money. Will the Minister outline whether this matter—not this particular case—has been addressed, and whether the Force is looking at developing a policy of retaining and indeed encouraging people to further pursue their career on a professional level?

Mr Killmier: As a department we are most sympathetic about, and we see the need to develop, this kind of capability. There were special circumstances in the instance cited, and possibly the member is unaware of them. That was the reason why in that case the individual's request was not acceded to.

We have an all-embracing programme, and I might mention, that, contrary to popular belief, there are in the Department a number of graduates with tertiary qualifications and those run into three figures. Behind that there are many hundreds of people currently studying in external areas through TAFE, universities and the institute, undertaking tertiary or certificate type courses. The examination qualifications to progress in the Force are not internal examinations, but are tied to the police study certificate consisting of 10 subjects with semester periods of about six months, taken and accredited through TAFE.

We also provide after that the necessary qualification for sergeant rank, but in addition we are encouraging and running the justice administration option at the Institute of Technology which is an associate diploma (an option in the business administration studies course). Outside of that, we have considerable numbers of people doing tertiary type studies who do receive encouragement.

We have a staff development section which encourages people to take on these studies, and gives them guidance. Within the Public Service guidelines they are allowed up to five hours a week on work release for that purpose. The only qualification is that the studies are required to have some sort of relevance to general policing or specialist studies, and there is some possibility that they will be applied. That was the problem in the particular case cited, namely, that the Department did not see eye-to-eye in those terms. However, in philosophical terms of management, we are very much aware of the need to develop people in this kind of way, and we hope that that will continue.

Mr RODDA: I raise the matter of exposed firearms. I noticed in the objectives that the Government says, amongst other things:

To identify criminal offenders and criminal activities and apprehend and detain alleged offenders.

I am sure that the public want to be assured that those officers who are charged with these dangerous and difficult responsibilities have the equipment and the suitable wherewithal to carry out their difficult task. I know, from my past experience, what is involved when a Minister is dealing in this area. I know also from past experience what a Minister can be exposed to when taking certain action. I can recall some of the rough phone calls that I received, and some of the invitations that I had to meet certain people at certain places to talk about 'bent coppers'. This relates to the area that we are discussing.

We have a wonderful Police Force in this State, for which I have the highest admiration and, indeed, it was a great pleasure to be associated with them for the 2.8 years that I served as Minister. The public must be assured that the officers have all the necessary equipment, especially in these tough, hard areas. The Smith and Wesson .357 was proved, after extensive examination and trial, to be the best weapon for the police to carry. There has been some public debate on the matter. Can the Minister assure me of his and his Government's attitude to this useful weapon which the police are now using?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is usual for police officers in South Australia to be armed. Apart from those who are wearing the exposed .357 Smith and Wesson, other officers are armed or using a different type of weapon. In fact, it is that type of weapon that has generated all the activity. Strict rules apply within the Police Department regarding who can wear the exposed .357 firearm and under which circumstances it can be worn. I believe the honourable member is alluding to the rather hectic period that I had earlier this year when a motion was passed at the A.L.P. Convention requiring police officers to wear their firearm under their clothes. The firearm was not to be exposed.

The main factor that generated the emotion was the wrong belief, particularly by the Police Association, that the Convention had moved a motion that police officers should not be armed. That was not the case. The A.L.P. Convention has a strong belief that police officers who are required to protect the community ought to be able, in the first instance, to protect themselves and should be adequately armed to enable them to do so. There was never any suggestion to the contrary. The Police Association, through the intervention of the Trades and Labour Council, took that dispute to the Industrial Commission. It was the decision of the Industrial Commission, based on workers safety, that police officers, required to be armed with the .357 Smith and Wesson, must wear that revolver disclosed on the hip. That decision was binding upon the Police Association, the Police Department and the Government, and we accept it as such. If an officer is issued with a .357, he will continue to wear it in line with current practice.

Whilst one might argue that the .357 can be worn under the tunic during the winter months, it is difficult in mid summer to find a suitable garment to cover a .357. Strict guidelines are laid down for the weapon and the instances in which it cannot be worn. It is basically worn by police officers on patrol. They are the front line—the people most likely to be placed in difficult circumstances and the people who do not know of the danger when going into some situations. Plain-clothes police officers often have some idea of the dangers, although not always. It is the mobile patrol officer who is most likely to be the first cab off the rank.

The areas in which the revolvers cannot be worn include sensitive areas such as sporting venues, general processions and parades, Rundle Mall, and the courts, where police officers will not be issued with exposed handguns. Nevertheless, circumstances could arise where patrolled personnel might be tasked to a sensitive area. If a problem arises in Rundle Mall, whilst officers in the Rundle Mall do not have a .357, additional officers may be called in to overcome a difficult situation. In those circumstances one would not require them to go back to central headquarters, divest themselves of the revolver and come back to Rundle Mall: that is unreasonable. At times police will be seen with exposed handguns. There can be no guarantee that an exposed handgun will not be seen in a sensitive area. Only patrolled personnel will wear exposed hand guns, and firearms will not be worn by police within prisons, correctional centres or psychiatric institutions.

Stringent controls have been determined, the reason being that nobody will believe that exposed handguns are suitable in areas where people are going about a peaceful activity. However, in some areas one needs the best equipment and access available and the situation must be balanced. The Industrial Commission has reached a decision based on workers safety. The assurance for which the honourable member is looking has been provided by the Industrial Commission.

Mr RODDA: I thank the Minister for that information. He says that it will be only the front line and emergency people who will have this weapon, which is regarded as the

'be all' of security. Do I understand from the Minister that an unexposed firearm will be worn by the police as in the case of the old Browning, which was the cause of some nasty mishaps?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member is correct. All police officers are armed where appropriate. If an officer is not wearing an exposed handgun, it is not reasonable to believe that he is unarmed. In some circumstances officers will not be armed but, in the majority of cases, they are armed or able to be armed. Police officers on duty are armed. The honourable member mentioned the Browning. I do not think the police are totally happy with the Browning, with which they have had some problems. There are likely to be problems of that nature with such a firearm. On the other hand, it has served the police well over a long period of time. Most senior police officers are more familiar with the Browning than with any other firearm and feel more comfortable with it.

The question of firearms is consistently under review. It is important that the police have the best weapon available and that such weapon is constantly reviewed. A replacement for the Browning is not expected to be an exposed handgun, as we would place police officers in a situation where they would go into sensitive areas either with an exposed handgun or with no handgun at all. That is not a decision that one could sensibly or reasonably take.

Mr RODDA: Is the Department looking at a firearm that could be carried unexposed? Could the Minister inform the Committee of the training that officers have on the use of the Smith and Wesson .357?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: My recollection is that the honourable member participated in establishing the training for the use of this weapon.

Mr RODDA: I thought the Department would have advanced since my days.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Perhaps it would be better if the Acting Police Commissioner reported on the extent of the training in which police officers must be involved before they are issued with a .357 Smith and Wesson.

Mr Killmier: There is a structured firearm/hand-gun training programme, at a number of levels. All trainees at the Police Academy receive firearm training, to a limited extent, on the firing range. Police officers who are issued with and are required to use the .357 revolver receive specialised training. There are three full-time firearm instructors. The senior instructor has been trained overseas in what we consider to be the very best training programme available. Those training methods are being utilised. I emphasise that a training programme of this nature is not only concerned with accuracy and manipulative skills in using a firearm, but it also focuses very strongly on what we call operational safety, the decision-making process, stringent departmental requirements that govern the use of firearms and an equal or stronger emphasis on departmental policy in relation to the circumstances in which firearms can be drawn, used, or even contemplated.

To date, 886 police officers have received advanced training. They receive refresher courses from time to time. The advanced training programme will be extended because we are developing a new patrolman's induction training course that will be extended to three weeks. Officers going into a patrol situation for the first time will receive an updated and more extensive programme in relation to firearm handling and training.

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister advise the Committee of any in-service training programmes used to instruct police cadets in relation to minority groups? I refer to a photocopy of an article from the *Listener*, published on 21 July 1983, which describes how police cadets are moved away from racism. I am particularly concerned that entrenched attitudes

exist in our society in relation to Aborigines in particular and other ethnic minorities. What programmes are available to assist police officers to overcome any bad habits that they may have in that respect?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is an important matter and one that is well known to the Police Department. It is essential that all graduating police officers be exposed to different pressures, different groups and different cultures, because we are now a multi-cultural country. The Acting Police Commissioner will provide the information sought by the honourable member.

Mr Killmier: We considerably emphasise the need for police officers to have correct attitudes and an understanding of minority problems and cultural attitudes. A new 12-month training course has looked at that area extensively. A number of modules, lasting for periods of up to one month, place particular emphasis on this area. The Department has three professional psychologists who are involved in the construction and delivery of the programme. We believe that we have an effective programme. We are caught with the attitudes of cadets entering the academy, because they reflect the bias that exists in the community at large. In that sense they are normal people.

We try to ensure that the cadets are not institutionalised in the Police Department and that they have an awareness of the issues facing minority groups. Quite a number of people visit the academy in relation to the programme, ranging from Aborigines, Vietnamese and representatives from other minority groups, who all put their points of view. That is usually done on a discussion basis, allowing people to debate various issues. For years we have also had a programme of sending cadets to organisations such as the Service to Youth Council and to institutions that house disabled people, to work with those people and to understand their problems. As an example, we recognise that the Vietnamese boat people have special problems.

Police officers are probably the first people who see those problems in a visible sense, and must interact with them. We have undertaken considerable work in an attempt to get close to these people by developing programmes of understanding. For example, we have produced a film that discusses Vietnamese culture, the differences between it and Australian culture, the way that Vietnamese name themselves, and misconceptions that Australians may have in relation to Vietnamese people.

That film has been generally acknowledged and recognised as being effective and is being used by outside organisations, as well. To answer the question, we are working hard at giving our people the necessary understanding of these cultures and of the particular problems experienced by various groups.

Mr GREGORY: The Acting Commissioner did not make clear what in-service training there is for police officers generally.

Mr Killmier: We are trying to work this into our refresher courses that four year and seven year experienced police officers attend at the Academy, and into the N.C.O. training courses. In addition, this initiative is supplemented by material sent out to regional training officers. Indeed, our in-house magazine *In Brief* contained an extensive amount of material in its last issue, as have several past issues, regarding the problems of particular ethnic groups. This must take its place amongst a whole range of training programmes, which are extensive. There is not always time to do all the things that we want to do and we have to make choices about these matters. However, we are addressing this problem and trying to achieve something in this direction.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary say whether or not it is the Government's intention to carry out regular public reviews of the South Australian Police

Force? I ask this question because at the 1981 Labor Party State Conference it was decided that a future Labor Government would conduct public reviews of the control and management of the Police Force. I understand that this move was initiated by the member for Elizabeth and that the intention of the reviews, according to the motion moved by that member, was to look into the management, control and effectiveness of the Police Force. Will the Chief Secretary say whether these regular public reviews are to take place and, if so, when will they commence, who will carry them out and will he give a commitment that the Police Department will be represented before those conducting the reviews?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: To answer the last part of the question first, should we have a public review of police operations the police would certainly be involved in it. I have no intention of authorising a public review of police operations, mainly because there are currently two internal reviews—a country review and a metropolitan review. In fact, the Police Department in South Australia is consistently reviewing its own operations because it has to be able to react to current trends. It cannot do that unless it has its operations consistently under review. At the time the motion mentioned was accepted there was great heat and controversy about the Police Force in South Australia which does not exist at the moment, so there is no need for the Government to require a public review of Police Department operations at this time.

I have no intention of holding a public review because I see no reason for such a review at the moment. I cannot envisage that there will be one in the immediate future, so I cannot give the honourable member any idea who would be on such a review committee. If there is to be any review at any time of police operations, personnel, resources or whatever, it will be essential that a representative from the Police Department is involved in that review. As the Police Commissioner has just pointed out to me, there are ongoing internal reviews in the Police Department.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary say exactly where matters are in relation to investigating complaints against the police? A committee was established to consider the best way of handling this matter and I understand that it has now reported. Therefore, will the Chief Secretary indicate the stage reached by this committee and where we are going from here in regard to this matter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Grieve Committee, as it was called, has reported. Because the report raises some matters of law, I have referred it to the Attorney-General for his consideration. Hopefully, legislation will be brought before the Parliament this year in regard to this matter. It is essential that we establish an independent method of reviewing complaints against the Police Force. I think that the current situation of Caesar investigating Caesar is unacceptable to the community at large. Having an independent review body does not weaken, but strengthens the Police Force, as any complaints would then be investigated by persons outside the Police Force. The committee's report is very good; the committee has done extensive work. It looked at systems applying elsewhere in Australia and has taken account of international systems, as well, in bringing down its recommendations. At the moment the report is still before me and has not been taken to Cabinet. I hope to do that as soon as possible. Here, again, it is a matter of legislation that I hope will be put before the Parliament this year. It will require the drafting of a new Bill and so depend upon resources available from the Parliamentary Counsel, who is under much pressure. As soon as we can, we will introduce such legislation; it is a commitment of this Government.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is one of the alternatives being considered in this matter the appointment of a judicial

Ombudsman, as the point was made in Labor Party policy prior to the election that it would appoint a judicial Ombudsman whose job it would be to investigate complaints against police officers?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government gave no instructions to the committee and merely gave it terms of reference to look into the best and most effective method of dealing with complaints about the police. The committee has taken account of Government policy, and I expect it took account of the previous Government's policy on this matter. I think that the former Government was developing a proposition regarding this matter when it lost office. All Government and Opposition views were known to the committee, but it was not constrained by the policies of any of the political Parties. Its charter was to look at all systems working elsewhere and to bring down a recommendation as to what it believed was the best system for South Australia.

They have done that. I do not think that it is appropriate for me to canvass the recommendations of that Committee before there has been a submission to Cabinet, Cabinet approval and legislation prepared. The recommendations will certainly be made known to the community in the fullness of time.

Mr RODDA: I wish to address a question to the Minister arising from a statement at page 31 of the yellow book in regard to road transport safety, the protection of persons, their rights and property, and so on. I notice that it is proposed to revise the random breath testing legislation with regard to administrative procedures, and to continue the traffic enforcement/education/safety plan incorporating special operation orders. It is some two years since random breath testing became part of the South Australian scene and all members of Parliament have been through the mill in relation to this. Some very distinguished persons have been apprehended and, according to their claims, they have been able to carry the very drug that put them over .08, and we all know how harassing that has been.

However, as against that, I think that it has made everyone aware of his responsibility to drive carefully. However, it would appear from the programme being addressed that the Government has plans to revise the random breath testing legislation. Will the Minister inform the Committee what he has in mind?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Of course, the responsibility for the legislation in relation to random breath testing is not mine, as Chief Secretary, nor that of the Police Department. The Government has already announced a review of random breath testing and the Police Department would have an input in that regard if it was requested or if it felt the need to do so. However, the Police Department is very much involved in the operation of random breath testing. Recently, the deployment strategy has changed marginally.

It is a matter of efficiency and economy and, because the deployment strategy has changed, the Department is better able to provide a much wider random breath testing service to the community which operates more effectively and efficiently than has otherwise been the case. The Police Department will continue to review the deployment of its own resources, and will certainly participate in relation to and be quite happy to make recommendations to the appropriate Minister on changes, if changes need to be made. However, that matter is being reviewed by the Government and the Police Department and, I, as Minister, will wait until it is appropriate for any input in that regard, if in fact we believe that we need to make an input.

Mr RODDA: In relation to road safety and speed detection, the digitector is also a familiar scene on our roads, all to our surprise sometimes. I recall recently reading in the press about a new device (I think that it was some sort of radar gun). I gather that that comes under 'to implement

the devised radar deployment strategies'. Will the Minister inform the Committee what new hazards are being used in regard to the errant motorist?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I believe that the honourable member is probably referring to the muniquip, which is a hand-held radar gun which can operate on a down-the-road principle: that is, one is gone before one reaches the speed trap, whereas now one has to wait until one reaches the area where the police officers have their strips, radar, and so on. I believe that the muniquip has a range of about 800 metres. I do not want to be held to that, because the technical details are not in my possession. However, the equipment can certainly pick up a speeding vehicle from a considerable distance and time that vehicle. I think that, when the gun is pointed at the car, a beam is ejected which hits the vehicle and rebounds into the gun and, because of the speed of those beams rebounding and shortening (and one would appreciate that that happens as the car comes closer), one is able to determine the speed at which the vehicle is travelling. Only specially trained operators use the guns, because the equipment is sophisticated and incredibly accurate (I understand), and skill is needed to operate it. Therefore, the likelihood of challenge, whilst it is always there, is not likely to be as successful as perhaps in regard to some other devices.

We amended legislation recently to ensure that the use of the muniquip was appropriate within the terms of the Act. The Department has been very cautious (or careful, if one wishes) to ensure that, before the radar guns are in common use, the operators are well trained so that they use it correctly, in a sense, as the community would expect. Certainly, the Police Department wishes to ensure correct use. However, I know that during the trial of this equipment, some of the speeds detected on South Australian roads were rather horrifying. This equipment is very mobile. A police officer can test speeds in a certain area and then move off very quickly somewhere else, so that the intelligence system that applies on roads may not be as effective with this piece of equipment as it is with the equipment used now. Certainly, it will be used more on country roads, where it will be more effective, because as the honourable member may realise, within the city the capacity to pick up a vehicle half a mile away is much constrained. The equipment will be very good in relation to heavy vehicles.

Mr RODDA: People who drive through the red light cause a lot of problems in the city. I understand that the Police Department has a device (a biphoto electric cell) which, after a car has gone through a red light, can photograph the offender's car. Of course, the driver gets the shock of his life when the man in blue confronts him with the evidence. A large number of accidents occur every day because of this offence: it is all too prevalent. It is one of the most dangerous aspects of city motoring. Will the Minister or his officers inform the Committee about this new device?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that the Acting Police Commissioner is better able to respond to that question.

Mr Killmier: Yes, we agree that this is a problem, particularly tail-end collisions at accident intersections and the motorists who try to beat the lights. We have looked at this from time to time over the years, and it has been used on an experimental basis in other places. There have been technical problems and we have not been satisfied that those problems have been ironed out. Recently, the Victorian police installed a more sophisticated camera, which has received a fair degree of publicity. We have reason to believe that that is fairly effective. The Victorian police are monitoring the equipment and we have asked for an evaluation for our consideration; when that has been completed we will consider it.

The principle behind the use of this type of camera is that two photographs are taken, one second apart, of all cars violating a red traffic signal. The camera takes a picture of the vehicle, its relationship to a white roadway line, the number of the vehicle, and the date and time of the offence. So, it is clearly effective in those sorts of things. We are considering the introduction of this equipment in due course, subject to approval and funding.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer now to the State Emergency Services. I am very concerned that the State Director of the State Emergency Services retired last Friday and that the Service is now without a head. I understand that the Minister was well aware that the Director was going to retire, and that provided an ideal opportunity for the new appointment to receive some tuition from the Director had an appointment been made appointed prior to the retirement of the Director. I understand that interviews are taking place and that there is a short list, but I would like clarification from the Chief Secretary as to when we can expect an announcement regarding the appointment of a new Director of the State Emergency Services and why it has taken so long for this appointment to be made.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I hope that an announcement can be made in a fairly short time. I do not agree that there has been undue delay, although certainly the matter has taken some time. I believe that the importance of the State Emergency Services in South Australia necessitates that we make sure that the Government appoints the right person as its Director. One of the first duties that will be given to the successful applicant will be to review the State Emergency Services to determine whether its practices are suitable for its current function, and also to make recommendations to both the Police Department and the Government as to what might have to be done to bring the S.E.S. up to date, if that is required.

I suspect that a number of changes would come from such a review, but such a review cannot be undertaken unless there is a Director. That will be, as I said, one of his first duties. It is always best to delay appointments to ensure that one gets the best appointment. One of the worst things that any Government can do is to rush into appointments and make them merely for the sake of making appointments. The State requires the best people in the right jobs, and the community is better served if that happens. Mr Hughes, who has been involved in the advertising, selection and interviewing of the applicants, may be able to add some comments to those that I have already made.

Mr Hughes: It is true that earlier in the year we were aware that the then Director would be retiring later in the year. At that time we considered the possibility of appointing a Deputy Director, who would then be considered for further promotion to the position of Director when the then Director retired. To determine an appropriate level for such a position, jointly with the Public Service Board, we commenced an organisational review of the State Emergency Services headquarters. In determining the level, members will appreciate that we need also to look at the functions of the organisation and at what the future directions of that organisation might be. As the Chief Secretary said, we believe that any new Director should be involved in such a review, particularly in looking at the future of the S.E.S. Therefore, with the agreement of the Public Service Board, we decided to proceed with the appointment of a Director-designate rather than of a deputy.

This position was subsequently advertised, I think late in June. The House has already been informed, I understand by a Question on Notice, that we received some 51 applications for that position. That involved a considerable selection process. We believe that the process that we adopted was appropriate for the position. We went further than just

the Police Department in the selection process and invited on to the panel Mr MacNamara, the Executive Director of the Western Australian Office of the Emergency Service and Defence Liaison, who has proved to be invaluable in that selection process.

As the Chief Secretary has indicated, a recommendation has now gone to Government, and at the appropriate time the Government will make an announcement on an appointment. I would like to repeat that, from the Department's point of views there has been undue delay. The time that has been taken has been necessary for a position of such importance and it was taken bearing in mind the need to involve the new Director in the future of the S.E.S. organisation and the importance of getting the right person for the position.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would concur with the need for such a review in that area. I was concerned following Ash Wednesday, when I personally (and I know that some of my other colleagues) received complaints from some S.E.S. units that they felt that they were not utilised to the full extent at that time. I know that some concern was expressed by those who went along week after week for training and then felt that they were not being used effectively in such an emergency.

I understand that there is also considerable concern amongst the ranks of the S.E.S., and I would like clarification on this point from the Chief Secretary. I am led to believe that last year part of the subsidy for local government for this year was used. I understand that the sum of \$77 000 for subsidies to councils does not include a sum to make up the amount that was used last year. Local government has been particularly concerned about this over the past 12 months because of extra expenditure with fires, floods, etc. They are looking for a maximum subsidy from the Government. I would like clarification from the Chief Secretary as to whether that is the case and what he intends doing about it.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I have the impression that the honourable member may have been talking to some of my councils! Certainly, the councils are very concerned about the level of subsidy, and have made very strong representations to me to have the level of subsidy increased. We have not increased the level of subsidy this year on two bases. We are in a time of tight economic stringencies and the S.E.S. is suffering those stringencies like most other departments and services within the community. It will be able to maintain the level of service, but we have not provided it with the funds to increase that.

We are going to have a review of the operations of the State Emergency Services, a matter that has been canvassed with the new Commissioner, who will be a party to that review. We will then be able to determine an appropriate level of subsidy. There are a number of ways we can help the State Emergency Services that go beyond the provision of subsidies to local government authorities. The contribution to a number of local government bodies in South Australia from the State Emergency Services far exceeds the State Emergency line. We are able to provide a maximum of \$5 000, although it is usually \$2 500.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is it a maximum of \$2 500 or \$5 000?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Previously the subsidy was limited to \$2 500, but approval has been given to increase that to \$5 000 if it is appropriate to do so. Total funding has not been increased. If a council receives \$5 000, less money would be available for other councils. The total amount available remains the same but the capacity to be flexible in regard to individual councils is greater. I acknowledge that this is a matter that needs to be reviewed. Local government authorities have made some strong recommenda-

tions to me about this, and the matter will be addressed during the review that is to take place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Government have a policy in regard to bringing all emergency services, including the C.F.S., under the jurisdiction of one Minister? If so, what is that policy?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The two emergency services not currently within the Chief Secretary's area of responsibility are the C.F.S. and the St John Ambulance. At this stage it is not intended to have a Minister of Emergency Services, as is the case in some other States, where there is a Minister responsible for all emergency services. I know that this matter has been discussed for a long time, but at this stage we do not have any intention to do that in South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: You have no policy on that matter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have no policy in regard to bringing the C.F.S. and the ambulance service under the control of one Minister who would be responsible for emergency services. As a result of the debriefing exercise undertaken by the Government following Ash Wednesday, recommendations about the performance of all emergency services may flow from that. However, that report is not with the Government as yet; certainly I have not had an opportunity to see it. An input into that report has been made by all the services involved.

The honourable member mentioned that some State Emergency Services personnel were unhappy that they were unable to participate to a greater extent in the Ash Wednesday disaster. We have a structure that the Commissioner of Police heads to cope with disasters. A state of emergency is declared and the Police Department is in charge of the necessary operations. All the emergency services fit into that. In regard to the Ash Wednesday disaster, I consider that our emergency services did not work in co-operation well enough. There was an improved co-operation during the most recent disaster which resulted from a plan developed by all the emergency services under the chairmanship of Mr Hunt, who was then Deputy Commissioner (now Commissioner) of Police. There is a plan for the metropolitan area and a plan for the country area. They are both now in place and they co-ordinate each of the community services. Their roles are defined and this should provide more effective use of their skills. Problems experienced in the past will be addressed having regard to the need to work more closely together. Thankfully, not too many disasters occur in South Australia, and we cannot create them so that people can train together to become more effectively co-ordinated. However, we are getting better at it and the plans that have been developed will ensure that the services provided will improve. I would expect that complaints arising from various individual services will be reduced accordingly.

Mr MATHWIN: In regard to the horse complement of the Police Force, is any increase in personnel or animals contemplated? Does the Minister expect that breeding of police greys will continue in South Australia? I understand that we have good stud stock available for this purpose. I believe that it would be a good thing to increase the stock of the Police Force. The advantages of the mounted section of the Police Force were demonstrated recently. While I was on my overseas study tour I saw the operations of the mounted police in America. That type of operation is very successful. It is of advantage in areas such as large shopping centres and car parks, and its use in controlling crowds cannot be disputed. I believe that a discontinuation of breeding of police greys would be a sorry thing for South Australia, as the mounted police provide a great service in the protection of the public.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This question was asked and replied to earlier today, but as the honourable member was

not here I will briefly refer to the matter again. There is no intention at all to reduce the mounted division of the South Australian Police Force. The greys are a functional part of the police operation; they are not ceremonial. This was clearly illustrated recently at the Roxby Downs blockade. They are also used at the Royal Adelaide Show. They are a functional part of the Police Force, but they perform a very essential public relations exercise for the police. There is no doubt that they are very well regarded: people love to see them, and they perform magnificently.

Mr MATHWIN: To save the time of the Committee, as this matter has been raised previously, I will be quite happy to read in *Hansard* the answer that was given previously.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: What I omitted to say when I gave the first answer was that police greys are used frequently in the River Torrens area, at the major shopping complexes, and in the vicinity of schools. If the honourable member notes those comments, together with those I made earlier, he should be satisfied.

Mr MATHWIN: My question relates to the Star Force and the training procedures in regard to its equipment. I understand that much equipment is available to the Star Force for use in times of emergency and riot. How much training do members of the force receive in regard to that equipment? I have heard that little training time was available in regard to much of the equipment. I understand that some equipment was available for use at the recent Yatala riots but was not used, which is fair enough. I am concerned about the training given and whether it is sufficient, whether it is initial training, or whether there is regular on-going training at six-month or 12-month intervals. In the case of an emergency, under whose command does the Star Force operate? I refer to the Minister's reply to my question in the House in regard to the bad riot at Yatala, when the police were available but were not called on. My information is that if the Star Force had been called on to settle the problem it could have been resolved in a matter of minutes, rather than making fire engines wait outside, unable to get into Yatala because of the prevailing situation. It is important that the Committee should know who gives the command in such matters.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The member has asked several questions. First, the Committee should understand that Star Force performs many services apart from the anti-terrorist operations for which it is largely known. It also is involved in cliff rescue and sea rescue, but Star Force members will also work as a normal part of the police arm. Therefore, when there are no special duties its members act as a flexible unit and can be used in any police activities: they can be in Rundle Mall, on point duty, or a whole range of other normal every-day duties. Star Force members have special training and the Government believes that it is essential to have a highly-skilled group of people who can respond to terrorist operations. As I said, we cannot see ourselves free from that and we could easily be involved in terrorist activities, and I instance the Adelaide International Airport.

For that reason, we need to have this group of people skilled to react to any situation, but they are involved not only in what is seen as anti-terrorist work. It is on-going training and their skills are used every day. I will ask the Acting Commissioner to respond. In regard to the Yatala situation, police will go into Yatala or any prison upon request, and that request must come from the prison authorities. The member should know that there is much sensitivity about police officers going into prisons. They go to prisons, but it is because there is no alternative, or because the situation has reached a point where there is no alternative, but the prisoners themselves respond badly. During the last dispute we had police officers go to Yatala, and they were quite effective. Throughout the world police officers would

support me: it is an uncomfortable place for police to be. They believe that prisoners are not fond of them. The decision as to whether or not police officers are called into prisons is made by prison authorities.

Mr Killmier: I do not know the basis of the member's observations that Star Force personnel receive insufficient training, because it is probably the most highly trained unit in the Department. They get the largest amount of training time on a continuous and on-going basis. They have specialist skills, including air observer/leadership activities, which means directing activities in a helicopter using relatively sophisticated equipment. They are continually training, and the structure of the unit is such that regular training programmes and refresher programmes are undertaken by all members. I am at a loss to understand the source of any suggestion that they are not getting adequate training.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to the women's arm of the Force. What is its present complement? Is it expected that it will be greatly increased? Are women trained for Star Force? Is it expected that women will become members of the Mounted Cadre?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We do not have statistics readily available because everyone within the Department is classified as a police officer rather than as a male or female officer. That information can be obtained if the member is anxious to know the breakdown. Duties reflect that they are members of the Police Force, and not police officer male or police officer female. We take the best recruits that we can get. They break down to about 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female. The Department wants the best possible people working in it and takes the best recruits. I am not aware of any policy decision that we must recruit so many females against so many males.

Mr MATHWIN: I was not saying that.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I understand that the member was not saying that. He was anxious to ascertain information about recruitment of female officers in South Australia. Yes, that is going ahead and is based on the quality of the applicant. I understand that the training course is about 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female recruitment.

Mr MATHWIN: What about the Star Force and the Mounted Cadre?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will ask the Acting Police Commissioner to respond to that question.

Mr Killmier: At present we have three women in the Mounted Cadre, and there is no objection to that. In fact, I foresee a situation where they may be in a preponderance because they seem to like that type of work. At the moment we do not have any women in the Star Force. We have one woman who can work with the Star Force. She is trained in negotiating skills and can be called upon at any time. She has passed her negotiator's course and in a situation she can be used and, in fact, was used, in the Roxby Downs operation in which many women were engaged. There are not at present women in Star Force in terms of cliff rescues, and the like.

There are special selection procedures for Star Force which in some areas involve a degree of strength and physical capabilities and, if they can meet those requirements, they probably would be acceptable. By the same token, any male who did not meet those standards would not be acceptable. It is therefore a question of whether they meet the particular requirements of that unit.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I wish to pick up the point in relation to my earlier question concerning the Evidence Act and the Government's refusal to abolish the unsworn statement. The Chief Secretary indicated that this was a matter for the Attorney-General and that it was not a matter that the Chief Secretary should be involved in. I suggest that, because of the very strong feeling, as I understand it,

that exists in the Police Force, this is a matter that the Chief Secretary should be shooting home very strongly to his Cabinet colleagues, namely, that the Government should take some action in regard to this matter. It is not a matter of throwing it off and saying that the Chief Secretary should not be involved.

I now wish to highlight one of the achievements of the South Australian Police Force: the introduction of the Blue Light Discos, which have been very successful. I attended the annual general meeting of the Blue Light Disco Committee and heard the report of the Chairman, who indicated that the discos had been very successful and had expanded throughout the State. It is difficult to know from the lines what resources are made available in that area. Will the Chief Secretary indicate the financial and manpower resources that are related to this matter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will respond initially to the question about the Evidence Act. I apologise if I said that the Chief Secretary does not have any involvement with it. Of course, every member of Cabinet is involved in any legislative change that comes before Cabinet. So, one has to be involved, and one may put his point of view during Cabinet discussions. The matter of determining the law and the operations through the courts is a matter legislatively for the Attorney-General, and I make the point that the Attorney-General is addressing that matter, and that primarily it is in his purview.

I agree with the honourable member that the blue light Disco has been an outstanding success, not only its capacity to support communities by providing entertainment and occupation, in a sense, for young people, but also because it has brought the police much closer to a sector of the community which sometimes feel as though society has rejected it. The Police Department and the police officers have been extremely efficient in providing this facility. In terms of resources, the Police Commissioner might be able to respond to the honourable member's question more effectively than I. Frankly, there is not a great resource question involved.

Mr Killmier: When the Blue Light Discos were originally conceived by the Department, and interested people in the Department, a quite deliberate decision was taken that it should not be a police-dominated activity but that the police perhaps might act as a focus around which community groups might assist. That has been very successfully achieved in my view.

I believe that, although a tribute to the police is deserved, it probably overlooks the assistance given by many ordinary citizens in various service organisations and other groups such as Rotaract which have been actively involved. The police input is largely carried out by off-duty officers who are involved with this project in their own time, and we believe that that is the way it should be. That is backed up by certain services that are provided, for example, by our legal officer, who has done a lot of work on constitutional and legal aspects. In the case of police officers, we will recognise injury on duty in certain circumstances, if it occurs. We have in the Community Affairs and Information Service an n.c.o. who provides an administrative co-ordination. We believe that that is about the amount of departmental resources which should be committed to this venture.

If it is to be done through full-time paid workers in the Police Department, the whole spirit of the enterprise will be lost. It is our observation that in another State, where an activity of this kind is associated with the Police Department, it has over the years become self-defeating because it involves full-time employees, and it results in massive fund-raising endeavours and all sorts of problems. We believe that this approach, which is the approach of the Victorian Police Department, is in the long term the best one. It is

self-sustaining in terms of the money that it earns through admission, and it can make donations to various charities and other worthwhile organisations without detracting from the primary role and task of the police.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My last question on this line relates to the traffic infringement notice scheme or on-the-spot fines. I remind the House that when the scheme was introduced by the previous Government it was described by the present Government (the then Opposition) as a type of back-door revenue collection. Obviously they have given their support to that scheme now by increasing the penalties. Do the police feel that this has worked successfully, and does the Government have any intention of making further changes to this scheme in the near future?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Traffic infringement notices were introduced in the first place in order to reduce the workload on police in the courts, and it has had a tremendous impact in that area. We have been able to redirect police resources into other areas where the priorities might well be higher. That is not to suggest that the priority in terms of traffic infringement is not important, but the system is certainly working well.

There is no doubt that it may be an irritant at times to people driving motor vehicles but, if they believe that they have been unjustly stopped and given a traffic infringement notice, they can challenge that in the courts: that right has not been taken away from them. In fact, the majority of people given traffic infringement notices (85 to 86 per cent) pay immediately. In terms of policing, it has been very effective, mainly because we have been allowed to utilise the police resources in other areas, and we are not holding up the courts with a lot of minor traffic offences.

The Government has no intention of interfering with the traffic infringement notices. All Oppositions have a responsibility to critically analyse legislation, and in Opposition we did that; we criticised the traffic infringement notice that the previous Government introduced. However, they are a fact of life, they are working, and the Government has no intention of changing the system. The increases in the traffic infringement notice scheme were in line with inflation; they have not been increased for about 20 months.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Ms Lenehan): There being no further questions, I declare the examination on the vote completed.

Works and Services—Police Department, \$400 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr T.R. Groom

Ms S.M. Lenehan

Mr J. Mathwin

Mr J.K.G. Oswald

Mr W.A. Rodda

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr G.T. Harrison, Acting Auditor-General, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr P.E. Kildea, Administrative Officer, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Ms Lenehan): I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I commend the Government on taking some action in this important area. On numerous occasions in the House I have called on the Government to take some positive action in this regard. Having said that, I suggest that the \$400 000 allocated for this year will not touch the sides. It will do very little to overcome many of the significant problems that are currently being experienced, although it may be regarded as a start in the right direction.

I understand that the communications system upon which operational policing is almost totally reliant has continued to pose a problem within the Police Force for some period of time and that the situation has now developed to the point where the injection of funds to upgrade the entire radio system is one of most pressing urgency. While I commend the Government for heading in this direction, I am also concerned that it has been able to allocate only \$400 000 for this year. Having said that, I ask the Chief Secretary to indicate exactly how that \$400 000 will be spent and whether he is able or prepared to make a further commitment for ongoing expenditure in this area.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The report on how the \$400 000 will be spent as a capital item is, I understand, 2in. thick and canvasses the whole gamut of the network system which we are upgrading. The figure of \$400 000 was requested by the Police Department and was not imposed upon it by the Government or Treasury because of financial stringency. Any criticism of that amount or what it can achieve is, in fact, a criticism of the police and not the Government.

Three major proposals have been submitted by the Police Department to the Government for consideration and funding. They are the metropolitan mobile patrol system, the metropolitan personal patrol system and the country mobile radio system. Each system has been designed to be implemented in annual phases over a fixed time period of seven years. Implementation has been planned to enable gradual replacement of obsolete equipment in all areas and to enable the phased introduction of new equipment. The first two systems mentioned have been capital funded (the \$400 000) to enable the initial phase to commence during the 1983-84 financial year. It was initially proposed that the country upgrading commence at the same time. In view of the limited funding, country proposals will not commence until at least 1984-85. As a result, adjustments to the communication plan have to be made to maintain the existing country radio system for the time being. I believe that that canvasses the point which the honourable member raised. In terms of the overall implementation of the communication network, sites have to be found, and we have to develop programmes of implementation.

In the early phase of implementation of the metropolitan mobile and portable radio systems, effective operation coverage is extended to cover from Gawler in the north to Willunga in the south and Mount Barker in the east. The system will include total replacement of all existing outdated mobile radios in patrol vehicles and the expansion of the issue to patrols of personal hand-held portable radios. Two emergency channels will be available to both mobile and portable patrols, extendable to six separate emergency channels for localised use. It is a seven-year programme. The \$400 000 is to allow site selection. The first two phases, the metropolitan mobile patrol and metropolitan personal portable systems, have suffered no delay as funds have met the

Department's request for those two items. The country mobile radio system has been delayed marginally. My initial response that there has been no delay is not correct in regard to the country mobile radio system; there has been a delay in that because of funds. But, the two essential parts of the metropolitan system have been funded in accordance with the police request.

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

Auditor-General's, \$2 458 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr R.J. Gregory
Mr T.R. Groom
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J. Mathwin
Mr J.K.G. Oswald
Mr W.A. Rodda
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr G.T. Harrison, Acting Auditor-General, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr P.E. Kildea, Administrative Officer, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

Mr OSWALD (Ms Lenehan): About two years ago the Audit Act was assented to and it was made mandatory for the Auditor-General to carry out efficiency auditing. That Act has never been proclaimed. I was advised last year, during the Estimates Committees, that the Auditor-General could not carry out his efficiency auditing task within departments due to a lack of staff. Last year I also recall harsh criticism by the then shadow Minister (the present Minister), with which I agreed at the time. He stated that the Auditor-General was not carrying out efficiency auditing within departments mainly through a lack of staff. The Minister is now in a position to rectify the situation. Is the Government prepared to now proclaim the Act and provide the staff to implement the type of auditing of which the Minister was so supportive while in Opposition?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, last year I was critical of the Auditor-General's Department for not providing an efficiency auditing service to the Parliament. As the honourable member would know, we were both on the Public Accounts Committee and this matter occupied some of our time. In Government we have a review of Public Service management involving a comprehensive assessment of the structure of the Public Service in South Australia. That is an internal inquiry. The whole subject of efficiency auditing has been referred to this review, and I have been informed that the first paper has been received from the printer.

The efficiency auditing component of the review was not addressed in the first paper. I am personally convinced, as I was in 1982, in relation to efficiency auditing. The Gov-

ernment will be waiting for a report from the Internal Review Committee in relation to the Public Service.

Mr OSWALD: Is it an internal document or is the Minister prepared to table it?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I had not seen the document until the Acting Auditor-General showed it to me. I think it is probably an internal document. I will take up the matter with the Chairman of the committee, who is attached to the Premier's Department. It is likely that the document will be available for distribution and, if that is the case, I will ensure that the honourable member receives a copy.

Mr OSWALD: Is the Minister satisfied that computer systems are being audited adequately? What provision has the Minister made for the future training of personnel within the Auditor-General's Department as distinct from the training of officers for internal auditing, which is already occurring within Government departments?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The whole subject of computing systems auditing is very complex and difficult, because technology changes so dramatically. We continually need to upgrade our skills to be able to provide an auditing service. The Acting Auditor-General informs me that before any officers go into the field to audit computer systems they are required to undertake a six month in-service training course in computer systems. Officers go into the field only when they have developed those skills. The Acting Auditor-General also advises me that his officers are exposed to training courses outside the Department and undertake a number of computer training courses. It is an ongoing training programme. To answer the honourable member's question, yes the auditing division is upgrading its skills.

Mr OSWALD: The Canadian system of Government auditing is generally accepted as a good model worldwide. I am advised that officers of the Auditor-General's Department have travelled to Canada from time to time to study the Canadian system. Has the Minister considered the Canadian system (which follows the pattern of appointing public accountants who have been professionally trained in audit procedures) to extend the skills of the audit staff?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not know whether we will introduce the Canadian system, although we are aware of it. I am not aware of any of our officers who have been to Canada. The Acting Auditor-General will provide a more complete reply.

Mr Harrison: None of our staff have been to Canada. As part of the process of training officers in relation to computerised auditing we have adopted a course that was initially introduced by the chartered institute from Canada. Our people have all been through that course, which was conducted by people from outside the Department. All of our staff completed that course last year. We receive a lot of correspondence from Canada. I firmly believe that Canada leads the world in relation to auditing. Canada uses the comprehensive auditing system which, in effect, is the same as efficiency auditing. It is a measuring stick that we are guided by and we would like to achieve that standard.

Mr OSWALD: Is the Government considering the appointment of public accountants to the audit branch?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will obtain a complete answer for the honourable member. Obviously he has a reason for asking that question. As the Minister responsible, I am not aware of any thoughts along those lines. That matter may have been canvassed in the Public Service management review that is currently being conducted and, therefore, I would not be aware of it. I am currently unaware of any proposal to introduce public accountants into the audit branch. I will obtain a reply for the honourable member in Parliamentary form suitable for incorporation in *Hansard*.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to page 102 of the Estimates of Payments, and I note that there is no allocation for the

Auditor-General's Department this financial year. I take it that this year's allocations for the Auditor-General's Department are set out on pages 103 and 104.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

Mr MATHWIN: Is it a mere coincidence that 'accommodation and service costs' of \$72 000 appears on page 103 and a similar allocation appears on page 104 for the same line? Is that the same \$72 000? There is a similar situation in relation to 'general administration expenses' on page 103, which has an allocation of \$23 500, and 'general administration expenses' on page 104, which has an allocation of \$23 000. The two allocations are very similar. On page 103, \$4 500 is allocated for 'minor equipment', whereas 'minor equipment' on page 104 has a proposed allocation of \$8 100.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This is the first year that the Auditor-General's Department lines have appeared in programme form—it has usually been in one figure. That is why the proposed allocations for the Department do not appear on page 102 but have been included on pages 103 and 104. The funds for the lines mentioned by the honourable member have been split almost evenly between the two programmes. The Department believes that is how the costs will fall and, therefore, they have been allocated accordingly. It was not a matter of taking a lump sum and making an arbitrary decision to cut it down the middle—half for one area and half for the other. The services and resources are probably evenly balanced. The funds are allocated to maintain that balance. I think that is a fair comment and I believe that that is what has happened.

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

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

Correctional Services, \$20 592 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mrs J.E. Appleby
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr R.J. Gregory
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr J. Mathwin
Mr J.K.G. Oswald
Mr W.A. Rodda
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr M.J. Dawes, Executive Director, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr M.A. Hutton, Acting Director, Support Services, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr R.W. Seaman, Finance Officer, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary say why the Correctional Services Act passed in 1981 has not yet been proclaimed, and will he indicate at what stage the regulations are, whether they have been finalised and when we will see them? I ask this question because this legislation

was debated and passed by this Parliament in 1981. When the former Government left office regulations were at an advanced stage, to say the least. The Minister has refused to indicate why the Government is refusing to proclaim this legislation and it has been said by a number of people that because the Government is refusing to take action on this matter we are continuing to have the many problems that have been experienced at Yatala Labour Prison, particularly in relation to erosion of authority of officers. Why is this legislation not being proclaimed; when will it be proclaimed, and when will we see the regulations?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: First, I state quite clearly that there has never been any intention on the part of the Government to delay production and proclamation of the regulations. I know that this is something that has been widely said, but I have been, and remain, as anxious as anybody to have these regulations proclaimed because there are many worthwhile changes to the system included in the 1981 legislation. I point out to the honourable member, and to anybody else who has an interest in this matter, that on 22 September 1983 we received a minute from the Crown Solicitor addressed to the Executive Director which states, among other things, that this Act is faulty in many respects. For instance, the Crown Solicitor states that the Act and regulations must be breached to react to a riot situation.

There are a number of recommendations contained in the Crown Solicitor's letter referring to the legislation approved in 1981 saying that it needs to be amended so that the intent of that 1981 legislation can be implemented. There have been many problems in producing the regulations. However, they are numbered. There has never been a deliberate intention to delay these regulations. I know that the feeling is that we were delaying them so that the Government could introduce its own amendments, but that is not true. If they do coincide, it might be appropriate to take action to introduce further regulations in line with amendments that the Government anticipates might flow in relation to the Parole Act. However, I totally refute the suggestion that the Government has delayed these regulations, because it has not. I point out to the honourable member that I am as surprised as anybody else that, in September 1983, the Crown Solicitor is reporting to us that the 1981 amended Act is defective and that, before the regulations can be proclaimed, further changes are needed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Minister saying that it has taken from early 1981 to September 1983 for the Crown Solicitor to determine that there are problems with this legislation?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, I am saying that. I add that the bulk of that time was during the honourable member's term of office, so if we are going to talk about guilt I suggest that it ought to be shared. When I became Minister draft regulations had been prepared, but they were defective and were returned to the Crown Solicitor. There has been considerable research and study of those regulations, and now in September we have this reply from the Crown Solicitor, which states in part:

It should be noted that recent media comments that suggest that the Correctional Services Act and the regulations will restore control to officers are incorrect. The Act and regulations do not purport to have that effect and will not do so. Indeed, once the ramifications of the Act and regulations are understood by the prison officers, industrial action by those officers could well follow.

That is a strong statement by the Crown Solicitor. He is pointing out to the Government that, if it implements the Act passed in 1981, it will not give the control of prisons intended by the Parliament and that, in fact, it is defective to the extent that prison officers might believe that they need to take industrial action because of the ramifications of the Act. In view of these matters, the Government will

be having a close look at the Act and regulations in response to the Crown Solicitor's letter to ensure that, when the Act is proclaimed and the regulations are effected, they do the things that were intended by the 1981 Act.

Mr MATHWIN: How many years do you want to do that?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In response to that interjection, we will be doing it as quickly as we can.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has the Chief Secretary asked for an investigation to be carried out to ascertain why it has taken this length of time for the Crown Solicitor to determine his attitude to this matter? I would hope that the Chief Secretary has ordered such an investigation. On a point of clarification, are we talking about problems in both the Act and the regulations?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, we are talking about both the Act and the regulations. The situation is dynamic to the extent that problems have occurred this year (and the Bromley case is a classic example) that were not contemplated in regard to the 1981 Act and regulations. Therefore, the situation is continually changing and is dynamic. It is not an easy thing, and I repeat that I would have to be a very foolish Chief Secretary indeed if I did not want these regulations to be drawn up and proclaimed, because they contain programmes that we want to implement as enthusiastically as the Opposition would wish to implement them. We have been in contact continually with the Attorney-General's Department. This is a massive exercise and it is not the only massive exercise before the Crown Law Office in terms of regulations. This is the earliest that we have been able to get this sort of reply.

Mr MATHWIN: You could always put the regulations in in full.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We cannot put the regulations in in full.

Mr MATHWIN: You do not have to.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Well, this is the first time that this document has been presented to us. The problem is that the Act itself cannot be isolated into clear parts. The Act is inter-related, so that the proclamation of certain areas impacts on others. The advice we have is that to do the job correctly the regulations and the Act must be proclaimed as a whole. That is advice which I am prepared to accept: the legal advice available to us suggests that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would suggest that the Chief Secretary has not answered the question that I asked. Has he asked for an investigation to be carried out as to the length of time taken? It is not good enough, in relation to legislation as important as this, for the Chief Secretary some 2½ years later to say that the Crown Solicitor has now found that there are problems with the legislation, after it was drafted by the Parliamentary Counsel, debated in this House and approved by both sides of the House and both Houses of Parliament. It is not good enough that we are told that this is the situation and that we should be considering amending the Act before regulations are brought down.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: What the honourable member does not realise or refuses to acknowledge is that circumstances have changed dramatically in 1983. The Crown Solicitor says quite explicitly that the Act and regulations passed in 1981 would not address the correct situation, that further amendments are needed, and that the Act and the regulations are defective in that respect. Therefore, he recommends that, in the light of experience and the changed circumstances in 1983 and the different cases which have occurred (and I mentioned the Bromley case as an example), further consideration of the Act and the regulations is required.

I do not know the intent of the member for Murray. My intent is to make sure that we have a prison system and a

prison institution that work. I have had some trouble trying to achieve that in the 10 months that I have been Minister. By proclaiming this piece of legislation and the regulations, we would only encourage further industrial disputation, as the Crown Solicitor has pointed out. When the regulations are finally prepared in a satisfactory form that is suitable to the Crown Solicitor, so that he can advise the Government accordingly, they will be brought in. It is my intention to ensure that that is achieved as quickly as possible. I cannot give the honourable member any time table except to say that I will continue in my endeavours to ensure that these regulations are brought in at the earliest possible time and that, when they are brought in, they are workable. To bring in regulations that are not workable seems to me to be the height of foolishness, and I do not intend to go down that path.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that it is advisable from the Chair's viewpoint to say that we see again for the third day a classic example of what not to do in the system of Estimates Committees. All the questions asked by the member for Murray have been allowed by the Chair because the Chair has made it a practice, similar to the practice of the Opposition the right to make a general statement or general remark. However, in no way (and the Chair is sorry to have to point out again) can the present form of questioning of the Minister be linked with the vote in front of us. Unfortunately, in the Chairman's opinion, that is the very bad system that we have got ourselves into, and that is the position in which the Chair has found itself.

I say again that the type of questions put by the member for Murray cannot in any way be linked with the vote before us. Nevertheless, I have allowed the questions, but I do not intend (as I said in my opening remarks) to allow a second reading debate or a grievance debate.

Ms LENEHAN: I have a general question in regard to 'Department of Correctional Services—Administration' (page 104 of the Estimates of Payment). I noted recently in the Ombudsman's Report that he was critical of the Department of Correctional Services. Will the Minister indicate what action is being taken by the Department in respect of these criticisms which would improve the performance of the Department in the areas referred to by the Ombudsman?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think that it is reasonable to acknowledge that there were criticisms of the Department in the Ombudsman's Report. Certainly those criticisms received considerable publicity. Unfortunately, the Ombudsman did not feel inclined to report, for instance, how many complaints against the Department of Correctional Services were substantiated. In fact, the percentage of complaints against the Department of Correctional Services that was substantiated was lower than that in regard to most other departments.

For example, in 1982-83, while there were 261 complaints against the Department (and that is by far the highest number for any Government department), only 29.5 per cent were reported as justified, compared with an average of 40 per cent in regard to all other departments. As the honourable member would be able to readily acknowledge, that figure is 11.5 per cent below the average, and compares favourably with the position in 1981-82, when there were 247 registered complaints, of which 39.7 per cent were found to be justified, as against the average for all Government departments of 47 per cent. It should be understood that the Ombudsman's Report was prepared prior to June 1983, and was signed on 30 June 1983. Thus, it was prepared prior to many of the major announcements that were made by the Government, certainly in regard to capital items, and prior to announcements in relation to manning of different institutions.

That is the first thing. In fact, the Ombudsman's Report, I would submit to anyone who read it carefully, was more a criticism of the preceding Administration than of the current Administration. In fact, the Ombudsman himself acknowledges that in a number of areas the present Administration had taken steps to overcome many of the problems that he highlighted.

Another area of the Ombudsman's report on which I should comment is that related to my own office—the Chief Secretary's office. The Ombudsman seemed to be critical of the fact that it took an inordinately long time for complaints received by him from prisoners to be investigated and for the replies to get back to him. First, I should say that complaints made by prisoners are always thoroughly investigated by the Department. We now have investigating officers within the Department who undertake that investigation. At times these are lengthy, because investigations should be thorough in order to protect both the prison officers, who quite often are the subject of the complaints, and the prisoners themselves, who are the complainants. So, we make no apology for that. Thoroughness here again is the best course of action to take.

I am concerned that the Ombudsman feels that there have been undue delays in my office. As the Minister, I follow the pattern established by my preceding Ministers and, as the member for Victoria would well know, Ombudsman's complaints go through the Minister, even though he be the only Minister in the Government who requires that action. That is necessary so that the Minister can be aware of the types of complaint coming from the institutions. Almost the only way, but certainly the best way, to keep on top of that is to have these files directed through the Minister's office. I am sure that there must have been some delays; otherwise, the Ombudsman would not have felt compelled to make that point. We have undertaken a random check of our own departmental dockets and we have not noticed the delays to which the Ombudsman refers. That does not suggest that there have not been delays. I am sure that the Ombudsman is aware of them.

We have changed the system in our office to ensure that the Ombudsman's inquiries are dealt with as quickly as possible. I would be very interested to hear from the Ombudsman whether or not those problems that he considered existed within the Department prior to June this year are still in his view apparent. I would suggest that in most cases they are not. If they are, we will address them.

Ms LENEHAN: I think that the Minister will agree that one of the fundamental purposes of the Department of Correctional Services is actually to keep prisoners in prison, while it has other roles such as rehabilitation and re-education. Will the Minister give the Committee some statistics about the escape rate from Correctional Services institutions in South Australia, and can he also tell the Committee whether his Department has been able to make comparisons between escape rates in South Australia and those in other States?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: First, any escape is one too many, and the responsibility of the Department and of the people who work within it is to ensure that offenders placed in our control and custody remain there. I regard any escape as a breakdown somewhere or other within our own Department. That is no reflection on officers of the Department, because prisoners are very clever at working out ways to escape. Nevertheless, we feel badly if anyone escapes, and we can appreciate the community concern.

Having said that, we certainly have the best record of any mainland State of keeping people in custody. For example, in 1982-83 there were 92 escapes in Western Australia, and the population of that State is just marginally in front of ours in recent weeks. There were 17 escapes in South

Australia in that time. These figures do not always compare like with like, as members would understand. People who walk out of a minimum security institution are walk-aways; they really are not breaking the security screen, unlike people who escape from high security institutions. I believe that the performance of the officers within the Department of Correctional Services in South Australia in terms of security is without comparison in Australian mainland institutions. Tasmania, I understand, has an equal or perhaps better record in security and custody.

It is our responsibility. I repeat that any escape is one too many, and that our intention is to minimise the opportunity and number of escapes. Where there is an attempted escape and that attempt has been foiled by departmental officers—which happens more than occasionally, because the officers are alert to the prisoners' desires to escape and take action to prevent that—we do very well, but 17 escapes are 17 too many.

Ms LENEHAN: In the past couple of months we have heard from the Minister an outline of various initiatives which the Department is taking. While I am sure that everyone welcomes these initiatives, I am wondering whether the initiatives are part of some overall future plan rather than being isolated incidents. Is there some overall plan in which the initiatives are seen as a part?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, the Government is working to a number of plans or reports. In terms of our capital structures, for instance, we are working to the master plan that was implemented by the Executive Director on taking office in South Australia. That has been very useful and has been the basis of our announcements as regards the developments at Yatala. That unit will undertake similar tasks in regard to the other institutions throughout South Australia, although we do not have the funding available and we have not programmed yet any capital work for those other institutions; but, that is part of a plan.

In addition to that, the Swink Report that I commissioned immediately on coming to office has been the basis of changes within the administration of Yatala Labour Prison. The earlier Touche Ross Report, which was commissioned by the previous Government, made recommendations in relation to the administration of the Department of Correctional Services. The recommended structures have been put into place and we are in the process of appointing officers to those positions. We have been very lucky to have seconded to the Department a number of very competent officers who have helped us out over the past very difficult six to seven months.

In addition, the Department is involved in the preparation of a corporate plan. I was very fortunate last week to attend one of the final briefings about the corporate plan. This plan will present to the Government a five-year programme of development and change within the Department. It relates not only to capital but to administration, and will address the whole area of where we believe that the Department of Correctional Services and the treatment of offenders in South Australia are going. It is essential for the Government to have such a plan. Quite clearly it relates to the community our priorities and provides the base for Treasury to make its assessments on future capital funding. Yes, there is a plan. I might say that there were very few plans when we came to office; I think that I could be forgiven for saying that.

Mr MATHWIN: The redevelopment of Yatala was there.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am glad that the honourable member said that, because this is one of the myths that is running around the community. When the Liberal Government left office it had no idea that the master plan was in existence, otherwise it would have been asking about it. I know that it had no idea. The only way Liberal members

found out that it was begun during the Liberal Government's term of office was when I released a film on Yatala which quite clearly showed on the credits that the master plan had been initiated by the Executive Director when he took up his position in South Australia. That information was not related to the previous Government: the plan was initiated and undertaken by the Department.

I find quite interesting, if not absurd, some of the statements about this from Opposition members. I take no credit for it; the credit is due to the Executive Director, whose initiative it was. No purpose is served in politicians, irrespective of to which Party they belong, taking credit for that. It was a very sensible initiative. So, there are plans, as we believe there must be if we are going to bring the whole area of correctional services into the twenty-first century.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will not waste time on this because it is limited, but before proceeding I want to question your ruling, Mr Chairman. Previously you suggested that the Committee cannot debate matters pertaining to legislation, but that forms the very base of the Department's administration.

The CHAIRMAN: That is my ruling. The Parliament has set down a system of dealing with the Budget, part of which entails the formulation of these Committees to deal with the estimated expenditure of Government departments. I would say also in explaining the reasons for my ruling that I, as Chairman, am certainly not happy with the system. However, unfortunately, as Chairman I am responsible for carrying out that which Parliament has decided to do. I can also assure the member for Murray that already I have discussed this matter with the Speaker, and I have told him that, in my humble opinion, this system must be reviewed. My ruling stands, namely, the Committee must deal with the specific estimates of expenditure for Government departments. If the honourable member wishes to dispute my ruling, that is his prerogative. I am simply enforcing the system that the Parliament has set down.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is not my intention to disagree with the ruling because of the time factor. However, I suggest that a precedent has been set by the operation of these Committees over the past two years. I fail to see how we can discuss matters concerning the administration of a department when we are not allowed to refer to legislation which, as I said earlier, is the very base of its administration. I shall refer later to certain statements made by the Chief Secretary. I now want to refer to a matter that relates to staffing. How does the Minister intend to improve industrial relations between the Department and the major unions, in consultation with the Public Service Board? In the yellow book this matter is seen as one of the major issues. How is the Minister going to do that, having regard to the comments that have been made by so many people, including the Ombudsman, that unions are running the prisons? Also, does the Minister consider that any difficulties have been created as a result of having two unions within the correctional services area? I refer particularly to problems that have occurred at Yatala. Does the Minister see gains as a result of the dual system with the unions?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Whether there should be one or two unions represented within our institutions is of course a decision that the members of the unions are able to make themselves, so I will not comment on that. People are quite entitled to be represented by the industrial body that best looks after their needs as they see them. If that means that there will be two unions as against there being one, then we will deal with two unions.

In regard to industrial representation, it should be the privilege of the individual working person to determine which union relevant to his occupation he will join. We

have two unions involved at Yatala; we have seen difficulties in dealing with two unions, and certainly there is a record of difficulties having occurred in the Department of Correctional Services in regard to administration versus the unions. We are certainly addressing this matter. The relationship (although it might not be regarded as such publicly for various reasons) between the unions, the Department, and the Public Service Board, I believe, has never been better. An effective procedure has been established by which members of the Department of Correctional Services, whether they be in the P.S.A. or in the A.G.W.A., can take up matters with departmental officers and with the Public Service Board.

Matters are taken up now in a spirit of trying to resolve the problem, rather than in a spirit of confrontation. This does not mean that there will not be hiccups or problems where we find ourselves publicly in dispute with a union. That will occur due to the very nature of the industrial system, and one would not want to stop that from occurring. The overwhelming majority of matters previously taken up publicly are now confidently taken up privately with the Public Service Board. We are working very hard to improve industrial relations within the Department. We believe that the unions have a very essential and important part to play, and we respect their role.

We have made two very important appointments that have impacted significantly on the co-operation between the unions and the Department. George Beltchev has been appointed Director of Operations, and Adrian Sandery has been appointed Assistant Director of Institutions. These senior officers within the Department can spend a considerable amount of time and effort working with the unions in the institutions themselves, and this is particularly so in regard to Dr Sandery. In itself that has given a focal point to which the concerns of officers can be directed. The arrangement is working, and I believe that it will not be too long before the types of industrial confrontation problem to which we have become accustomed will be a thing of the past. Further, appointments have been made at the senior managerial level and at the base-grade clerical level within the Department of Correctional Services. Those officers will help to overcome some of the current reasons for union complaint. The honourable member may want to take up that matter further with me.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will take up the matter further later. Has the Chief Secretary set any deadline as far as the introduction of legislation relating to parole is concerned? The discussion paper has now been circulated. I have previously already expressed concerns in this House about this matter: I feel that the Government had probably made up its mind where it was going with this, even before the discussion paper was released. When is it anticipated that that legislation will be brought before the House, and is the Minister working to a deadline in regard to that matter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The deadline is to get the legislation into the House as soon as I can. Today's discussion has thrown up how many (not only on this line but on other lines) important pieces of legislation my officers are working on at present. This just happens to be another one of them. We have had considerable response from various bodies and individuals concerned with correction in South Australia to the discussion paper. Those responses are being summarised and will be considered in the immediate future. There is a degree of urgency about the parole legislation that insists that the Government introduces legislation as early as it can. We also understand the logistics of introducing legislation. I still hope to have a Bill before Parliament this year (in the 1983 sittings). We will be working towards that end.

The member commented that he believed the Government had already made up its mind. I did attend a seminar at which the member was present and he heard me say the same thing then: despite what was reported publicly (I am not blaming the media), the discussion paper was not accepted in principle by Cabinet. In fact, I did not ask it to do so. I asked Cabinet to give approval to circulating the discussion paper so that people would have an idea of the proposals suggested in case they wanted to respond to them. True, many of the proposals are those that I have sought to have introduced, but there have been responses to those and they will be varied. I can assure the member that when the legislation does come down it will be different—I do not know to what extent—from what the discussion paper set out.

The extent of the difference will have to be determined, and we will also have to wait until it goes to Cabinet for Cabinet's decision on any changes that I recommend. We have not made up our minds. We are still flexible and anxious to amend the legislation. The overwhelming majority of submissions received agreed that a change is necessary, but the submissions differ to a degree as to what the changes should be.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: At page 44 of the yellow book, under the heading 'Implications for Resources', the following statement is made:

The Department will need to critically review its financial management generally and impose greater controls and accountability throughout all levels within the organisation.

What has been done and what does the Minister intend to do about that? I am aware that the Department has employed extra staff, some of whom are not members of the Correctional Services Department (for example, Mr John Burdett). How many people have been employed who are in that category but who are not part of the Department?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Whilst my officers obtain the statistical information I will deal with the first part of the question. Certainly, we are most anxious to upgrade our financial management generally. We are doing that. The preparation of this year's p.p.b. information, as compared with last year's, is clearly indicative of that. There has been some criticism of aspects of our financial management in the Auditor-General's Report, particularly about the Yatala Labour Prison canteen. We did respond to the Public Accounts Committee's report on that and devised an accounting scheme, but that was rejected by Treasury and we are now working with Treasury to devise another scheme to satisfy the Auditor-General's complaints.

Another area about which he complained concerned financial accountability within the Department and our inability to cost effectively the production of produce of our workshops and farms. We hope to introduce systems in this financial year to address that need. We acknowledge that there are weaknesses and we intend to address them. I point out to the member that the amount of work that needs to be done within the Department really defies description. The offices and the resources that we now have available are far in excess of what was made available to previous Administrations, and it is about time, I am sure we would all agree, and this enables us to attack a whole host of fronts.

Our greatest priority is in terms of our institutions and their stabilisation, as well as being able to provide improvements within those institutions. We are addressing that. True, we would like to be able to do everything at once, but it is absolutely impossible to do so. We will continue to make strides as we have been doing. Any reasonable assessment of developments within the Department within the past 10 months would indicate that we are serious about that.

Secondments include Mr Hutton, who is sitting at the table with me and who is Director, Support Services. We have Mr Mike Copley and Mr Tony Lock and Mr Bob Jeffery, from Management Services. We have Mr John Williams, who has assisted in the corporate plan, and we have Mrs Cheryl Vardon, from the Education Department, who is a member of the management development programme. She has been seconded to the Department.

In addition, we have had a number of people appointed within the Department in positions that have enabled us to do the tasks that we are charged to do. We have appointed two investigative officers; a Senior Staff Development Officer, Mr Hinora has recently come to the Department; and I have already mentioned Dr Sandery and Mr Beltchev, who just filled the position when it became vacant on the retirement of the previous Director. There have been a number of new positions created and filled either by permanent or seconded officers, but eventually they will be filled by permanent officers from the Department. Not all are in that category. Mr Williams is involved with the corporate plan, for instance, and once that plan is developed there will not be a permanent position there.

Mr FERGUSON: Page 44 of the yellow book deals with the community service order scheme. There is an increase from \$13 253 to \$28 000 in the estimate for country gaols as for the purchase of plant and equipment. I understand that the scheme will be extended to the Iron Triangle and Port Adelaide. Can the Minister indicate what results have come from the introduction of the community service order scheme in the Noarlunga and Norwood area? If it has been successful, why cannot the scheme be extended to the rest of the State?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is a good question. Yes, it has been successful, and there is no doubt about that. Although pure economic considerations are not the essential criterion, members should know that it costs an average of \$757 a year for a person to be on a community service order scheme, compared with \$26 000 a year for a prisoner in an institution. In economic terms there is a considerable saving, but there are many more profound savings than that. Through the use of that scheme we save much in human development and the character of the offenders.

I believe that imprisonment is the last card in the pack, and I expect that the courts share that view. The courts need to have available to them alternative sentencing options, and the community service order is one of those sentencing options. I would like this system available State-wide. Unfortunately, there are financial constraints. There are already two community service order schemes operating, one at Norwood and one at Port Noarlunga. They are working very well, and we intend to have a community order scheme established at Port Adelaide, as the honourable member pointed out, and in the Iron Triangle, and the sooner that happens the better it will be.

I believe that the courts will not enthusiastically embrace the system until it is State-wide, because, while it is not State-wide, there is inequality in the capacity for courts to sentence offenders. If in some areas the courts can put offenders on community order service work, and in other areas the only option available is to imprison, it is not a fair comparison.

However, there are constraints, and it is my hope that, as the economy picks up and as funds become more readily available, the system will be introduced State-wide. It is certainly a priority within the Department. Sentencing options should be available to the courts. The community service order scheme has been and is a success. It is a socially productive sanction in that it keeps an offender in his own community. If an offender comes before the court and is placed in gaol, there is quite often a dual penalty. In

addition to the gaoling, an offender often loses his or her job. The community service order allows a person to continue in his employment so that he is able to maintain the economic viability of his family, and at the same time repay the community for the offences that he has committed. That seems to be a much more preferable way of dealing with those offenders whose crime seems more suited to the community service order.

I am anxious to see that the courts view community service orders as an alternative to imprisonment. If the courts continue to imprison people, and see the community service order merely as an alternative to fines, it will mean that those people able to pay a fine will do so, and those who cannot will be placed on a community service order, which will discriminate against the less affluent section of the community, who are, overwhelmingly, the largest section in the community. So, it is important that community service orders be imposed as an alternative to imprisonment, with no regard being given to the capacity of people to pay a fine. If that works, it will help to reduce the number of people in prisons, and there are far too many people in our prisons who are serving short sentences. Prisons are there for the more serious offender, and frankly I believe that very often that is the only option available to society for those serious offenders.

Mr FERGUSON: My next question relates to the line in almost every gaol in relation to the staff. Will the Minister outline the extent of the problems that have been caused by the burning of A Division and part of C Division at Yatala?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Certainly the burning down of A Division and a section of C Division has placed great stresses upon the Department because it has meant the transfer of prisoners to other institutions. When we transfer prisoners to other institutions, we have to staff them. We have had to increase staffing at Adelaide Gaol by 11 custodial officers and at Port Augusta Gaol by 13 officers. Prisoners should be moving to Port Augusta very soon.

In relation to the Port Augusta prison extension, Greenbush, it was not finished in November last year or when I attended the opening ceremony five days before the last election. However, I do not expect that that had anything to do with the opening.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The actual construction was not completed until the end of December and the security locks, so essential for that wing to be put into effect, did not arrive in Australia from overseas until March or April of this year. No funding was provided at all to man the institution at Port Augusta. We had to wait until we had our own budget and we provided the funding. In fact, the previous Government had a policy of reducing the number of public servants, and one member of that Party was overheard saying that, if it was still in Government, there would be 2 000 fewer public servants than are employed now. One would have expected that the Department of Correctional Services would have been—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. You have already pulled me up on a ruling indicating that the matters being debated were not part of the line. I would suggest that this matter now being raised by the Chief Secretary has nothing to do with the line.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. I ask the honourable Minister to contain himself and come back to the line.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I accept your ruling. I just got carried away. We have increased the personnel in Port Augusta by 13. This year, we plan to increase the number

of custodial positions across the Department by 40, which is a significant increase. I might add that there is a similar problem in relation to the industries complex which may come up later on: the timing of the construction that is always being expressed publicly is not accurate; also, it has been said that no funds were put into it to provide additional staffing that might be required.

To answer the honourable member's question, we are increasing the custodial staff within the Department, and we want to widen the role of a prison officer. We will be introducing changes within the system, and some of those changes have staff resource allocations.

Mr FERGUSON: The Minister referred earlier to the proposed capital works programme at Yatala. Would the Minister outline what he is proposing?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We are working on a rather significant capital programme for Yatala. To implement the Swink Report, it will cost about \$1.25 million to build the minimum security facility adjacent to the women's rehabilitation centre; this will enable the Department to take the minimum security prisoners out of Yatala. That is a high priority, and everybody agrees with that. All of the minimum security prisoners will be taken out of Yatala, and it will return to being a high security institution. That will cost about \$1.2 million.

In addition, we will be building a security fence which, on the original estimates, will cost about \$1.5 million. There will be the cost of demolition of a number of the buildings there, as long as our application to the Department of Environment and Planning and to the Authority there is accepted. We intend to demolish A Division but, despite all the publicity to it, that approval has not been given: that will cost \$350 000. We also have to upgrade the boiler complex at Yatala, and that will cost about \$450 000.

We are continuing to install flush toilets. Some were installed by the previous Government, and the current work is being undertaken by this Government. We are continuing with that \$100 000 programme, although the total cost will be \$1.6 million. As a result of moving the industries complex, another 39 cells require the installation of flush toilets. We will be spending about \$340 000 this year on security for the industries complex. Some people believe that that complex is ready to move into, but those additional funds need to be spent on it.

Mr MATHWIN: Plus \$1.25 million for the outside.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, maintaining prisons is an expensive process. Other expenditures include the resiting of the brickworks within the Department; tower alterations; the removal of C Division; a surveillance and security system in the Northfield Security Hospital; and planning for staff training and recreation facilities. These items mean that we will be expending over \$4 million exclusively at Yatala this financial year.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer to page 45 of the yellow book under the heading 'Prisoners Detention Service' where it states:

Provision has been made for the full-year cost of the appointment of staff to man additional first and second watch posts at Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol, resulting in an increase of \$48 000 and 8.7 staff.

Will the Minister advise whether that will assist in the current situation at Yatala? Will it ease the situation of prisoners being locked in their cells for 16 hours per day? The problem is a lack of staff or the lack of an additional shift. Is that alluded to in the programme and will it ease the shocking situation that currently prevails? Some inmates deserve the benefit of better conditions which could be provided with an additional shift. If this provision is made, it would be very good news.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The additional personnel for the first and second watches will not address the problem to which the honourable member has referred. The problem is critical, and I am anxious to solve it as soon as possible. We are working with the Public Service Board now to facilitate a system that will allow the prisoners to be out of their cells for much longer periods than they are currently. The problem should have been addressed some time ago. The fact that prisoners are still kept in their cells in South Australia for such long hours is an indictment on us all—legislators as much as anyone else.

Mr MATHWIN: It has been the same for the past 25 years.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, I expect for the past 100 years. It is a problem which, particularly in the summer months, can cause considerable problems within our institutions. A number of options are available to us which we are currently discussing with the various organisations. That will, hopefully, allow us to introduce a system where prisoners can remain out of their cell for a much longer time. An extensive review of all positions within our institutions is being undertaken to provide us with base material so that we are able to implement a system whereby prisoners can be allowed out of their cells. This line does not provide the staff to which the honourable member referred.

Mr MATHWIN: I refer also to the operation of the Community Service Order Scheme where, on page 44 under the heading 'Expansion of the Community Service Order Scheme', it states:

Implement the Community Service Order Scheme by opening at least two more centres, one metropolitan and one country.

What progress has been made to date? How many programmes are under way, and how many are in the pipeline? It appears that there would be an abundance of work to be done in this area. I know problems exist with the unions, which are concerned about keeping their own workers in jobs. It is a delicate problem which faces not only us but also people in other countries. I have visited Germany, England and America, but they do not seem to have the great problem that we appear to have in this area.

A great deal of work could be done in conjunction with councils. I refer particularly to sanitary blocks—a problem facing local government and many churches. This type of work could be undertaken instead of employing people on week-ends. I compliment the Department on the way in which it has grasped the nettle. The Community Welfare Department is behind this Department in regard to the Community Service Orders Scheme.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is no shortage of work for people under the Community Service Orders Scheme. We have had the co-operation of a number of local and community groups. Much of the work we do is related to assisting elderly citizens who may not otherwise be able to have the work done. The honourable member is correct when he says that we must be careful that offenders are not doing work that would normally be done by someone in a paid occupation, thereby depriving some citizen of a job. To ensure that that is not the case, we have a Community Service Advisory Committee which has the responsibility to supervise the operations of community services. For every region we establish there is an advisory committee.

A nominee of the Trades and Labor Council is included on each advisory committee to ensure that paid work is not done by offenders who to all intents and purposes are unpaid, and that the system does not thereby cause conflict by taking work away from people who desire it, especially at present when work is difficult to obtain.

In the Noarlunga area 28 offenders and, at Norwood, 53 offenders have complied with a community service order, and 139 have done work under the system up to the present,

while 58 have successfully complied with a community service order and six others have failed to comply and have been referred back to the courts. That is always likely to happen and offenders who are given this opportunity must fulfil the conditions entailed. The type of work undertaken has included erecting a children's playground in Trinity Gardens; paving a footpath for handicapped persons in Fullarton; cleaning up a cemetery at Mitcham; assisting in maintaining a dog rescue home at Lonsdale; gardening for pensioners in Christies Beach; and caring for children at a creche run by volunteers at Noarlunga. We have also used some offenders, in conjunction with the police, at Blue Light discos. We try to specify work that is appropriate to the type of offender with whom we are dealing.

Mr MATHWIN: Recently, while on a Public Works Committee inspection of Yatala Gaol concerning the new fence to go around the perimeter, I noticed, in the centre of the area to be developed, a stable which could represent a security hazard when the new fence is erected. There seems to be no sense in leaving the building where it is, and there is some doubt whether the building is an authentic historic relic. As the area around Yatala is to be developed as a beautified open space, this building should be removed, not only in the interests of security, but also to improve the view beyond the fence. The whole project would then be more satisfactorily and effectively completed, as it should be in the light of the expenditure of over \$1 million on the security fence. Has the Minister thought about having this stable removed by people who qualify for a community service order? Such action would solve many problems with the local council, with the local residents, and with the Department, and I am sure that its removal would be satisfactory to all concerned.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I cannot argue very much with the honourable member on this matter. We are aware of the stable (or barn) and believe that it would be preferable from the point of view of security if it were not there. If it can be moved and if such a move is acceptable to the people concerned with the heritage of some of our older buildings (and I accept that this is a genuine building that should be preserved), it would be preferable if it could be moved. As the honourable member has said, we intend to upgrade the valley behind the gaol, so that the area with the stream running through it can be made a pleasant picnic ground. Many buildings near the river, some of them relics, will be preserved, and it would make sense to place the stable in the same area.

Even if the building stays where it is, it would not necessarily mean that the perimeter fence would be ineffective, but we are aware that it would impact on the effectiveness of the fence. The suggestion that offenders working under a community service order could participate in the removal of the stable is worth considering. However, as I understand it, the bricks used in the construction of the building are heavy, and the handling of those bricks might prove to be beyond the ability of offenders. This matter is being considered.

Mr OSWALD: On page 62 of the yellow book, it is stated that the equivalent of 16 full-time officers were employed on general administration in 1982-83 compared to 52 in 1981-82. The Estimates show that the recurrent expenditure on this line has been increased from \$628 000 for 1982-83 to a proposed figure of \$943 000 this year. Will the Minister explain the reduction in staff from 52 to 16 and say how such a reduction was achieved in the light of an increase in recurrent expenditure?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The difference in the costing is because this year we have to pay \$262 000 to the Public Buildings Department for accommodation. That cost has never shown up in individual department lines before—it

has always been carried by the Public Buildings Department. That cost is now applied to our lines. A reduction in relation to intra-agency support services is shown on page 62 of the yellow book because manning levels for those services have now been allocated to individual programmes. There has been no reduction in numbers; in fact, there has been an increase. Those figures now show up in individual programmes. I can obtain an example for the honourable member.

Mr OSWALD: I accept the Minister's word. I refer to page 50 of the yellow book and the figures in relation to prisoner security. In 1983-84 it is proposed to employ 278.8 full-time equivalent staff. That is a significant increase over the 222 employed in 1981-82 and the 254 employed in 1982-83. The average daily number of prisoners fell from 861 as at 30 June 1981 to 754 as at 30 June 1983. In view of the reduction in prisoner numbers, what is the 1983-84 budget in relation to prison officer callback and overtime? Page 72 of the Auditor-General's Report states:

The cost of callbacks and overtime increased by \$329 000 to \$1.507 million and represented 10.2 per cent of total cost for salaries and wages.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: While that information is being obtained, I will comment on the other matter raised by the honourable member. It is certainly our intention that any increase in custodial numbers should be offset by a reduction in the callback and overtime figures. The amount of overtime and callback is having quite a detrimental effect on the health of prison officers within the Department of Correctional Services. Frankly, there is too much overtime and callback for them. I am sure that the prison officers themselves agree that it is in their best interests for the amount of overtime to be reduced.

The number of custodial staff does not always go hand-in-hand with the number of prisoners. The honourable member would be well aware that we have to provide a basic staffing structure which does not change dramatically if the number of prisoners fluctuates. There has been a need to increase staffing in both Adelaide and Port Augusta, which takes up a large part of the increases in the number of custodial staff. As I pointed out earlier, we are currently reviewing every position at Yatala Labour Prison. Hopefully, that review will be available soon. We have allowed \$1.164 million this year for callback and overtime. That allocation has been reduced from last year because there were a number of incidents last year that we hope will not occur this year. The allocation shows up in the normal salaries and wages line for each institution.

As an example, I refer to page 104 of the Estimates of Payments and the line for 'Adelaide Gaol'. An allocation of \$3.279 million is proposed under that line for Keeper, Deputy Keeper, Instructors, Prison Officers, Supply and Clerical Staff. That allocation includes a provision for overtime. The very nature of a prison officer's duties requires a certain amount of structured overtime and penalty—more penalty than structured overtime. That is the nature of the occupation. Prison officers work shifts and at weekends; they work five days over a total seven-day roster. There is always a built-in component to cover those expenses.

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister supply further statistical information later?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question relates to the Correctional Services Advisory Committee. How is the Minister using that Committee? How often does the Minister meet with the Committee or its Chairman? What specific reports has the Minister asked the Committee to examine?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not meet with the Committee itself very often. The Committee meets quite frequently. I have facilitated the Committee visiting institutions in Vic-

toria and New South Wales, and some of its members have been to Queensland, to look at institutions in those other States so that the Committee can compare standards with South Australia. I have also facilitated the Committee visiting institutions within South Australia. I have asked the Committee to review the submissions received in relation to parole. The Committee is currently awaiting a summary on parole before making recommendations to the Government.

I have asked the Committee to look at the United Nations minimum standards to see how South Australian institutions compare with those standards. I think that that is a critical task that the Committee can perform for the Government. The Committee has been given a considerable task and it needs to inform itself completely about the situation in South Australia and how that compares with other States before it makes recommendations to the Government. We certainly regard the Committee as a valuable asset. The Committee provides an alternative source of information to the Minister as against the information that I would receive from the Department, and that is a healthy situation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to the workload of probation and parole officers. Comment is made about the increased workload in the yellow book. What is the average case load for an individual officer, bearing in mind that Justice Mitchell recommended in one of her earlier reports that a case load of 45 was appropriate? I understand that the level is much higher than that at the present time.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The average case load for an officer is 56.7. However, the case load at Mount Gambier is much higher, where it is 74. The lowest case load, 45, occurs at Berri. If there are changes to the parole system that could result in additional resources being directed to the probation and parole division because there might be more people on parole. However, that will be a matter for the courts, not for me, to decide. This suggestion does have resource implications for the probation and parole branch. The number of reports prepared by probation officers increased to 239 in August, so there has been a considerable impact upon the case load of individual parole officers. The case load varies, but the average is 56.7 cases per officer. That is probably higher than we would wish it to be. I think that Justice Mitchell recommended a case load of about 45 cases.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No, 40.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not think that anybody has been able to get close to that figure since the issue of Justice Mitchell's report. This is a matter we are looking into, as the programme papers indicate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: One of the matters mentioned under the heading 'Agency overview' in the programme papers involves a reduction in the number of remand prisoners and other prisoners. How does the Minister intend to reduce the number of prisoners? I know what he has in mind regarding parole matters, but is legislation being prepared to enable such a reduction?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There are a number of ways in which the prisoner population in South Australia can be reduced. One of those ways is to have different parole provisions. However, while initially such provisions might have some impact on prisoner numbers the courts will take account of those new parole procedures and apply sentences accordingly, so I am not sure how it will work in the long term.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: So that there is no guarantee that that will reduce prisoner numbers.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It might in the short term, but we do not have any long-term guarantee. This matter will remain with the court, where I have always argued it should be. The Attorney-General has already announced that he is working on a new Bail Act setting down the rules for bail.

Proportionally more offenders are held on bail in South Australia than in any other State in Australia except New South Wales. We believe that if legislation similar to that applying in other States is introduced the number of persons on remand will be reduced. Along with the new bail Act there will be a new bail hostel, so that rather than holding persons on remand in the remand centre they will be held in the bail hostel. This will involve those people who require some form of custodial treatment but who do not necessarily require housing in the remand centre. Legislation introduced by the honourable member's Party while in Government will allow for prisoner work release, when it is implemented. That will not really affect the number of people in custody, but it will change the nature of the custody, because in a sense they will be able to go out into the community to work and then come back to the half-way house (we could call it) at night. There have also been changes to two pieces of legislation, so that drunkenness is no longer an offence that warrants imprisonment—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That will not affect a lot of people.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It affects a lot of people in my electorate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Who are actually in gaol because of drunkenness?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes. The other altered legislation relates to imprisonment for non-payment of fines. This will result in a work/fine option. Imprisonment will no longer be an option for non-payment of fines and will be replaced by a community service order scheme. In addition, this Government intends introducing periodic detention as it works either in New Zealand or Victoria. It is the same, in a sense, as a community order scheme but is a harder option, certainly in the way in which it operates in New Zealand. There are 3 000 New Zealander offenders currently on periodic detention, which requires an offender to attend a centre early on Saturday and to work all day under custodial care before being released again at night. I do not believe that all of those 3 000 offenders would otherwise be in prison, but nevertheless that scheme reduces the prison population enormously.

Put together, all of these options, if we are able to introduce them during this term of office, will effectively allow a reduction in the number of prisoners in South Australia. However, this all depends on to what degree the community wishes to offend, and that is a matter that is outside the control of the Minister in charge of correctional services.

Mr FERGUSON: The Clarkson Royal Commission was one of a number of inquiries set up to investigate incidents that occurred within the Department of Correctional Services. What steps has the Minister taken to ensure that such incidents do not recur, and, if they do, what steps has he taken to ensure that such incidents are thoroughly investigated so that the State does not have to bear the expense of another Royal Commission?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: A number of serious criticisms came out of the Clarkson Royal Commission and we have taken action to address those criticisms. In fact, one of the first actions of the Executive Director when I came to office was to provide me with a comprehensive report showing the response to each of the Clarkson Royal Commission recommendations. The most essential action that we could take was to issue a new set of departmental instructions, which were needed to replace and upgrade the somewhat outdated administrative instructions which had existed, in what we regard now as a rather unsatisfactory form, for a long time. Those departmental instructions have not been completed, but we have completed the bulk of them. We have completed 40 of the instructions and we are working

through them. We do not know how many we need to introduce.

We have also introduced an incident reporting service, which was established to ensure that, whenever a significant event occurs in either a prison or a probation and parole office, an officer is required to report immediately to a telephone answering service. If the incident is serious enough, a member of the executive of the Department must be contacted so that immediate action can be commenced. One of the major criticisms made by the Clarkson Royal Commission was that there was no facility, system or structure within the Department to provide for such reports to be made. Because we have introduced this system, the Department is better able to monitor incidents within the service.

In addition, as I mentioned earlier, a senior investigations officer has been appointed to investigate any incident that the Executive Director of the Department believes requires detailed attention. Here, again, the Clarkson Royal Commission was critical of the Department's capacity to investigate incidents that occurred within institutions. We now have our own investigation section. We have always worked on the principle that, if a matter is considered serious enough to warrant police intervention or investigation, we will have a police investigation. That, of course, will continue. In addition, we have a capacity now to investigate incidents that occur within prisons. I think that that covers some of the major issues that came out of the Clarkson Royal Commission.

Mr FERGUSON: The other departmental inquiry was conducted by the firm Touche Ross. What action has the Minister taken to ensure implementation of the recommendations of the Touche Ross Report?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This report was commissioned by the former Government in 1981. It recommended that a position of Executive Director, and a number of other positions that the Department so badly needed, be established. The previous Government appointed the Executive Director. The structure recommended by the Touche Ross Report has been implemented within the Department. We are now in the process of making appointments. We need to advertise and fill some of the positions, because some of them are held by seconded officers at present. The Department had been sadly neglected in terms of resource and certainly in terms of manning resource. We hope that the added capacity of the Department now to present a more effective case to the Public Service Board, Treasury and the Government will ensure that no longer will its needs be overlooked, so that this very important aspect of Government responsibility can be addressed as it ought to be addressed.

I think that I have addressed myself mainly to the first Touche Ross Report. The second Touche Ross Report was associated with the Yatala Labour Prison, which I think I have already mentioned. The recommendations in terms of administration have also been met. We have established the structure, but, unfortunately, we need to make an appointment which has been forced upon us.

Mr FERGUSON: As I understand it, all the reports have referred to the lack of training in the Department. Will the Minister indicate what is being done to improve the standard of professionalism of the officers in the Department?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: This is a very important question, and one of the really serious needs of the Department is its capacity for in-service training. There are a number of reasons why this has not been able to be achieved in the past. Since we have been in office, we have appointed a senior staff development officer whose duty will be to ensure that effective in-service training takes place. We have established a scheme that provides three separate courses: a custodial procedures course, which lasts for three weeks and

focuses on basic questions of the security of prisoners and the safety of officers; a correctional knowledge part 1 course, which occurs after probationary officers have been on duty for some time, but within six months of their appointment; and a correctional knowledge part 2 course, which further extends their understanding of the underlying rationale of corrections.

We are part way through one of those training courses. We have recently employed 10 new correctional officers at Port Augusta from the Port Augusta region. These people are now going through a training course which consists of the three parts I have just mentioned. In addition, we are very anxious that prison officers are able to take advantage of additional courses which upgrade their skills and which enable them to better manage the institution and to have a better view of their role as prison officers, and I think that that is very important.

In-service training is absolutely essential. Until we are able to provide to our officers the sort of training that is commonplace in other prison systems throughout Australia and the world, we will always have some difficulty. I cannot promise the honourable member that I can wave the magic wand and produce those in-service training schemes overnight. We have to combat certain problems before that can be accomplished.

We are sending officers from South Australia interstate: recently two correctional officers attended a riot control and hostage negotiation course in New South Wales. That the sort of programme to which we want to expose our officers. On their return they can train the officers in South Australia in the same way that they have been trained. As the honourable member would have noticed, a training and development centre has been provided in the redevelopment plan for Yatala, so we certainly intend to go into training, as we have a responsibility to do so.

Mr RODDA: My question relates to the overview (page 45 of the yellow book) dealing with prisoner detention services. The Minister has referred to the problems of accommodating people after the horrendous fire. However, in my day there were some arguments about doubling up. Has the Department had to double up prisoners in cells relative to the accommodation, and how many prisoners were involved?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: As a result of the fire and the reduction in prisoner accommodation, we have had to double up at Adelaide Gaol and Yatala, and increase extensively the numbers at Cadell to a maximum of 140. That is in excess of the maximum we would like to see at Cadell. I do not like the Department having to put two people in a cell, because most of the cells are very small anyway and, in my view, doubling up is unsatisfactory. I think that, by and large, most of the prisoners and prison officers would agree with that.

I was surprised recently to be told by a rather experienced prisoner that a number of prisoners do not mind doubling up in cells because they are able to better cope with the situation if they have company and someone to talk to. Of course, this addresses the problem mentioned by the member for Glenelg (long hours in the cells). If one is put in a cell at 4.30 p.m. and not let out until 8 a.m., it is useful to have someone to talk to. Some prisoners prefer that, and believe that it helps them in rehabilitation.

In doubling up, we are careful to ensure that the prisoners put together are compatible in the sense that they are able to live together. Of course, we take a number of other considerations into account in determining who should double up. However, in answer to the question, we have had to double up. I am not sure of the numbers, but I can obtain that information for the honourable member. Pris-

oners still double up in Adelaide Gaol and Yatala, and I can obtain the figures for the honourable member.

Mr RODDA: The Minister will remember that I had to alter some regulations to meet the legal requirement. I think that the Committee on Subordinate Legislation took us to task over that. The Minister mentioned that extra prisoners had to be taken to Cadell. Is the major section of Cadell operating as a lock-up prison? It was an open prison. What is the situation now following the fire?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Cadell is a minimum security prison. I was there recently and, as the honourable member knows, Cadell has dormitory type accommodation with prison officers maintaining security over night. In the former medium security new wing at Cadell, the top floor was an unlocked minimum security facility, whereas the bottom floor housed prisoners who go there voluntarily and they like to be locked away at night. Therefore, we accommodate the various needs of the prisoners. Some prisoners at Cadell like to be locked away securely at night, and others prefer not to be.

The bulk of the prisoners at Cadell live in dormitory wings, but for all intents and purposes, it is a minimum security facility, certainly in terms of the work load and where they are placed to work. One could hardly describe someone walking away from Cadell as escaping. However, the number of prisoners who walk away indicates, by and large, that the people placed there are selected carefully and that the people who work there are fulfilling their role as part of a minimum security prison. The daily average is 95, but there are approximately 140 at Cadell as a result of the fires. There were two separate escapes during the past year.

Mr FERGUSON: Referring to the Estimates, page 105, 'Administration—Accommodation and service costs', there appears to be a new line of \$262 000. Can you tell me what that new line represents?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Previously, the accommodation and service costs were not included on the lines of the individual departments, but for effective accountability these costs are now required to be allocated to the Department so that it knows the full cost of its operation. That is why a figure of \$262 000 appears on our lines this year for the first time. Previously, it would have been shown on the Public Buildings Department lines, but now it is shown in the individual department's lines for accommodation and service costs.

Mr FERGUSON: Similarly, on page 106, under 'Labour Prison—Purchase of plant and equipment', the allocation for last year was \$181 000, but only \$95 382 was spent. This year we go back to a proposed figure of \$297 000. Can you explain the reason for the short-fall and why this figure is up again in the 1983-84 Estimates?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The reason that it was underspent was that a number of items ordered during the year did not turn up until this year. We ordered them at the right time, but they were not delivered at the right time; so, we underspent during that period. That expenditure has now been transferred to this financial year; so, we have the increase because it includes the underspending of last year. A number of prison vans, for instance, were ordered, but did not turn up, and these will be paid for in this financial year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Madam Chairman—

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Ms Lenehan): I would be very pleased just to be called 'Madam Chair'. It would make it very easy for everyone.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Madam Chair, I ask a question under 'Agency overview—issues for the commissioning of Yatala Labour Prison industries complex'. I understand that an announcement has been made recently about that. How many staff are actually required to operate the complex? How many hours will the prisoners work in that complex?

Will the workshop be open every working day, and what is the position with the availability of markets for goods produced in that complex?

Mr Dawes: The prisoners' day at Yatala Labour Prison is encompassed within the normal eight-hour working shift of prison officers. That is likely to remain so at least for the foreseeable future—perhaps to the end of this year. So, the working day for prisoners is that time which is left over after the prisoners undertake their normal toilet, washing, recreation time, and so on. The working day is between five and six hours.

The problem of markets is becoming more acute. The State allows goods produced in prison industries to be used only in the service of the State, which is appropriate. The items that the industries make generally speaking are used by Government departments, including the Department of Correctional Services.

On the number of closures, when the manning scale at Yatala Labour Prison falls short of the number of persons required under the scale to have the total prison open (that is, all workshops and all posts within the prison filled) a hierarchy of positions is worked through by an agreement between the unions and the management. The first places to be closed down, unfortunately, are the industries. So, this closing of workshops—and usually some workshops are closed every week as a result of not enough staff turning up for duty—means that our reliability as a producer of some goods is not particularly well regarded. Until we are able to meet production targets and produce items on time it is likely that we will be in a less than favourable position to attract additional work.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I note that there is to be an implementation of improved health services to prisons. What staffing provisions have been made for professional staff to oversee the health services? Are there any problems related to the co-ordination of the activities of the health services and correctional services staff? I presume that mental health personnel would be involved as well.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No problems exist between the Health Commission officers and Department of Correctional Services officers in relation to the delivery of health care to prisoners. We believe that prisoners ought to have made available to them the very best health care that it is possible to deliver. They have the same rights in this regard as does any citizen. The appropriate authority to provide health care is the Health Commission. The Department of Correctional Services has custodial and rehabilitative functions, and at least here in South Australia we do not believe that that Department should assume responsibility for the delivery of health care. The Department has responsibility for ensuring that prisoners receive adequate health care, and that is delivered by the Health Commission.

As the honourable member would know, there is an infirmary at Yatala. I understand that that will be brought into commission in about February next year. An additional 17 Health Commission staff will man the infirmary. That will certainly aid the Government's capacity to provide the appropriate health care for prisoners. The correctional officer medical attendant ranking will be maintained whilst those people are still undertaking their duties, but it is the Government's intention to transfer the entire responsibility for delivery of health services to the Health Commission. Prison clinical services will be provided across the State.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In regard to the agency overview and support services referred to in the Programme Estimates, I note that provision has been made for the employment of additional staff in the stores complex at Yatala Labour Prison. Does that mean that prisoners have now been removed from the store at Yatala and, if so, what are the reasons for their removal? Also, is it likely that this

will happen with the canteen? In other words, do prisoners still work in the canteen and, if so, is that policy likely to change?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Prisoners no longer work in the store, as a result of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The store is now staffed by people who are not prisoners. Currently, prisoners are still working in the canteen, but the matter is being reviewed. Problems do arise with prisoners working in the stores and canteens, and some of these have been highlighted by inquiries undertaken. Because we are having a new stores costing system established (this matter was canvassed earlier in response to a question asked by the member for Henley Beach), additional store staff will be required for that new system.

Mr FERGUSON: We have heard a lot about the problems that have occurred at Yatala Labour Prison and to a lesser extent about those that have occurred at Adelaide Gaol. Will the Minister indicate what the picture has been in the State's other five prisons, and can he give details of any plans that the Government might have for those prisons?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The bulk of the institutional problems that the Department has had have been connected with Yatala, and, to a lesser extent, the Adelaide Gaol. I believe the other institutions have worked very effectively (certainly, under considerable pressure, I might add). In regard to plans for the future, we have the team that was established to look at the capital funding requirements for our structural needs. It was the report from that committee from which we worked so far as the new work at Yatala Labour Prison is concerned. We have already announced plans for a medium security prison, although we have not yet decided where that will be established. The State's regional institutions are working well. They are serving a very useful service as mainly medium and low security prisons. Higher risk prisoners are not sent to those institutions. I think it is reasonable that I pay a tribute to the officers of those institutions who have helped and who will continue to help the Government overcome a very critical time.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer to the line relating to purchase of plant and equipment for country gaols (page 105 of the Estimates). Actual expenditure for 1982-83 was \$13 253, and it is proposed to increase expenditure for 1983-84 to \$28 000. Will the Minister explain the reason for this increase?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The allocation for 1983-84 allows for expenditure for new replacement items of equipment needed for the normal operation of institutions. The major items include a baler for Port Lincoln costing \$12 000, a new van for Mount Gambier which will cost \$8 200, and a regeneration water conservation unit for Port Augusta which will cost \$3 000. They are the main items making up the total amount of \$28 000.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Page 45 of the yellow book indicates that average full-time employment will increase by 45.1 staff members. Will this increase in staff enable programmes to be developed for prisoners, which will enable them to spend more time out of their cells and be more effectively occupied?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Certainly, that is an important aspect of the increased custodial staffing, to enable the Department to start developing programmes for prisoners when they are out of their cells for an extended period. Although we have not accomplished that as yet, we are in the process of developing procedures and systems that will allow us to extend the out-of-cell period, and then we will need to develop the programmes. That in itself has resource implications. We have appointed at Yatala an Assistant Manager, Programmes, so that he can develop suitable programmes. We have an Assistant Activities Officer to be appointed to Port Augusta to facilitate preparation of pro-

grammes for prisoners in their out-of-cell time; this is essentially for night-time activities as well, whether it be cultural, educational, or the like, because it is part of an essential effort to try and rehabilitate people who are institutionalised.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Under the heading 'Implications for Resources' at page 44 of the yellow book, we learn this:

Increased use of community correctional provisions will require additional resources, which may be relocated from the custodial area with a significant reduction in prison numbers.

What does that actually mean? Has a proposal been developed that will indicate how many prison staff will be relocated from the custodial area?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The implication for resources is a notification of what will happen in the future. When the community service order scheme was introduced in Tasmania, it took a number of years for that to show in a reduced prison population. There needed to be a transfer of custodial officers into the delivery of other services in the Department. That will take time and we are merely giving notice here that we expect that to happen.

The career of a prison officer should not be restricted merely to custodial work. Eventually there should be available to prison officers the opportunity to spread their skills and get experience in other work areas within corrections. All corrections areas are not necessarily custodial activities. The import of that is that as the new alternatives bite into what are currently prison numbers (if they do) it may be a requirement of the Department to look at utilising in other ways the skills that we already have. Certainly, it does not mean in any way that there will be a reduction in the number of people who will be working within institutions, but their role may change marginally.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister said earlier that all minimum security prisoners were being placed in new premises that were being constructed, but that cannot be the case because there would be more than 40 minimum security prisoners in Yatala alone without considering those in the deplorable conditions at Adelaide Gaol. I seek clarification on that situation. Also, we have heard today and previously about the need, which I appreciate, to establish segregated accommodation, particularly for maximum security prisoners. I would like to know what is happening on an immediate basis in that area.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is correct, as the honourable member said, that all the minimum security people currently housed at Yatala will not be housed in the new facility, but they will be housed. I said that minimum security people at Yatala would be taken out of Yatala and that by then we would have some accommodation available at Cadell and at Port Augusta that would enable us to overcome that particular problem.

In terms of segregation for high-security prisoners, I expect that that is one of the most critical needs that we have. Certainly, it is the cause of much of the difficulty at Yatala in regard to our inability to effectively segregate. To do that we have to get the minimum-security people out of Yatala, and we also have to get out the medium-security people. We have to provide a new medium security facility, but that will not happen overnight. In the meantime, we will have a continuing problem with the little capacity that we have to segregate high-security prisoners in Yatala.

We are looking at a number of options, and we will also have the capacity, once some of the demolition work has been completed, to look at yards that will enable us to more effectively segregate prisoners, one from the other. However, in terms of cell accommodation, we will have to be prepared to live with what we have for some time yet. Perhaps we will be able to effectively segregate people in their out-of-cell time, and one way of doing this is to provide better

programmes for prisoners so that their time is occupied. It is when their time is not occupied and they sit around and brood that many of these problems come to the surface. We are looking at that. I agree with the member that it is one of the great problems that we face.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What was the cost of the provision of legal services and legal assistance to prisoners? I cannot see that set out anywhere in regard to when a prisoner is brought before a visiting justice and legal advice is provided.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The member cannot find that information because it is not a payment made by the Department of Correctional Services. That service is provided by legal services and funds are provided by a number of sources. The State Government provides through the Attorney-General a significant amount of the money that is available for those legal services. However the allocation is not in our lines but in the lines of the Attorney-General. There is no cost to us at all.

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

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$4 294 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr R.J. Gregory

Mr T.R. Groom

Ms S.M. Lenehan

Mr J. Mathwin

Mr J.K.G. Oswald

Mr W.A. Rodda

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.W. Bruce, Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr B. Treagus, Director, Finance, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr D. Grubb, Deputy Chief Officer, South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Ms Lenehan): I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to the Metropolitan Fire Service, with the restructuring of organisations and the redistribution of responsibilities, have sufficient funds been allocated and approved for this task as recommended in the Cox Report? If so, what priority do the restructuring of the Budget and plans of the corporation have? Are funds allocated in this Budget for the reallocation of stations as recommended in the Cox Report and, if so, how much has been allocated for that purpose; how many stations will there be; where will they be situated etc.; and what has the working party recommended in regard to the rationalisation of resources?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is certainly provision for the new manning structure as recommended in the Cox Report, and it has been implemented. That allows for 102

people over five years. Capacity for that is provided within the Budget.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: For what?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: For the manning. There is an additional 21 for this year as against 19 provided for last year. There is also capacity to manage a restructure of the administration within the Department which has also been contemplated. Regarding any changes that might be needed in the structuring or siting of individual fire stations, we have had the Cox report and an internal review of that report. That is currently with the Government and Treasury in order to look at the funding implications and to see whether that will be Government policy. That matter is therefore before Cabinet at the moment, and I cannot say any more than that.

Provision has been made within the Budget to allow for any capital works that might flow from any Government decisions, but I am not able to say what is recommended, because that matter is currently before Cabinet and Treasury and we have not yet had the funding implications presented to us.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that the Ash Wednesday disaster indicated that there were problems in the emergency services communication system. What is being done to improve this facet of the fire service, and what funds represent this area above grading operations?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Certainly, the Ash Wednesday fire did show up some shortcomings in communications—not only in the police area but also in the Metropolitan Fire Service area. We ought to acknowledge that, and we are addressing that problem. Mr Bruce can give a report to the Committee as to the current situation concerning communications.

Mr Bruce: Currently, the metropolitan service has in hand a major communications upgrading programme which had been under order for some considerable time. This programme is very well advanced and will co-ordinate with the completion of the new headquarters station. This service affects other areas outside of radio telephone, for example, the alarm receiving equipment in the control room. The real problem occurs with the radio receiving equipment. For technical reasons, the frequencies are not compatible with Country Fire Service frequencies. I understand from instructions that I have received that it is technically not possible to get the two frequencies together. Both services are well advanced with their radio equipment. We have had discussions with the C.F.S. in an endeavour to try and eliminate this problem. It could well be that ultra high frequency radios will need to be held by both authorities and able to be worked from a command position.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: With the extension of the fire service role into crash rescue, in support of the Police Force, what funds are provided to equip the service to enable it to effectively conduct this function, and are new support tenders being provided for this purpose?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The equipment that the fire service has available to it for its normal work can be utilised and is now being utilised for a wider role. The fire service did not have to purchase any new equipment: it just means a more economic use of the equipment that it has. If you have a very competent and skilled service with the equipment to hand, it seems sensible that these people ought to be able to use that equipment for the benefit of the community. It has just extended the role of the fire service, but it does not mean that it needs to purchase any more equipment.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand what the Minister is saying. Certainly, we are not looking at a duplication of equipment, but a need for new support tenders has been seen, particularly for that purpose. Are they being provided or not?

Mr Bruce: The support tender is a multi-purpose vehicle. The entire design of the vehicle will enable it to be used in a whole range of functions, only one of which will be the carrying of rescue equipment. It will, for example, be capable of carrying equipment for decontamination and use at hazardous chemical spillages, carrying lighting plants, generators, salvage equipment, and bulk foam compound. The design of the vehicle enables the modules to be lifted on and off the vehicle so that the whole range of functions can be put into use most effectively.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to the grants to the Offenders Aid Rehabilitation Service of South Australia. Actual payments last year were \$145 000, and this year it is proposed to allocate \$155 000 which, when inflation is taken into account, would indicate a reduction in real terms in the grant to OARS. I was of the opinion that the Government intended upgrading its support for offenders on release. Does this indicate that the Government has taken a policy decision to downgrade its support for OARS and downgrade its general support for those offenders who perhaps need help when released, particularly in the area of rehabilitation?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is probably slightly worse than the honourable member realises, because the additional \$10 000 we are providing is to allow OARS to transport families to and from Cadell, as many prisoners' families are in a desperate plight and do not have the capacity to transport themselves. The real figure for the work of OARS is the same as last year—\$145 000. Whilst we appreciate the value of the services OARS provides, in a time of severe financial stringency we have had to make hard decisions. One decision we had to make was in the area of additional funding for OARS. We provided an additional \$10 000 for a specific purpose, although general funds have remained the same. I do not know how the honourable member wants to interpret that; I would not interpret it in quite the way that he has. It was a decision made in light of resources available.

Mr OSWALD: I may be only a pharmacist and not an economist, but I would have thought that, if \$145 000 was allocated last year and \$145 000 is voted again this year, it would appear, in the light of inflation, that we are reducing the amount of money available to OARS for its programmes this year. I appreciate that an extra \$10 000 is going towards transporting friends and relatives to Cadell (which is commendable) but, according to the line, the Government has reduced the support given to OARS for this year which, I imagine, will be received with great trepidation and disappointment by that organisation, which is trying to do its best on limited finances for offenders being released into the community.

Mr RODDA: A working party was looking at alternate funding for the Fire Brigade apart from moneys raised through insurance policies. Will the Minister inform the Committee of any progress made in that respect?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Not a great deal of progress has been made. When I came to office a committee appointed by the previous Government was still in existence. The Chairman of that committee came to see me not long after I became Chief Secretary in order to discuss whether we wanted that committee to continue its operations and, if so, whether we would provide meeting expenses, fees, etc., which had not been provided by the previous Government. I advised the Chairman of the committee that the whole matter would be reviewed. It took some time to look at the matter and ascertain what methods were being used in other States.

We are in receipt of some recent reports from other States (in particular, Victoria) on the method of funding of Metropolitan Fire Services and fire services generally. As a result of some consideration over a number of months, we

have advised members of the committee that we wish them to continue with that investigation. We have added a person from Treasury to the committee. We have put funds into place on the recommendation of the Public Service Board, to allow for meeting fees and expenses that the committee might incur during its investigation. There has been a considerable delay to enable the Government to look at the system of funding. It is our decision that the committee should continue and we have facilitated that.

Mr RODDA: I refer to the line 'Public Institutions Chaplaincy Service' with an allocation of \$65 000 for last year and a proposed allocation of \$65 000 for this year. I am mindful of the financial constraints with which the Minister and the Government are faced. I believe an approach for a larger allocation was made. Will the Minister advise whether the allocation matches up with demands made by various clergy in those areas?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The contributions the Government makes to the Chaplaincy Service in a number of areas does not provide for the full funding of the services that those people provide. It is a contribution towards it, rather than total funding. There has not been any increase. We have decided, in a time of financial stringency, to maintain the level of funding. This is not unusual because, from 1977 to 1981-82 it was maintained at \$50 000. Last year it was increased to \$65 000 and we are maintaining it at that amount. I would not suggest that that would meet the total commitment of the Chaplaincy Service as it provides a significant service.

Mr RODDA: I refer to the line 'Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals'. That Society has had real problems with its financing. If I recall correctly, it has held public fund-raising functions. Will the Minister report on how it is shaping up?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member has an advantage over me there, as I am unaware of the financial difficulties to which he has referred. However, I take on board what he says as I know of his close interest in and relationship with that organisation. For the same reasons I have given for not increasing amounts allocated to other lines, I give for this line. The Government must make difficult decisions in tough times. They say that tough times require tough decisions. It is not easy to hold at a consistent level the contributions to groups like the R.S.P.C.A. The Government currently has a committee reviewing the Act applying to cruelty to animals. We should have a report from that committee fairly soon. The real financial problems (which I do not doubt exist) were not ones that we had before us when we made the decision to maintain the figure.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister advise on the progress of the installation of the micro-electronic system? I refer also to the Deltec system. What is the cost of completing that installation? Is it too early to say whether or not the system will be effective?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It would be as well if I asked Mr Bruce to answer.

Mr Bruce: The installation is now well advanced. At this stage we are meeting the time frame for total installation. We hope to complete the transfer of all existing fire alarms on to the Deltec system by August or September next year at the latest. The cost of provision has been phased in over a number of years. Without reference to the specific costs provided each year, I would not be able to answer that question but will provide the information for the honourable member.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! I take it that the information will be provided in a form suitable for incorporation in *Hansard*.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, Madam Chair.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Increased emphasis has been placed on training, particularly in relation to in-service training which, I believe, is a two-day course. What priorities have been placed on training in relation to that course, and is training a growth area in this year's Budget?

Mr Bruce: It certainly is a growth area. Unfortunately the provision for in-service training had been neglected to a great degree. I believe that the training programme has not been adequate to meet the demands of the service. We are currently dealing with the problem. A training advisory committee has been set up with service personnel representation, and it is chaired by the Deputy Chief Officer. The committee will make recommendations in terms of the types of training courses, the appropriate content and all promotional aspects relating to training courses. The two-day training programme mentioned by the honourable member has been implemented and has been running for something like six or seven months. The first course has involved the entire staff of the Metropolitan Fire Service and is almost complete. All members have completed the two-day course which has involved a concentrated period of training in high-rise fire-fighting procedures.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What funds have been allocated for the greater alarm response system? Will it ensure a higher degree of public safety? How will it affect public safety generally?

Mr Bruce: The greater alarm system is the introduction of a pre-determined attendance system, which is based on a type that is used extensively in other countries throughout the world. It relates to specific risk. We have divided Adelaide into three risk categories—A, B, and C, with A being the top risk area. A specific response of appliances applies to each of the risk categories. The categories are upgraded depending on the alarm level required by the officer-in-charge. Broadly speaking, we believe that the community will see a much greater degree of effectiveness in response to major fires. We believe that first attack hitting powers will be greater than has been the case in the past.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I notice that \$280 000 is provided in the Miscellaneous line for the helicopter service. That is a significant reduction over the actual payment last year. Can the Chief Secretary explain the reduction? Will the reduction affect the services provided by the helicopter?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is no real reduction in the funds available. I agree that there is certainly an apparent reduction in the 'Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous' vote. This year users of the helicopter service will be invoiced for the cost of departmental usage. As such, each user has been allocated funds to cover anticipated flying hour costs, as follows: \$72 000 to the police, \$21 000 to the Health Commission, and \$10 000 to the C.F.S. Therefore, that part of the cost of the helicopter service will come from those Departments. I think that is an effective way of ensuring accountability. Departments have money allocated to them and they have to spend it wisely rather than the full allocation coming from the Chief Secretary's lines. The funding is still there but it is now paid from a different pool.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What funds have been provided for the internal consultative committee of the Metropolitan Fire Service? Can the Chief Secretary provide information in regard to the personnel involved on that committee?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It will not require funding because it is made up of departmental personnel. It will have representation from the two industrial organisations involved: the management panel and the engineering section of the Metropolitan Fire Service. I understand there will also be representation from administration. The committee has not yet met, although it has been constituted. The first meeting will take place within the next couple of weeks.

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

Tourism, \$5 299 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Mr T.R. Groom

Mr G.A. Ingerson

Mr J.H.C. Klunder

Ms S.M. Lenehan

Mr I.P. Lewis

The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr G.J. Inns, Director, Department of Tourism.

Mr A.B. Noblet, Deputy Director, Department of Tourism.

Mr L.J. Penley, Assistant Director, Development and Regions, Department of Tourism.

Mr D.E. Packer, Assistant Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Tourism.

Ms A.E. Rein, Assistant Director, Planning and Research, Department of Tourism.

Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Ms Lenehan): I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I begin by expressing my disappointment and that of the Opposition that the tourism budget is being examined at this hour and, indeed, later on a Friday night. I hope that next year the Government will re-arrange its programme so that officers of the Department and the Parliament are not brought back on a Friday evening to examine what the Opposition considers to be an extremely important departmental budget. This situation did not ever occur under the previous Government. I believe that the time table should be arranged in such a way that the Department of Tourism line is considered during normal sitting hours.

Bearing in mind that the increase in the departmental budget is very much subject to the rate of inflation, will the Minister say to which lines in the Department of Tourism budget (and I will be asking the same question later in regard to the Miscellaneous line) do the round-sum allowances apply? My impression is that they apply only to the salaries of the Director, travel promotion and tourist officers and accounting, clerical and general staff, but that there is no salary component in the other contingency lines. It is important for the Committee to understand what additional sums will be given to the Department of Tourism from round-sum allowances to take account of inflation. Will the sums apply only to the salaries of the group that I have just mentioned?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It seems to me that the honourable member does not have a good memory, because I recall that last year my colleague, the member for Gilles, complained that tourism was not given time for adequate consideration because it came on at the end of a very hard and long day after matters relating to the health budget. I

do not think that the situation has changed. The amount of time available for the tourism portfolio this year is the same as that allocated to it last year. This matter depends on how the Opposition establishes its priorities as to how much time should be spent on the Chief Secretary lines and how much on tourism. I am happy to accommodate the Opposition. Also, today is a sitting day for the purposes of the Committee, as someone has to sit on Friday. I would have been as happy as anyone else if these matters had been dealt with on Wednesday. The answer to the question the honourable member raised is that she is correct and that the round-sum allowance is related primarily to salaries. The other lines that appear under 'Minister of Tourism' are as they are, that is, the funds that have been allocated for salaries.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister advise the Committee what is the anticipated rate of inflation affecting the line 'Tourist advertising and promotion' in the following three categories: electronic advertising on radio and television; press advertising; and promotional brochures through the normal print media?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is anticipated that the increase in the cost of electronic advertising, whether related to inflation, or whatever, will be 12 per cent to 15 per cent, in press advertising 8 per cent to 10 per cent, and promotional brochures 15 per cent to 20 per cent. As was the case last year, if there is an excess above the figures provided in the Budget then a request can be made to Treasury in expectation that it will be met, but such amount would not come out of the round-sum allowances, which is a different pool. We certainly expect increases in costs for the various media and promotional brochures.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That being the case, the increase from \$1.5 million in actual payments last year for tourist advertising and promotion to \$1.9 million this year will, to a significant extent, be taken up by increased costs and will, as I understand it, not allow for a great actual increase in expenditure on tourist advertising and promotion. Will the Minister indicate what increases, in real terms, which will enable greater amounts of tourist advertising and promotion to be undertaken are inherent in that \$1.9 million?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: First, it is more appropriate to compare proposed amounts for this year with voted amounts for last year and not to compare proposed expenditure for this year with actual payments made last year. We have been through this matter already today and I have explained to the honourable member that there is an expectation that any increase in promotion and tourist advertising that occurs because of inflation can be met. The reason that there will be a significant increase in our promotion budget (and it is a 53 per cent increase) is that we will not have to meet the production costs that were met last year. The honourable member would be aware from her time as Minister that there were considerable production costs last year. That not being the case this year, a greater percentage of that amount can be directed into promotion and advertising. There has been an effective 53 per cent increase in capacity to promote and advertise the tourism product in South Australia.

Ms LENEHAN: I turn to page 127 of the programme papers: under the heading 'Agency Overview' there is continual reference to the growth and development of facilities and to the establishment of a greater commitment by the private sector and Government to not only the development of tourism facilities but also the upgrading of existing tourism facilities. Has the Department adopted a position in respect to applications made to Government agencies in respect of financial assistance? I am thinking particularly of the Industries Development Committee where tourism projects that have applied for finance have not met the committee's guidelines when seeking funding or financial assistance by

way of guarantee or incentive payment from the Government. Will the Minister say whether the Department has looked at the guidelines proposed for the establishment of the new Small Business Corporation and whether or not the Department is looking at making recommendations along the lines of establishing a separate body responsible for the sort of funding currently carried out through the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: First, we do not believe that the Industries Development Committee can adequately investigate tourism projects, because the criteria that those projects need to meet to qualify for funding within I.D.C. guidelines are too restrictive. The tourist industry is a different beast altogether. As the honourable member pointed out, it is very difficult for such projects to qualify for funds. I think that the record would indicate that many more applications are refused than one might normally expect because of those guidelines. In making its recommendations the Department of Tourism has regard to the viability of the industry and the tourist potential of any project before recommending that these matters should go before the Industries Development Committee.

The Treasurer has already announced that he believes that those guidelines are too restrictive and that, to adequately support the tourism industry, we have to provide alternative funding criteria. I understand that the Tourism Development Board has met with the Industries Development Committee to discuss criteria established by that committee. This matter is part of an examination taking place in relation to incentives to industry generally. Hopefully out of that will come recommendations which will allow the Government to more effectively support those projects that really need an injection of finance to get up and go.

We acknowledge that the tourism industry is a risk industry. Sometimes the risks are greater than those in other industries, and because of that and because of the tourism need in certain areas, the Government should be involved. Many of the projects are in remote areas to which private companies feel reluctant to go. In those cases, the Government ought to be able to provide some assistance. As the honourable member has pointed out, it is difficult under the present guidelines. Hopefully we can provide a system in which tourist projects can more readily seek support with a great deal more confidence than at present.

Ms LENEHAN: Page 127 of the yellow book under the heading 'Strategies' refers to programmes of development for key tourism areas which will be progressively prepared, and a number of key major projects will be actively encouraged. Without expecting the Minister to give an elaborated list, will he outline what are the major projects that the Department sees as having high priority, and what are the key tourism areas?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am prepared to announce that Porter Bay is one of the priority developments in which the Government is actively and financially involved. However, I do not think that I should announce publicly any of the other projects which we are considering and which we believe are viable and should have some priority. The Department has almost completed an investment guide which will certainly provide all the base information that prospective investors might need in regard to various regions and investment prospects. I believe that this will be a very useful guide to private enterprise and, hopefully, flowing from that will be some injection of funds from private enterprise. As the strategy points out, we have identified key areas, and development plans are being developed for these areas as we are able to do so.

Ms LENEHAN: The yellow book refers to 'Corporate/Management Objectives', one of which is:

To ensure ease of access to the State's holiday experiences.

My question relates to the ease of access for interstate visitors who wish to either stay in Burra for several days or have a day visit to Burra. It has been brought to my attention that, because the Morgan to Burra road is unsealed, it provides difficulty for many bus companies which would prefer a direct route through to the Flinders Ranges or other parts of South Australia. Does this kind of project fall within the gamut of that objective, or would the Department and indeed the Minister consider this a joint Federal and State project, because I believe that it will require a fair amount of finance? I think that this is an important issue because it has been raised with me on several occasions, and most recently when I was doing a familiarisation tour of Burra and the Riverland.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Department agrees with the honourable member as to the importance of that road. We have made representations to the Minister of Transport to give that road high priority in the tourist road programme. There is not a lot of money in the tourist road programme. I would be happy if more funds were available to it, but probably the most constructive role that we can take is to make representations to the Minister, asking that he give the highest priority to a particular tourist road. We have done that in relation to the road to which the honourable member refers. I certainly do not disagree with the honourable member's remarks in relation to the viability of the road in terms of encouraging visitors from Eastern States to come to Burra, which is a very attractive holiday destination and one of which I expect too few South Australians have taken advantage.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order. I seek your direction, Mr Chairman. I know that in previous Committees you have required members of the Committee to refer to the line when asking questions. The member for Mawson referred directly to the yellow book without reference to the Estimates of Payments. I am happy to refer to the lines, but I seek your guidance as to whether that is required.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order is taken. The Chair has previously ruled on that basis in relation to that issue and many others. It has become apparent, from the Chair's viewpoint, that it is simple to link up a question with a particular line. The Chair would appreciate it if members who ask questions or seek information refer to a certain line and then refer to the relevant page in the document. The point is taken: it is something which I had tried to get members to do for four days, and have not been able to do so.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My question relates to the total Department of Tourism expenditure, namely \$5.299 million. I am at a loss to understand the figure which appears on page 128 under 'Agency overview'. The proposed total expenditure for 1983-84 is \$14.026 million, which is an increase. Is that section of print inadvertently included and, if that is the case, I hope that my query will not be counted as a question.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The figure of \$14.026 million as opposed to \$5.299 million on the line is provided for, in the main, by the estimated total value of the bookings, which is about \$7.874 million. That is the bulk of the difference. That money is generated within the Department. We take bookings and invest money in the short term: we do the best that we can with it. That refers to the bookings that the Department generates in its activities. The figure of \$418 000 relates to maintenance of buildings, and that is paid to the Public Buildings Department.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have to accept that that will be counted as a question. However, I put it because there was an inadvertent insertion in the health budget which stated that one-third of the State's population was

mentally retarded. It is possible that there may have been a similar error here.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is coming to the conclusion that the member for Coles is leaning on its generosity.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The line, 'Tourist Advertising and Promotion', and the related statement on page 127 of the yellow book under 'Issues', refer to interstate competition increasing markedly and states: 'Unless South Australia can improve or at least maintain its competitive position in the market place future growth in tourism will be jeopardised'. Does the Minister or do his officers have information relating to the budget expenditure for this current year of our competitors in other States and the percentage increase by those other States, and is the Minister aware of the boost in the budget of the Department of Tourism in Tasmania, which increases promotional funds to \$6 million, which is a 100 per cent increase over previous years?

The scheme allows the private sector the opportunity to maximise the funds spent on general corporate and individual company advertising by providing a special \$1 million incentive. Can the Minister advise the Committee where South Australia stands competitively in terms of its expenditure on tourist advertising and promotion and whether the Government has contemplated an incentive scheme similar to that established in Tasmania to encourage the private sector to spend funds on general corporate and individual company advertising?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not have available the comparable figures between South Australia and the other States in terms of advertising budgets. I could probably get that for the honourable member. The only total figures that I have available are those that were available last year, and South Australia ran a very poor last except for the A.C.T. Our performance in providing for tourism has not been all that good, and certainly we need to improve on it.

We have looked at the co-operative advertising—I think that this is what the honourable member was mentioning—and we have a programme commencing in February for co-operative advertising with private industry. I do not believe that South Australia is providing anywhere near enough funds for tourism generally, but what we need to do, and we are doing it now, is to evaluate the return for the money that we are currently spending. One just cannot madly rush in and spend a lot of money in any area without evaluating what sort of benefit flows from the expenditure. That is where we are at the moment. We want to evaluate the effectiveness of our advertising, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria.

We believe that it has been very successful, but once we have the proof of the pudding (the facts on the board, if you wish) we can then justify further expenditure. Without doing that research and having that justification it is somewhat more difficult to argue with Treasury for the funds that should be available. We want in the Department of Tourism to effectively spend our money, and we want to be able to justify increased expenditure. We will do that not merely by pointing to what the other States are spending but by pointing to the effectiveness of our own advertising programmes, which I think is the most forceful argument that we can use.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the member for Coles wanted some figures which the Minister did not have.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We can get the individual budgets for each department, but it is very difficult to get the marketing budgets, because one is not necessarily comparing like with like. For instance, in our own budget this year we would be comparing a budget that has a more promotional content than last year, when there were larger production costs, etc. We can certainly get the individual budgets; we can look at the honourable member's request on the adver-

tising and promotion budgets, but I really do not know how relevant that will be. It is a legitimate request.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out to the Minister as usual that if the figures are supplied they should be in a form that can be put in *Hansard*.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would have thought that the Treasury would have had a very convincing demonstration of the effectiveness of marketing expenditure as a result of the increase in visitor figures in 1981 and 1982. I hope that for the Minister's sake, and for the Department's and the State's, that not too many more years of convincing demonstrations are required for Treasury to respond.

In relation to that same matter of co-operative advertising, on page 127 under 'Strategies' it is stated that co-operative advertising with the private sector will be developed as an integral part of the domestic campaign. Can the Minister advise the Committee of the estimated value of the private sector input into the advertising and promotional campaign in the current year?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: If I can just respond to the first part of the question—it was more a comment than a question—there was a 53 per cent increase in the advertising and promotion budget this year. If we continue at 53 per cent each year, I will accept that the Treasury can be convinced. I do not think that we can hope that it would be incremental, but it would be nice to contemplate. Perhaps the Deputy Director of Marketing can respond to the second part of the question.

Mr Noblet: It is intended to launch a co-operative press advertising campaign next February following industry response to a prospectus which will be issued in October this year. The co-operative press advertising campaign is designed to complement the television advertising, which seeks to present an image for South Australia. The co-operative press advertising will seek to promote specific products. We are hopeful of raising \$210 000 by way of industry contributions, approximately matched by the Department.

Mr GROOM: I have only two questions to the Minister, and I think that both can fit under the lines, 'Tourism Research' or 'Tourist Advertising and Promotion'. On page 216 of the Auditor-General's Report, he says, under 'Receipts':

Because of the changed role now adopted by the Department whereby efforts are concentrated towards increasing travel to and within South Australia the value of interstate and overseas bookings through the Department has declined with a resultant drop of \$70 000 in commissions earned.

Can the Minister comment on this and indicate whether any steps are intended to redress this indicated trend?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Department and the Government see the primary function of the Department of Tourism as being to encourage tourists to come into South Australia and South Australian tourists to stay and spend their money here. We do not see our role primarily as providing a service for tourists to leave South Australia, to go either internationally or interstate. We have always provided a service for Ministers and departmental Public Service officers; so, most (if not all) of their travel is arranged through the Department of Tourism. We certainly have a role, though, in marketing South Australia, and we market South Australia in Victoria and New South Wales—I think very effectively—and, of course, in South Australia in our own Travel Centre.

The commissions fell in the year ended 30 June 1983 because of a drop in interstate and overseas booking activity. The Department's efforts are now concentrated on increasing travel returns within South Australia. As a consequence, the interstate section has closed and the activities of the overseas section have been downgraded. Revenue earned by day

tours conducted by the Department also fell because of increased patronage of privately conducted day tours. I do not imagine that that trend will change. In fact, there is a changed emphasis within the Department itself. We feel that the Department should be promoting South Australia and encouraging people to come here and that it does not do us a lot of good to send them elsewhere.

Mr GROOM: Reference is made on page 127 of the Programme Estimates, referring to the line 'Tourism Research' or the line for 'Tourism Advertising and Promotion', as follows:

With the introduction of direct international flights to Adelaide, there has been a need for stronger South Australian promotion overseas. A beginning was made in 1982-83 but needs to be consolidated.

Will the Minister elaborate on the steps being taken to consolidate this beginning?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Our major overseas market is New Zealand. There is an officer in New Zealand working with the Australian Tourism Commission, and because of direct links with Auckland and Adelaide the market has been developed. We still get a very low percentage of the total number of New Zealand visitors. Only 9 per cent of New Zealand tourists come to South Australia, which is not good enough. We are working on that matter. I was in New Zealand recently, at which time we commissioned a marketing consultant, Francis Kerr, to represent South Australia within the trade in New Zealand. We anticipate that that will have beneficial results. The sum of \$130 000 has been allocated in this year's Budget for the marketing of South Australia in New Zealand. The Government works in co-operation with the Australian Tourism Commission and Qantas. An amount of \$60 000 was allocated for advertising and \$20 000 was allocated to Francis Kerr for marketing.

We will continue to maintain our interest in Europe and the United Kingdom markets. We are represented on V.F.R. (Visiting Friends and Relatives) and we will continue to be represented on Corroboree, which is a tourist exhibition in London, the largest Australian exhibition in London. We are also represented at I.T.V., in Berlin, which is the largest exhibition and marketing forum in the world. The Government has also announced that South Australia will begin a programme of familiarisation with the travel and tourist industry in Japan, and we will be bringing agents from Japan to South Australia so that they can become familiar with the product that we have. The Government has announced its intention to recruit a Japanese national attached to the Australian Tourist Commission to represent the Department of Tourism in Japan. That is a little way down the line. The Premier is in Japan at the moment having discussions about tourism, among other things.

At the moment we are involved with familiarisation rather than direct employment: we will bring that officer to South Australia to train here so that he or she will be able to better market in Japan the product that we can offer. The Government will be involved in South-East Asia. Also we have a small but increasing interest in marketing South Australia in North America. The Government's budget for marketing South Australia overseas this year is \$260 000. Although that is not a huge amount, I should point that we are working very closely with the Australian Tourism Commission and the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, has been able to have his Budget allocation increased by 75 per cent. The Federal Government's programmes will include rather massive promotions in North America and South-East Asia.

The South Australian market will be tapping in to that. We do not believe that the Government should be embarking on big expensive advertising or promotion programmes overseas in marketing South Australia as a sole destination:

we believe that it is more sensible to try to include South Australia in a total Australian marketing programme, so that when people come to Australia for whatever reason and visit the Eastern States, Ayers Rock, the Gold Coast, or the Barrier Reef, for example, South Australia can be involved in a tour package that includes bringing such people to South Australia as well. We will work with the Australian Tourism Commission to increase our percentage of overseas visitors to South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the line 'Tourism Advertising and Promotion'. I preface my question by congratulating the Minister and his officers on the manner in which they have promoted South Australia for Tourism Week. I have been enormously impressed by what I have seen in the press and by what I have heard on radio and seen on television. However, I am sure that the Minister would understand my disappointment about the Opposition not having been extended an invitation to any single one of the activities that have taken place. I wonder whether that has been due to a Ministerial directive, bearing in mind that as Minister I directed that the Opposition be included in all such functions. What has been the cost to the Department of Tourism Week? What has been the input, if any, from operators who have stood to benefit from the projects that were included as part of Tourism Week?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The cost to the Department was only about \$10 000. That was very good value for the results from Tourism Week and the awareness programme with which the Government is involved which, hopefully, will be obvious. The figure of \$10 000 is an approximate figure because all the bills are not in yet. The reason why we were able to get away with that programme so cheaply is because the operators themselves co-operated by reducing the costs of their own programmes. Ansett, Briscoe and Premier Roadlines reduced the cost of their day tours. Kay Hannaford reduced the cost of her walking tours. A major expense was involved with the luncheon. The Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce both made contributions to that, which enabled the cost of that luncheon to be reduced. The cost was shared equally three ways. There was great co-operation on the part of the industry generally and we very much welcomed the presence of the Chamber of Commerce, the first time that it has been involved in such a function. That is a clear indication that the Chamber of Commerce acknowledges the importance of tourism to South Australia. We welcome that. We expect that that co-operation will continue. In fact, there are significant benefits from the tourism industry for people who are members of the Chamber of Commerce.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister did not give an answer to the question I asked about whether the operators contributed to the cost of advertising. Perhaps he might be good enough to reply to that.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am sorry, I overlooked that matter. The operators did not contribute to the cost of advertising.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the following undertaking made by the Labor Party as part of its election policy:

A Bannon Government in association with industry will produce a regular tourism publication to promote a better understanding of key issues, provide information of initiatives under way, and ensure an effective flow of information.

The last time I recall receiving the departmental publication *Grapevine* was either at the beginning of this year or at the end of last year. Have any issues been produced subsequently? If not, why not, and when will the promised publication be circulated and at what intervals?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: A copy of *Grapevine* will come out on Monday of next week, so the member can be forewarned—

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is 10 months later!

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is just soon enough after the Estimates Committee for the member to realise that production had been completed and that we did not hurry it up as a result of the Estimates Committee. One of the first things we did on coming to office was provide the department with a working journalist and photographer. They are now working with the Department to enable publications of this kind to be provided. *Grapevine* is to service the trade and will be available on Monday. The member can suggest that it took us a long time to get it up and running, but we have it there now and we intend to have it published six times a year—every two months.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the America's Cup and the great thrill that we all had this week. The fact that everyone is talking about the tourism gain that Australia can achieve when the next challenge is held in Perth is important and, as I hope to be in the Minister's position when that occurs, I am thinking more in the short term at present. Recognising that the Western Australian Government will certainly be mounting a strong promotion to attract Australians to Western Australia between now and then to see Australia II and the cup, it represents a unique opportunity for South Australia as a stop-over as part of a package, because almost everyone going to Western Australia will have to go through or over South Australia.

Has there been any contact yet by the Department with the Western Australian Department to make the most of a package tour which would include a stop-over in Adelaide and the regions? If not, will the Department make such an approach? In doing so, will it highlight to airlines that flights from Adelaide to Perth are on just three days a week, and that anyone who wants to stop in Adelaide is faced with some difficulty in having a stop-over on the way to Perth? What can the Department do to capitalise on increased tourist traffic to Western Australia?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We are anxious to work closely with Western Australia. The Ministers and Directors agree that Western Australia, Northern Territory and South Australia show much of what overseas people believe the real Australia to be, and we are certainly willing to work co-operatively with our neighbours to the north and west. We have not had discussions with Mr Semmens, who is still celebrating with Mr Bond and the crew somewhere on America's East Coast. In Western Australia the Premier is the Minister of Tourism, and he is rather euphoric at the moment.

I do not know that it is quite the right time to be speaking to him about these matters, but the member has raised a legitimate matter for the Department, and she can be assured that we will do all we can to tap in to what increased visitation results from the Americas Cup. It is likely that Australia II will be transported from city to city so that all Australians can pay homage. Certainly, in 1987 the member should contemplate bringing visitors to Australia to see the V.F.L. Grand Final, the Melbourne Cup, the Adelaide Grand Prix and the America's Cup. That good package should bring hundreds of thousands of people to Australia. We are aware of the situation and will be party to such initiatives. However, we still have four years of potential tourism growth. I will take on board the member's comments. Certainly, it is our intention to co-operate and tap in to that trade.

I have just been advised that South Australian brochures were distributed in Newport at the time of the America's Cup, and we are participating in a North American Co-

operative Press Campaign with the Australian Tourist Commission and we expect to participate in a sales mission to the United States next May. Currently we are investigating a media promotion in Los Angeles to be conducted during the Olympic Games next year. We are aware of the potential.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: What about the lack of flights?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That is a matter which we will take up with the appropriate authorities. I guess that we will have to establish a market before we get additional flights. We should not wait for that. I point out that 80 per cent of people who visit South Australia come in private vehicles. We believe that there is enormous potential, and we are working with Mr Semmens and the Western Australian department in promoting the Indian Pacific (true, it must first be a reliable service), which has great potential as a tourist attraction. There is potential to provide additional bus services with stops along the way, because it is a long way between Adelaide and Perth by bus in one haul. Perhaps there is capacity to improve that trip by providing stop-overs on the way. I have been advised that there are about eight flights a week between Adelaide and Perth.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: But I am told that they occur on just three days a week.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I will look at that with a view to doing something about it.

Ms LENEHAN: I refer to page 109 and specifically to 'Tourism research and tourism advertising and promotion'. At page 127, under the heading 'Strategies', the last sentence is as follows:

One of the strategies is to enhance awareness of the importance of tourism. An awareness programme will be launched.

First, how much of the advertising and promotion budget (obviously research money would be available) has been allocated to the awareness programme? Secondly, what sort of awareness programme is planned by the Department? I am thinking particularly in terms of an awareness raising of the general public. Is the department embarking on a programme similar to that which was embarked on in Singapore, for example, or does the department have some other initiatives that it intends to implement in regard to the awareness programme?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The awareness programme is very much under way. While it does involve the Department in a lot of money, we are working with the 'S.A. Great' Committee. There is no doubt that one of the pieces of advertising involving Des Colquhoun in the 'S.A. Great' television spots is a remarkable piece of work and we were involved in that. To give a more detailed response to the honourable member's question, I will ask the Director and the Deputy Director to explain to the Committee exactly what we are doing and have done in terms of the 'Awareness of South Australia' programme.

Mr Inns: It would be appropriate if my Deputy Director, Mr Noblet, was to give some detail of the specific programme. The Department is looking at 'awareness' in a very broad spectrum and, indeed, to label the programme 'awareness' and to define it as such in a sense defeats its very purpose, because 'awareness' is to make people aware without perhaps necessarily being subject to a conscious set of advertising techniques. It is to make them aware of, firstly, the value of tourism as an industry and, secondly, of the range of products that we have. That is in addition to the specific holiday ideas that we might promote under the joint campaign.

As the Minister has said, the awareness programme as such has already commenced through, first, Des Colquhoun's 'S.A. Great' campaign television advertisements, to which we have contributed and which are very splendid advertisements and, secondly, Tourism Week, which is currently

operating this week. We are also joining with the Australian Tourist Commission and other State Departments of Tourism in an Australian domestic tourism awareness campaign which will exhort Australians to take their holidays within Australia rather than overseas this year. I have been appointed a member of that Committee, and it is that campaign which will use, as the Federal Minister for Tourism announced yesterday, Paul Hogan as one of the main media advocates. It will commence late this year and continue into the next calendar year. As for some of the specific ideas as distinct from the specific programme, my Deputy Director could give you some indication of some of the programmes that are starting to come off the assembly line.

Mr Noblet: I would like to think that some of the programmes have been self-evident in the past 12 months, and I think that Tourism Week this week has probably been a good demonstration of the kind of tourism awareness programme that the Department envisages. The Director alluded to the fact that the programme needs to be approached in various segments depending on the group to be addressed at any one time. The fact that the media has co-operated to the extent that it has in the past week suggests to the Department that the tourism awareness programme directed at the media has been working. The fact that the Department was able to achieve co-operation from the Chamber of Industry and Commerce suggests that that part of the tourism awareness campaign is well under way.

Probably the greatest example of the tourism awareness campaign's working is reflected in the increased vote to the Department of Tourism and the awareness programme of Treasury implemented earlier this year. Specifically, the 'S.A. Great' campaign has only cost the Department of Tourism about \$10 000 for production of material but will generate about \$100 000 to \$150 000 of media time and space. That spreads the message to the community at large that the industry is worth about \$700 million and is generating a significant number of jobs.

Further radio commercials are now in production by the Department's advertising agency, and it is envisaged that those radio commercials will be used free of charge on a community service basis by Adelaide and regional radio stations. The Department of Tourism officers are constantly addressing meetings, be that of local government, regional tourist associations, service clubs or schools, and each of those addresses is tailored according to the awareness requirements of that particular audience.

Within the last fortnight a final script presentation has been prepared by the Department's advertising agency for a 10-minute to 12-minute audio visual presentation; this is aimed particularly at local government in order to highlight the need for greater co-operation between local government and the tourism industry, and to demonstrate both the social and economic benefits of the industry in South Australia in the future. Those various components are expected to be completed within the next couple of months, although I support the Director's comment that a great amount of work has already been commenced and is well under way under the category of tourism awareness.

Ms LENEHAN: I now refer to a need that has been expressed to me from various quarters for some sort of rationalisation of tourist offices in regions, particularly in country towns. By way of example, it has been shown that in some towns—

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order. The line that that comes under is the next line 'Miscellaneous', not the line that we are examining 'Town tourist offices', as I understand it.

Ms LENEHAN: No, I see this as an advertising and promotion line because some of the things to which I am referring are not actually tourist offices which are receiving

payment. That is the point that I am trying to make, and my question is a very short one. May I continue?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Ms LENEHAN: It has been suggested that there is no uniform position of tourist offices in towns. In some towns, the offices are being run by private operators who are essentially not being paid for the work that they are doing within the office. It has also been shown (and I have experienced it personally) that some of the offices are open throughout the weekend—virtually seven days a week; others are open only during office hours and others yet only on a Saturday morning. When the tourists want the offices open, they are not open. Is the Department looking at reviewing the provision of tourist offices or at any sort of rationalisation so that a complete service will be offered to the travelling public of South Australia?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The answer is 'Yes'. I have before me a policy report 'Provision of tourist information services in country areas of South Australia'; that addresses all the matters that the honourable member has raised. This document is currently being circulated amongst the tourism regions, and we are waiting for feedback from it. Certainly the matters that the honourable member has raised are relevant. We acknowledge that, and we have had them investigated. When in a position to do so, we will make recommendations as to how to address some of them, particularly, as the honourable member pointed out, the discrepancy in services and times of opening etc. It will take some time to implement because we need the co-operation of those people currently involved in tourist offices.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the Committee that Mr Rodda will replace the Hon. D.C. Wotton and Mrs Appleby will replace Ms Lenehan.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to small businesses and their involvement in the tourist area. A need exists for many districts and tourist areas to combine with local government. It is my opinion that a large problem exists in getting businesses in those areas to combine with local government and tourist areas. Could the Minister advise us on what is being done to involve local people?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The backbone of the Regional Tourist Association is composed of small business people within that region. These businesses recognise the importance of tourism to their own financial well-being. They become members of the Regional Tourist Association, have some input and can affect decisions locally and the recommendations that flow through to the State Department of Tourism.

The area mentioned by the honourable member is vital to tourism in South Australia because, overwhelmingly, the operators, entrepreneurs and businesses within the tourist industry come within the small business category. We are very anxious to involve them not only because they put their own finance into the industry but also because of their input, which is vital. If we need to know how an industry is going within any region, one of the good indicators is the small business sector of that region as it can benefit in a variety of ways of which it would hitherto be unaware. That is one of the reasons why we were delighted that the Chamber of Commerce had acknowledged in a practical way its co-operation and relationship with tourism by being the co-sponsor of the tourism lunch last Tuesday. In the co-operative advertising in which we intend to involve ourselves next February, we will give small industry operators the chance to advertise at rates which they could not otherwise afford.

It is a broad-brush answer to the matters raised by the honourable member and should indicate that we are aware of the part that small business people play in tourism in South Australia. The South Australian Government, through the Tourism Department, can encourage people to come here. We can spend a lot of money advertising South Australia and encouraging people to come here but they will not come back unless the services are provided and they feel welcome. Those services are provided by small business people. There is always a tendency to differentiate between small tourist operators and small business ventures, but, by and large they are the same thing and are very important to the industry.

Another regional manager has just been appointed to Port Lincoln, which is a vital tourist area of South Australia. Regional managers exist to assist small business. An additional regional manager has also been appointed in Adelaide. Both of those appointments have occurred in the past nine months. Previous appointments were made by the honourable member's Party when in Government.

Mr INGERSON: A lot of small businesses are obviously unaware of their role in the tourist industry. It was recently brought to my attention that many brochures put out promoting particular areas in South Australia do not show routes for travelling to those areas by road or from interstate. In other words, the brochures do not show routes for travelling to particular areas and they do not highlight attractions along the way. It was brought to my attention that the Queensland Government in particular seems to go out of its way to promote its tourist packages from the point of departure to a tourist area. What is the South Australian Government doing in that area?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member's point is valid. We are aware of the problem. In fact, we have already taken action to change the brochures to ensure that when we are promoting a destination we provide travel routes to tourist areas for prospective tourists. The first of such brochures for presentation to the market is on the Flinders Ranges. We acknowledge that there have been some shortcomings in some of the tourist brochure material. One always produces brochure material for the prevailing market, to create awareness of a particular tourist destination. One then follows up that awareness by providing a tourist with ways and means of reaching the destination.

It is difficult if one is starting from a base where little work had been done, which was the case in relation to tourism a couple of years ago. It is difficult to provide all the necessary information in one brochure. One must first create an awareness for potential tourists, to encourage them to come to South Australia. Having created that awareness, we then provide the follow up information, including ways and means of reaching the destination. That is the second phase of the Department's promotion of South Australia. The honourable member's criticism is valid, and we are aware of the problem. I think that the honourable member will be pleased with the change in our brochure material. Provision has been made under this line for the expenditure of \$375 000 for brochures, displays, resource material, and so on. The brochures are available to the trade all over South Australia and Australia. If the honourable member does not mind, I point out that that allocation is an increase of 20 per cent in that area. We are aware of the need to upgrade the brochure material and its content.

Mr INGERSON: The Minister would be aware that tourism is a seven day a week industry. A criticism of the tourist industry relates to penalty rates, particularly in regard to restaurants. Adelaide is often criticised because it is difficult to obtain a meal at a reasonable restaurant level on Sundays. The excuse often given relates to the significant effect of penalty rates. My question is not meant to be loaded in a

political sense. The comment I have made is often thrown up in relation to our tourist industry.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It is an appropriate question. It is a subject that is widely canvassed whenever the tourist industry is discussed and whenever members of the industry get together. At the last Minister's Conference that I attended we were informed that the Australian Tourist Commission had commissioned a committee to look at the whole question of penalty rates. That committee comprises a former Premier of South Australia, Don Dunstan, now Chairman of the Victorian Tourist Commission, Mr John Haddad, I think General Manager of Federal Hotels, and John Rowe, Executive Officer of the Australian Tourist Commission. They have been formed into a committee to investigate the whole subject of penalty rates. I should point out to the honourable member that there are many people in the industry who believe that the penalty rates argument is not as valid as appears on the surface, because people working in the industry are on the lowest base rate of any employee in Australia. Therefore, if we were to do away with penalty rates we would have to increase considerably the base rate as a trade-off.

The industry has not really come to grips with this matter. In terms of base rates or award rates the people working in the hospitality industry in Australia are probably on the lowest award of all, workers, so the encouragement for them to work in the industry is that the penalty rate supplements the base rate to provide them with a reasonable income. If we were to do away with penalty rates there would be an immediate request by their union for an increase in award rates. I think that most people who have looked at this matter closely would agree that such an application would succeed. Therefore, it is questionable whether abolishing penalty rates would automatically reduce costs. That may be the case. I think that that matter is arguable, but it is a matter being addressed by the committee established by the Australian Tourist Commission. It is a valid question, one being looked at at the highest level by the Federal Minister, who has commissioned his own report on this matter.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer now to tourism research. I have attended many meetings where there have been arguments as to what is research and what is advertising. During the periods that I have had an opportunity to travel overseas I have found that one is presented with surveys of all sorts, shapes and sizes regarding tours, even when one arrives at an airport. How is this research being tackled? Are surveys being used, or is it being done by comparison with other tourist centres? Is a certain amount of money set aside for people to use for research, and are those people given a target? What is the basis of the research?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I think South Australia is fortunate to have one of the best, if not the best, research persons in the tourism industry in Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am pleased that the honourable member for Coles agrees with my remark, although she probably has an interest in this matter since she appointed Anne Rein to her present position. I think that it would be appropriate for Ms Rein to report to the Committee on the matters raised by the honourable member in regard to funding of research and the sort of research that we are involved with in South Australia. I take the honourable member's point that research can be totally ineffective or very productive. We think that our research is productive and I ask Ms Rein to now give the honourable member the information that he seeks.

Ms Rein: We have quite an extensive research programme in South Australia. Part of that programme relates to monitoring overall trends in tourism, how many visitors we have, where they come from, how long they stay, and things

of that nature. That sort of information gives us a valuable base in marketing and identifying where our major markets are so that we know where to direct most of our money. We then do special research to find out what are the needs of those markets, and what sort of holidays people in that market are looking for. We then look at what sort of product we have in South Australia and that provides the backdrop for our advertising campaign in that market.

We then use research to evaluate the effectiveness of that campaign in the market to ascertain whether we have met our objectives. The information we collect is not only about the visitors or the potential visitors, what they need and where they go, but also about visitor satisfaction. We undertake research in conjunction with regional tourist associations to identify why people go to particular areas of the State, what they like about the area, and how they think that area can be improved. We also undertake research into particular sectors of the industry itself.

For example, we have monitored the accommodation sector (hotels and motels) at a State level and a smaller area level to see how things are going. That sort of information is used by potential developers and by us in advising developers whether there are new investment opportunities in particular areas and, if so, in what form. We undertake research in response to the needs of our other two divisions, namely, marketing and development and regional liaison, and we ascertain whether assistance in some particular area is required. We have done some work in relation to marketing for package tour potential, and so on. We also do research work in conjunction with the industry at its request. In conjunction with the Caravan Parks Association, we considered why people do or do not use caravans. That information is being used in marketing campaigns.

In terms of people picking one up at airports and asking questions or alternatively visiting one's home, if questions are asked at an international airport whilst one is leaving the country, that information is used for the international visitors survey which is conducted by the Australian Tourist Commission. That provides a wide range of information which is used by the Australian Tourist Commission and the Department in devising overseas marketing campaigns, as well as giving us some idea of the volume of international tourism into South Australia, why visitors come, and issues such as that. If one comes across people asking questions in one's own home about travel undertaken within Australia, that information is used for the domestic tourism monitor which is a national survey undertaken on an annual basis, and paid for by the States and Territories on a co-operative basis. It is undertaken by the Roy Morgan Research Centre in Melbourne and it provides information on domestic tourism.

Mr FERGUSON: I have a supplementary question. I was interested to know that the Department is researching the effectiveness of the campaigns. Has it had a chance yet to research, for example, the 'Enjoy' campaign, or is it too early in respect of the research programme?

Ms Rein: Yes, the 'Enjoy' campaign has been going long enough in Victoria, with enough weight behind it, (in other words it has been on television often enough), for us to start some evaluation work. Evaluation work is in hand in relation to the response from Victoria. We will do an evaluation in South Australia in November. We plan to do the Sydney evaluation once that campaign has been going for a while. We do not have any results yet. We are doing an evaluation on Melbourne and country at present. We plan to do an evaluation in South Australia after we have more information.

Looking, for example, at our travel centres, which give some indication—they are not a full evaluation—in Melbourne the number of bed nights booked since the campaign

started has increased by 45 per cent. In Sydney, in just the one month in which the campaign has been going there, it has increased by 41 per cent in terms of booking through the South Australian Government Travel Centres.

Mr FERGUSON: The latest travel agency to fold up was Tour World International in about June of this year. I understand that the Department has tendered or is tendering some advice on possible legislation, but I would like to know what advice would be given by the Minister to people booking through travel agencies before the legislation comes along. In other words, what would your advice or the Centre's advice be to people who book through tourist agencies so that they can secure their deposits?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The only advice that we could give, if we gave any advice at all, would be for people to ensure when they book their overseas or interstate travel that they do so with a creditable company, but we really cannot give advice that would reflect on or be in favour of any travel operator in South Australia. We really have to take a rather broad view of the industry generally, but we are concerned very much about the matters raised by the honourable member.

Here again, at the last Tourism Ministers Council there was discussion about the registration of travel agents, and it is part of our pre-election policy. Currently, the industry itself is involved in a self-regulatory procedure called 'Gold Seal'. The AFTA people believe that this will provide the answers. NSW, on a one-off basis, unilaterally will introduce legislation for the registration of travel agents. South Australia's point of view is that this is more a consumer affairs responsibility than a travel industry responsibility, although it impacts directly on the travel industry. This matter has been under the purview of the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, which normally includes consumer affairs, anyway, has addressed itself to this matter. A discussion paper has been prepared by the Tourism Ministers Council and the Consumer Affairs Council on the subject of registration of travel agents, which will ensure that the consumer's dollar is protected. If a travel agent goes broke the consumer will be protected; there will be trust accounts, etc. We are having continuous discussions with AFTA (South Australia) and AFTA federally and with the Ministers of Consumer Affairs. We hope that we will be able to resolve this matter very quickly in that the appropriate legislation will be introduced in all the States and federally. If this is not to be the case, New South Wales will go ahead anyway and introduce its own legislation to register its own travel agents.

Although I do not want to be seen to be too critical of Gold Seal, because it seems to be a legitimate effort by travel operators to regulate their own industry, the trouble with it is that there will be many people who will be outside the auspices of AFTA and who will not feel obliged to comply with the Gold Seal regulations and requirements. Therefore, consumers who are not members of AFTA could still be at a disadvantage. This is a matter that the Government is looking at, and hopefully we will be able to resolve it in the near future. These days, people seeking advice about leaving South Australia do not come to the Travel Centre, because we are not too enthusiastic about sending them off somewhere else: we are very enthusiastic about encouraging them to stay in South Australia and spend their holidays here.

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister provide details of the full intrastate promotion programme? Having already referred to the awareness programme and to Tourism Week, and so on, can the Minister put it all together and tell us what the tourism programme is? Perhaps details could be provided for the various components involved, such as television, newspapers, brochures and posters.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Broadly, our intrastate programme includes media advertising, involving television, for which \$100 000 has been allocated; press, \$30 000; radio, \$10 000; tapes \$140 000; public relations activity, \$5 000; information centres, \$15 000; and special projects, \$10 000. The total allocation of \$170 000 is the sum we have budgeted for in terms of our intrastate awareness and promotion programme.

Mr RODDA: The amount allocated for subsidies towards development of tourist resorts is \$342 000. In regard to the relationship between the States of Victoria and South Australia, what arrangements have been entered into in regard to liaison between particularly the Wimmera and Western Districts region of Victoria and the South-East area of South Australia? Many tourists from Victoria travel to the South-East through Bordertown, travelling south through Naracoorte to Mount Gambier. They then return to Victoria. I understand that some finance is provided to the South Australian Government by the Victorian Government. Will the Minister provide details of any such arrangements entered into with the South Australian Government?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We are attempting to develop closer co-operation between the South-East Regional Tourist Association, which is the South Australian body representing the South-East region, and the Victorian organisation, which is the South-West Regional Tourism Association. There have been problems and difficulties in getting these groups together. In fact, early in the life of the present Government, discussions were held with the Victorian Government, the South Australian Director of Tourism, and the Assistant Director, Regional Development, and some months ago they met with the Chairman of the Victorian Tourism Commission. Within the past few weeks the Assistant Director has again visited the South-East and delivered a rather cryptic message. It required them to get their act together. We are not in competition with each other. We want to work in co-operation with one another, so that there is more effective use of the tourist dollar. It may be useful if Mr Penley makes the appropriate details available to the Committee.

Mr Penley: The Department's activities over the past two years in this area have centred on drawing together the South-East Regional Tourist Association and the South-West Regional Tourist Authority (in Victoria) into some form of co-operative promotional activity. We have never thought about entering a co-operative development activity in regard to the line 'Subsidies to Tourist Resorts', at which I presume the question was aimed. We are not in a position to comment on the area of co-operative development.

However, as recently as the week before last, at the last Green Triangle Development Conference, a committee was formed and charged with the responsibility of over-seeing some joint activities in many areas, tourism being just one of them. However, I am pleased to report that the tourism activities that will be examined by the Committee in regard to future joint promotions are seen as the primary objective of the Green Triangle Development Conference. We see tourism as being the big economic winner in that area. I am confident that our rather fruitless efforts of the last couple of years will bear fruit in the next six or eight months in drawing together those two groups. The respective Government Departments involved are keen and willing to get on with the job, but they cannot do it alone and must have the support of those regional associations, which is what we are aiming at now.

Mr RODDA: Moving away from the border, and heading toward the Coorong, Robe, Kingston and Millicent, I am sure that the Minister will remember discussions I had with him prior to his overseas visit. The discussion arose from disappointment expressed by Millicent people with the pub-

lication of a report highlighting Kingston and Mount Gambier (but not Millicent) as the tourist pinnacle in the South-East. Millicent is led by an energetic Mayor, has scenic spots, is not far from the vineyards of Coonawarra and all they have to offer, and is adjacent to excellent fishing on the south-eastern seaboard. What is proposed under the line 'Subsidies to Development of Tourist Resorts' with particular reference to the towns I have mentioned?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The member did raise this matter with me before my overseas visit some months ago. I am aware of the disappointment of the people of Millicent that they did not receive a specific mention in some of our advertising material. As I understand it, there was some unidentified pictures of Millicent. That is often the case because in the material that we produce we cannot name everyone and everything. Certainly, we acknowledge that Millicent is an important part of the South-East region and the South-East tourist experience. We have applications from the Millicent council which we are looking at, and there is at least one submission for which we will be providing some funding. I can assure the member, the council and Millicent citizens that from the Travel Centre any visit to the South-East would involve a tourist spending time in Millicent.

That is not to suggest that Millicent should be the only destination in the South-East, but as a destination in its own right it is able to rank with all the other attractions in the South-East and I thank the honourable member for bringing that matter to my attention. I want to assure him that there has never been any intention on the part of the Department to neglect the attraction of Millicent. Promotion and advertising is a very difficult and sometimes touchy business. If we promote the South-East, inevitably that will increase the number of visitors who go into Millicent, whether or not we actually mention Millicent in the brochure or television material. It is not only Millicent to which it would apply; there would be a whole host of towns, destinations or attractions that we may show but not name.

It is a difficult decision to make but I have taken on board the criticism of the honourable member, and I appreciate his concern. All I can do is reassure him that we are aware of the attraction of Millicent and the surrounds, and its central position (I might say) within the South-East, which makes it an ideal place for people to stay. If they want to visit the area, Millicent is ideally situated, as are some areas in Mallee. I can see the member for Mallee looking at me with a rather stern face. I do not know how the boundary changes will affect the various interests of members generally, but jointly I am sure that they have the best interest of the South-East at heart.

Mr RODDA: My last question relates to the major development taking place in the South-East, and that is the rebuilding of the Dukes Highway, which will be a racetrack from Adelaide to Melbourne. There is some large funding involved in completing the road from Naracoorte to Penola, which will link up with the bulk of the infra-structure that has been built on the road to Nangwarry, and hopefully join up with the Keith Highway. Optimistic entrepreneurs are building a couple of motels down there. Is that development being taken on board? It will be a very good highway into the South-East, and it will complement South Australia receiving tourists from Victoria, and vice versa. We see quite an attractive investment there in transport as a means of getting from A to B. I am sure that it will make Millicent happy. I do not want it thought that I was being super-critical about Millicent, but people there did raise their disappointment. I am sure that they are very happy to be situated where they are, especially with the road developments going on. I would be interested to hear the Minister's

comment on this new road system which will probably be completed by 1985.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Of the people who visit South Australia, 80 per cent come by road in their own private car, etc., and the bulk of our market comes from Victoria, which means that the South-East is very strategically placed to participate in that tourism input to South Australia. Because of our very effective promotions in Melbourne and in Victorian country areas, we anticipate that the number of Victorians visiting South Australia will increase, so we believe that there is a very good future for the South-East. I am not too sure of some of the developments that the honourable member is canvassing. I do not know whether Coonawarra Motel is one of them. If it is, it is certainly a venture of which we are very supportive. We think that it has great potential. Any developer within that area who is contemplating spending money in a tourist venture is able to approach the Department so that he can tap into the expertise we have in terms of advice. Officers of the Department would be only too happy to help and provide advice and assistance. We are very much aware of the road developments because of their impact on tourism, and we are anxious to provide what technical advice we have to prospective developers.

If the honourable member has some specific tourist complexes in mind, he might be able to raise the matter with the Department after the Estimates Committees and we could tell him how we view them. Our support is a hard-nose technical support. We are not encouraging people to get involved in ventures merely for the sake of building a motel. I also point out that we have been involved in the 'stop-off on the way' promotion with the A.C.T., N.S.W. and Victoria, which campaign has been very successful and incorporates the South-East as an ideal stop-off area.

Mrs APPLEBY: Is it the Minister's intention to monitor Community Employment Project programmes granted to communities which will provide added attractions to South Australian and interstate visitors? I refer to such places as Kingston House, which is being developed and restored and is likely to qualify for these type of grants.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, very much involved. We want to have a considerable input into the programme as a Department. In fact, the \$1 125 000 provided to the Porter Bay complex was provided under that job creation scheme. If the honourable member would look at the line 'Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts', which has the smallest increase within the lines, she will notice that it is only about a 3.4 per cent increase. The reason for that is that the line provides only \$342 000. It used to be \$500 000 back in 1979, but it reduced progressively until 1982. In the last Budget it was marginally increased and it has been marginally increased again. In the face of industry criticism, we have been able to sustain that increase because we are putting a lot of job creation money into tourist-oriented projects. The honourable member has raised an important point. We are anxious to be involved and believe that there is considerable benefit to tourism in such job creation schemes.

One problem exists, namely, that the job creation programmes are funded mainly in areas with high unemployment, whereas the most appropriate tourist ventures should go where the tourism product is, and often one cannot match the two together. Fortunately, we were able to match the two in a number of areas to benefit tourism generally. So, while we are able to provide this sort of support at Porter Bay and the \$342 000 on the subsidy line can be directed towards specific tourist-orientated complexes or improvements, the job creation money can go to areas which have a tourist benefit and which also have high

unemployment. Port Lincoln was a case in point. That is an important point, and we are very much aware of it.

Mrs APPLEBY: Is it the Minister's intention for the Department to monitor what projects are done under that line within basic communities in the State?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Yes, we have an input into that committee and our advice is sought as to where the money ought to be spent. There has been an acknowledgment by the Job Creation Branch within the Minister of Industrial Affairs' portfolio area that tourism needs should be canvassed when the decision is made.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to the line 'Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts'. I express the gratitude of the people in Keith and Meningie in particular for the assistance that they have obtained under this scheme for the establishment of facilities in their respective communities. Can the Minister say which plans, if any, that have been submitted to the Department will receive subsidies under this line this financial year (if that has been determined)?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: We have received a considerable number of applications for subsidies under that line. Frankly, we do not have the resources to meet them all. The Department must determine its priorities and make recommendations accordingly. In fact, I was just addressing myself to this line in a reply to the member for Brighton, and I refer to the 'Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts' line. We are matching it up with funding provided through the job creation scheme. Therefore, what we are unable to provide through the 'Subsidies towards development of tourist resorts' line we have an input under the job creation scheme. Therefore, we have a two-pronged approach for providing subsidies to local government in assisting in the tourist resort area.

No announcement has been made yet, but we are certainly a fair way down the track in determining where the funding will go. A quick perusal of the allocations contemplated indicates that they include large areas of the State. Meningie, Keith and Tintinara will certainly participate under the subsidy line. Subsidies will be made available to those areas under this line. In fact, the South-East appears to be doing fairly well.

Mr LEWIS: Is the Minister willing to provide further details?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No, the scheme has to be fine tuned. I think I can make a commitment: I will ensure that officers honour the commitment by informing the honourable member at the same time or, if possible, even before the allocations are made in relation to areas within his district. That would be fair to the honourable member, but I do not think it would be fair to other areas under consideration for tourist subsidies if I went further. In fact, I think I have probably gone too far anyway.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to the provision of funds for the development of facilities, and so on. Has the Minister heard from the South Australian Water Skiers Association about the proposed development of three water skiing courses at Tailem Bend in time for national and international competition in that area of South Australia in 1986?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: No.

Mr FERGUSON: My question relates to the announcement that was made earlier this year by the Minister in relation to the tourist agency that the Department has established in Western Australia. I understand that it has been established through Elders IXL. Has there been enough time to evaluate the worth of that agency?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: It was the intention of the Government in commissioning Elders Travel to be our agents in Western Australia to review the effectiveness of that agency after 12 months. It has been operating for only nine months. After the 12 months has been completed we

will review how effective Elders Travel has been in promoting South Australia. This review will be carried out by our research division through monitoring visitor numbers to South Australia. An officer visited Western Australia about a month ago and indications are that there is increased interest in South Australia there. We will wait until the 12 months is up to give that agency a fair opportunity to fulfil the task that we have set it.

Mr FERGUSON: The Minister has mentioned promotion in New Zealand, Japan and possibly in America. Is that the sum total of the international promotion programme and, if not, will the Minister give details of what that programme is?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: If the honourable member has an opportunity to look at *Hansard* he will see that I have covered this matter fairly extensively. We will have varying degrees of promotion in New Zealand, Europe, the United Kingdom, Japan, South-East Asia and North America. There is a provision for special projects that arise from time to time. The figure involved for that promotion is a little over \$250 000, which does not signify a great expenditure by South Australia. However, I point out that we are working closely with the Australian Tourist Commission and it is that Commission's role, as we see it, to promote Australia as a prime destination for tourists. We want to tap into that promotion, and all our overseas advertising will be done in conjunction with that Commission. I believe that the Commission has the funds and resources available to it to do the major promoting of Australia. What we need to do as a State is to tap into that promotion to ensure that visitors coming to Australia include South Australia in their itinerary. If we are able to do that, and that alone, we will certainly dramatically increase the number of tourists coming to South Australia.

Mr FERGUSON: I have heard suggestions of a possible influx of tourists for the 1986 Jubilee celebrations. Has the Department considered this matter and made predictions and calculations or set out a programme for 1986?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I understand that the Jubilee 150 Committee has finalised its advertising programme today. It will now sit down with departmental officers to determine the advertising strategy for 1986. We are very much aware that in that year South Australia will be the focus for much of Australia's tourism, because a number of major conventions will be held in South Australia during that year. In fact, I think that the convention programme is almost booked out. People who go to conventions are tourists. These conventions will be domestic, interstate and overseas conventions, as I understand, so 1986 will be a big year for South Australia. Our tourism figures in that year will be vastly increased. We are working to ensure that we are able to accommodate those visitors.

My particular interest is that, once people come to South Australia for the first time, be it for a convention or some other reason, they should be made so welcome and enjoy themselves so much that they will want to come back for a holiday. I am confident that that will happen because, without being too parochial, Adelaide is a lovely city, as I think we would all agree. The year 1986 will be an important year, and the Tourism Department is working closely with the Jubilee 150 Committee to ensure that it is a successful year in relation to our visitors.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I, like the member for Mallee, am interested to know what projects have been approved under the line 'subsidies towards development of tourism resorts'. What is the value of each, what is the time table of each, and what are the priorities beyond those which have been approved and which will be recommended, presumably, to the Department of Public Works for job creation schemes? If the Minister is not able to advise the Committee

tonight what those projects are, when will he be able to make those announcements? Does he intend to do so progressively throughout the year, or will it be within a matter of weeks, or before the end of this year?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am not able to advise the honourable member of the projects that have been submitted to or recommended by the Department for approval. Those recommendations have not come to me, as Minister, yet, but I expect that they will in a couple of weeks. However, we do not intend to have a rolling programme of approvals. We have researched very carefully the projects that have been submitted to us, and I expect announcements to be made for at least half the funds available, hopefully within a month.

Certainly there is no intention to merely have a rolling programme of announcements. I think that it is important to provide the funds as early as we possibly can, because these projects are vital, and that will be done. When I am in a position to do so, I will certainly make a public announcement.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I put the question because I know that a number of projects were in the pipeline when the previous Government left office. I imagine that those who submitted those projects would not want to wait any longer than they have to.

My next question relates to the tourism research line. As has been indicated, I am impressed by the quality and output of the Research Division. I am also struck by the fact that much of the material, particularly in relation to market surveys, appears to me not to be disseminated to where it can be assessed and put to effective use: private operators who might be expected to gain the most benefit from it, and regional tourist associations.

My question is in three parts. First, what action does the Department take to ensure that the people for whom the research is designed, receive the benefit of that research and the benefit of some kind of analysis which would assist them directly? Secondly, what is the standard circulation of the material, and what volume of each of the publications has been produced? Thirdly, what is the cost? I am talking about the cost of the publications, not the preparation of the same, because in my own case I know that I have sought and received from the Department sometimes up to 100 volumes. Thankfully, I have never had to pay for them because, in this respect, I regard myself almost as the Department's or the State's agent in disseminating that material. However, it must be costly, and I would like to know the total cost of publication for the Department for the last year, and the method of dissemination and assistance with analysis for the people whom it is designed to benefit.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The honourable member is a very good public relations officer for the travel industry in South Australia: I readily acknowledge that. I am surprised that she says that the research newsletter does not find the market for which it is produced.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I was thinking not of the newsletter but of the more detailed single publication.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: As I understand it, the research information does find its market. However, I will ask Ms Rein to provide information in relation to the research newsletter, the standard circulation, the volume and the cost.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am referring not only to the research newsletter but also to the total range of publications produced by the Research Division.

Ms Rein: The Tourism Research Newsletter is produced twice yearly. One of its basic and main functions is to provide short summaries of the major research that has been undertaken. At the back we always produce a list of the available publications. That is intended as a guide to

the industry to give it an idea of what is available and to assist it in selecting what publications it requires. That research newsletter has a very wide circulation; it is circulated to at least 2 000 people in South Australia. It goes to all operators of whom we are aware, and we are quite happy to add anyone to the list. The cost of the Tourism Research Newsletter in 1983-84 is estimated to be \$5 000 for two editions.

The actual print run for other reports produced by the Division depends on the publication. For example, we have printed about 1 500 copies of the tourism development plan. We print that in runs of about 500, but we print other publications in smaller runs, because they are directed towards a smaller group of people within the industry. In total, our estimated cost for production of reports in 1983-84 is \$12 400.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As a supplementary question, I can see that there is a dilemma in that the Department is providing a service which assists tourist development and promotion, but at the same time I know that other Government departments that produce material of such substance and in such a volume make charges. Has the Department ever considered that?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: The Government believes that it benefits hugely by investment in the tourist industry and by patronage of the tourist industry in South Australia. So, the Government believes that it ought not to charge for the research work that it does, because it benefits in so many other ways. It seems unreasonable to charge the industry that in itself has the capacity to be such a strong economic generator in terms of both cash-flow and jobs in South Australia. It is a service that we believe we are able to provide to the industry, as it was previously. We benefit from a viable and enthusiastic tourist industry; so, any contribution that we make is returned many-fold.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before asking my next question, and bearing in mind the time, I move:

That the total of the Department of Tourism line be put for consideration before we move on to 'Miscellaneous'.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot do that. The position is that we must run out of questions. While somebody is prepared to ask questions, we are in difficulty. Are there any questions?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the Department of Tourism line before we move to Miscellaneous.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is quite aware of what the member for Coles is saying. It is not for the member for Coles to literally dictate whether or not we will close a line. If there are any questions still prominent on the line, the line is not voted on; that is the situation. There are no motions to be taken. Are there any questions? There being no questions, I intend to declare the examination of the vote—Tourism, \$5.299 million—completed.

Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous, \$366 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
The Hon. Jennifer Adamson
Mr D.M. Ferguson
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr G.A. Ingerson
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr I.P. Lewis
The Hon. D.C. Wotton

Witness:

The Hon. G.F. Keneally, Chief Secretary and Minister of Tourism.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr G.J. Inns, Director, Department of Tourism.
Mr A.B. Noblet, Deputy Director, Department of Tourism.
Mr L.J. Penley, Assistant Director, Development and Regions, Department of Tourism.
Mr D.E. Packer, Assistant Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Tourism.
Ms A.E. Rein, Assistant Director, Planning and Research, Department of Tourism.
Mr R. Lucas, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the line 'Tourist Associations—Regional tourist associations' for which a sum of \$290 000 has been allocated. Will the Minister identify the amounts to be allocated to each of the regional tourist associations, and will he indicate whether there is any change of direction in the purpose for which those funds are to be used?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There is a problem in regard to advising the Committee, and even the Parliament of the break-down before we have actually advised the regional tourist associations themselves. There has been a marginal increase to offset inflation for most of the regional tourist associations. Also, there is a marginal increase in the allocation to the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: An increase to what?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am considering whether or not it is appropriate to make these announcements before the tourist associations themselves have been advised. The situation at the moment is that the recommendations for this have not come before the Minister for approval. The break-down of allocations to the individual regional associations have not yet been approved by me. If I were to announce the details here I would be totally committed to approving the submission from the Department, whether or not I felt that I wanted to vary the allocations. Certainly, I can indicate that I am considering an allocation of about \$120 000 for the A.C.V.B. Also, I am considering providing executive support for SATIC and SAARTO from this Budget line. The allocations must be approved by me and the matter should be discussed with the tourist associations themselves before an announcement is made. Suffice to say, they have all had an increase. I might say that I am not happy with the basis by which the money is allocated to the regional tourist associations. I will be having further discussions with the Department to verify the method previously used for allocations, which was based on visitor nights: I think that other factors ought to be taken into consideration. Whether that will affect this year's allocation or not is a matter that I have yet to decide.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I believe that it makes a mockery somewhat of the benefit of the Estimates Committees when the Committees cannot examine and question a Minister on specific allocations to specific organisations. I appreciate the protocol involved, but I believe that before it was presented to Parliament, the Budget should have been in a form that enabled members to ask questions and be provided with specific answers. I hope that next year that will occur.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I give that undertaking.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Notwithstanding the unsatisfactory position in regard to the development of both tourist resorts and the allocations to be made available to

regional tourist associations, in regard to the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau, has any provision been made for the three-year lead time promotion that would be required for an international convention centre? Several months ago the Premier indicated that an announcement about the centre would be made in a few weeks time. If it is to proceed, the centre will be built in about three years time. International conventions take about three years in lead time planning. Therefore, the promotion of the convention centre will need to be undertaken this financial year if it is to receive bookings when it is opened. Is any contingency sum set aside for that purpose?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: To the best of my knowledge, no special contingency is included in the funding that takes account of the issues raised by the honourable member. I know that in its general planning for 1986 the A.C.V.B. has taken these matters carefully into account. It is aware of the potential that exists. It is aware of the matters raised by the honourable member and is giving them due consideration.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I refer to the line 'Town tourist offices' (and specifically to page 142 of the yellow book) in regard to the role of the town tourist offices to provide information on the impact of tourism on local areas. What projects were completed last year and what projects are now being conducted to fulfil that goal of providing information on the impact of tourism on local areas? This is related to the whole question of a State tourism awareness campaign.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I do not know whether I can adequately respond to the question, because I am not sure what the honourable member is asking.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I understood that in the past 12 months there have been specific surveys undertaken in local government areas to alert local government and business in the area of the impact of tourism on the area in question. I would like the Committee to be advised where those surveys were undertaken, what was the outcome and where are surveys planned for this year?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Surveys were conducted at Mannum, Murray Bridge and Port Lincoln. Survey reports are to hand. Perhaps the honourable member could receive a summary; we will provide a summary in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and a report for the member.

Mr FERGUSON: In regard to town tourist offices, which the member for Coles was discussing, an increase from \$48 900 to \$65 000 is provided. Will that mean an increase in the number of town tourist offices?

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: There will probably be two additional town tourist offices that will be subsidised by the Department. I will have the information inserted in *Hansard* for the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: As the time has expired, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.45 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Tuesday 4 October at 11 a.m.