

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 7 October 1980

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B***The Committee met at 11 a.m.*

Police, \$72 730 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr. E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Dr. B. Billard  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr. G. F. Keneally  
Mr. J. Mathwin  
Mr. T. M. McRae  
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald  
Mr. I. Schmidt

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. A. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr. L. D. Draper, Commissioner of Police.  
Mr. F. F. Bowering, Finance Officer, Police Department.  
Mr. T. J. Chuchett, Buildings and Property Officer, Police Department.  
Mr. K. J. Bertram, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have received replies to questions asked of the Deputy Premier by the members for Gilles, Elizabeth, Napier, and Unley last Tuesday and I direct that those replies be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

I understand that Committee members have a copy of the minutes of the meeting on 2 October. I have examined those minutes and, if there are no objections, I will sign them as a correct record of the proceedings.

During the answering of questions, the Minister may state that he will obtain information for the Committee later. I ask that the information provided be brief and in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you would let the Minister know that the Committee would be most appreciative if the information that members seek could be made available during the Committee's sitting today. That would be of much more assistance than if we had the information later.

**The CHAIRMAN:** By experience last week, we learnt that it was possible for a Minister to obtain some information while the Committee was sitting and, if that is possible, we would request that that be done. Of course, with other information, that is not possible, and you heard me this morning refer to some answers to questions. On previous occasions, we have given the opportunity to members of the Committee to suggest any time limits or any times to be allocated to certain votes if a member cares to give an estimate of what he feels would be desirable. It is not necessary and would not be rigid: the times would be flexible.

**Mr. McRAE:** I think the situation today is a fairly complex one and, in those circumstances, Opposition members would not care to make such a suggestion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It has been the practice in this Committee, because we have no amplifying system, for

members of the Committee to stand when speaking, but that is not necessary as far as the Minister and his officers are concerned.

I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr. McRAE:** When the Liberal Party came to power last year, one of its major proposals that it had put before the community concerned law and order. The Minister will recall (and I have dealt with this on previous occasions in the House) that there were certain highly objectionable advertisements paid for under cover of darkness by various people which suggested that there was a link between the then Government and the crime rate. The Liberal Party policy in relation to the police appeared to be limited to this:

A Liberal Government will (1) legislate to protect the Commissioner of Police from arbitrary dismissal and (2) strengthen the Police Force.

I should like to observe that there has been a very clear cut in the police expenditure line. Assuming a very reasonable degree of inflation of 10 per cent (most economists would say 12 per cent), on my calculations there has been a real cut of at least 7.5 per cent. Therefore, in the first place, I should like to ask the Minister how, in policy terms, he can reconcile the policy of his Government, and the promise it made at the time of seeking office, with the slash in the allocation of police funds.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not accept that it is a slash in terms of police funds. We are at the end of our first year in office and, across the board, with the restraints that were announced by my Premier, we have sought to maintain law and order through the Police Force in terms of those restraints. This does not mean that policy is not on-going or that we do not look at increasing the area. Everyone will agree that there are extra needs, but putting more police officers on the street does not mean that that is the be all and end all of the extent to which they will maintain law and order.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It is not a bad start.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The member says that it is not a bad start. In these days of long distances and fast speeds, a police officer has to be equipped with other gear. The Premier has announced that the area of police is a flexible area, and this vote that we are discussing today, in terms of Government policy, is in accordance with the funds that are available.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It has been the practice in this Committee that, if a member has a line of questioning that he wishes to follow, he is acknowledged from the Chair several times. From that member, we go to the other side of the Committee.

**Mr. McRAE:** Does the Chief Secretary admit that, as a matter of fact, the expenditure on the police line has been reduced in real terms by approximately 7.5 per cent?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There is an increase of \$1 857 000. If we want to argue about real terms or perhaps 12 per cent and if the member is pressing for that, a lot of other people would go short. The funds that the Treasurer has available are shared. The figures have been worked out as at the present time in accordance with the funds that the Treasury has available.

**Mr. McRAE:** I am disturbed at the Minister's attitude. He is dodging what is transparently clear. Allowing for a moderate rate of inflation of 10 per cent, there has been a cut of 7.5 per cent in real expenditure, and that simply does not line up with the policy which he put forward as spokesman in this area in seeking Government in this State. Nowhere near does it line up with that. I would like the Chief Secretary to indicate to the Committee in what way he has, in his or in his Government's term of office,

strengthened the Police Force.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I refer to the honourable member's opening gambit. In addition to the \$72 730 000 proposed for the police, it must be realised that when comparing funding for the previous year there is provision in a round-sum allowance for wage increases at the same rate of inflation in the Police Department which allows for the national wage and other increases. When this is taken into account, the proposed amount for the police does not involve any reduction in real terms. The further question which the honourable member asked concerned, I think, the effectiveness of the police at this juncture.

**Mr. McRAE:** I asked what has the Government or the Minister done to strengthen the Police Force.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We are talking about what the police are doing. We are living in times of financial restraint, and I have mentioned the round-sum allowance for wage increases and the rate of inflation. Policing is a two-way affair, as I see it. There are initiatives that have been implemented.

**Mr. McRAE:** Tell us what they are.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** What are these two-way affairs?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The member for Elizabeth is not unfamiliar with two-way takes. I refer to crime alert. There have been strong campaigns in several suburbs, where members of the public have been given instructions on where they can assist, for instance, in regard to security within their homes. That is only one area. The Police Force in this State is highly regarded throughout the Commonwealth.

**Mr. McRAE:** Nobody disputes that.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** They are giving a very sound account of themselves in their work in this State. I will ask the Commissioner to make some comments on the Police Force and its activities.

**Mr. Draper:** Although the overall total of people employed in the Police Department in the past 12 months has not increased, the active strength of the Police Force has increased because of the transfer of people from the cadet field into the active strength field. In the past financial year we have increased the active strength by something like 50-60 people. There will be some increase, again, in this current financial year by the transferring of people from one pool, in a sense, to another, and this, together with a review of the manpower allocations that have been made in the department in the past, will provide a pool for the transfer of people into the prevention and detection fields.

In addition, we have the crime alert campaigns that the Minister referred to. These have been carried on with intensity over the past 12 months, and we propose to increase and diversify activities in this area also in the current financial year.

**Mr. McRAE:** The Minister referred to an earlier line providing for money to be set aside for national wage and, presumably, work value increases. It is absolutely absurd for the Minister to suggest to the Committee that by relying upon these figures he can inflate the line before us. Quite clearly, this line cannot take account of national wage and other adjustments not foreseeable at the time of drafting of these documents. That was a clear misleading of the Committee by the Minister, and he is treating Committee members as fools. I will not wear that. Quite clearly, the police budget has been slashed. I therefore ask the Police Commissioner—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Questions must be directed to the Minister, who will dispose of them as he wishes.

**Mr. McRAE:** I draw the Minister's attention to the claims that he made before coming into office of

staggering increases in the crime rate which his Party used extensively in its publicity. It indicated that South Australia had staggering increases in the crime rate, something of the order of 8 per cent or 10 per cent, and that this State, unlike other States, was suffering from such a deluge of crime. I would like some factual information from the Police Commissioner on that. Was the increase in the crime rate for years 1977-79 any different in this State from that in any other State? Secondly, has the crime rate in the last 12 months increased or decreased compared with the previous three years? I hope the Minister will allow the Commissioner to give us this factual information.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I hope that the honourable member is not attributing any increase to me. I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

**Mr. Draper:** I cannot answer that question at this stage. I certainly cannot give any information on the difference in increase, if there is an increase, between South Australia and other States. Concerning whether the crime rate has increased in South Australia in the past 12 months, the answer is in the affirmative, yes. As to the exact per cent of increase, I cannot say, without reference to criminal statistics which are available at headquarters.

**Mr. McRAE:** Can that information be obtained?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** The line regarding overseas visits of officers has been increased up to \$23 000. I take it that the Chief Secretary's reason for this increase is that he is putting more emphasis on the need for officers and the department generally to gain experience. He knows, as well as the member for Playford knows, that that is a policy in which this Government believes.

I remind the member for Playford that, among other things, our aim is to protect the community, to prevent crime, to apprehend offenders, and to bring them to justice. To achieve this aim, we will ensure an appropriate level of staff and resources.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Why don't you have the document inserted in *Hansard*?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** If the honourable member wants a little cross chat, he can have it; it will give me the greatest pleasure to oblige him. The Liberal Party also said in its policy speech that the Police Commissioner should be given the same independence and protection that exists for Public Service Commissioners, the Auditor-General and the Valuer-General. So, if members opposite wish to talk about our policy, I will read it through for them. That should save their having to go right through the policy document every time that they speak.

The member for Playford referred to the advertisements that were placed in the press before the election. Surely, the honourable member would be the first to admit that those advertisements were inserted by people who were concerned about the situation that existed then. Obviously, in any country there is a crime problem, and those people were concerned about it. Of course, this all depends on the type of crime involved. If we as Parliamentarians bring in new laws and regulations, more offences will be committed. The former Labor Government certainly surpassed all records in this respect, and, the more regulations that we bring in, the more criminals we will make.

When the member for Playford raised this matter, it was an area of concern to him. However, he did not tell the Committee that the advertisements were inserted by concerned residents in South Australia. Obviously, the Minister, being a responsible Minister, is acutely aware of the situation.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** We are here to question the Minister, not to defend him. We want information.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I am giving you some.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have allowed the member for Glenelg considerable latitude. Will the honourable member now direct his comments to the information that he is seeking from the Minister?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Ask him how to spell "filibuster".

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Does the allocation for overseas visits of officers mainly centre around the fact that it is always good policy to have a well-informed department? Also, what visits are involved, and which countries is it expected will be visited in what I consider will be a fact-finding operation?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The sum of \$23 000 has been allocated for the overseas visits of officers this year, representing an increase of \$11 690 on last year's allocation. The requirement for a member to attend an unscheduled course in the use of Smith and Wesson revolvers in Massachusetts, U.S.A., accounted for over-expenditure of \$2 000 on this line during 1979-80. Provision is made in 1980-81 for the attendance of the Commissioner of Police at an Interpol Conference to be held in Manila, Philippines, the estimated cost of which is \$3 000.

The provision also involves the attendance of a departmental representative at a U.N. Congress on Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders, which is to be held in Caracas, Venezuela, and to allow a visit of Special Forces in America. The estimated cost of this trip is \$7 000. The allocation also involves approval for financial support to a member to study for a Master of Science degree at the University of Strathclyde, Scotland, the estimated cost being \$5 000.

The balance of the allocation is associated with the attendance of Chief Superintendent K. L. Thorsen at the Senior Command Course, Bramshill College, U.K., involving expenditure of \$8 000.

All of these visits will widen the knowledge of our police officers and will mean much valuable information for the Police Force when the officers return. I think that the Commissioner is to go to Manila in a couple of weeks. This money will result in a valuable input to the Police Department.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not all that impressed to hear about our police officers going to learn anything in Manila. I should have thought that the type of policing that occurred in the Philippines was more the martial law type of policing, which we would not want in this country. What funds have been provided for the re-establishment of Special Branch; when did that occur; how many positions are provided for; and is this the State security allocation that has been referred to?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Will the honourable member please say to which line he is referring?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am referring to the lines relating to Assistant Commissioners, Superintendents, Inspectors, Sergeants, Constables, Probationary Constables, Cadets, Storemen, and other general employees.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The honourable member has referred to Special Branch, which, although not specifically identified, would come under the allocation for Assistant Commissioners, Superintendents and Inspectors. The situation regarding Special Branch is the same now as it was during the term of office of the Government of which the honourable member was a member. An audit is under way, although it has not yet been completed. Mr. Justice White was on extended leave, and a small amount

of auditing is still to be done. As far as I know, it has not yet been completed. There is a small number of officers in Special Branch, and I ask the Police Commissioner to elucidate.

**Mr. Draper:** Four officers are in the Special Branch—an inspector-in-charge, a sergeant and two other ranks plus a clerical assistant. That has been the level for the past 18 months to two years. It is not intended to change it at present.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I refer to page 268 of the programme papers, which deals with the State Security Programme. Can the Minister provide a break-down of what amounts are spent on the Special Branch, Government House security and Parliament House security?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask Mr. Draper to provide the information that the honourable member seeks.

**Mr. Draper:** I can supply that information, but not immediately. I can give the member information about the relative number of people involved in each section, but I cannot give information about the financial allocations for their upkeep. The Special Branch has already been enumerated; Parliament House security involves manpower of one; and Government House security involves manpower of either six or seven, but I am not sure exactly.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The figures given by Mr. Draper do not tally with the manpower level of 14 as set out at page 268 of the programme papers.

**Mr. Draper:** I am speaking from memory and stand to be corrected.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I point out to the honourable member that four Ministerial portfolios in these papers were accurate and that others were not so accurate. The number of 14 set out may not be accurate because the figures in other portfolios were not up to date.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out to members that on page 1 of the programme papers it states that the information in the papers should be regarded as indicative rather than accurate to the last dollar and manpower number. Some of the statistics are not absolutely accurate.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will check that for the member.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** There should be no difficulty in the Minister's providing the Committee with the accurate information that I have sought.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I refer to overall funding and staffing, which was referred to by the member for Playford. I note from the Budget Estimates that the comparisons made by the member were quite fatuous, because he neglected to indicate that several large payments made in the last financial year were on a one-off basis. This significantly changes the overall picture. For example, \$982 000 was voted for the development of a firearms control system. That one-off payment did not continue this year. Similarly, \$180 000 was voted for the purchase of aircraft, and was a one-off payment. If one adds the figures one finds that, in comparing the amount voted last year with the amount voted this year, if we subtract the two figures—\$66 000 000 previously voted and \$72 730 000 voted this year, which well takes into account the inflation rate (this is the true basis of comparison with the figures from year to year)—the increase between the amount voted in 1979-80 and the actual payments in that year relates to variations such as those payments which are made out of the Treasurer's Fund, which takes into account salary increases.

To say that the \$72 700 000 should be compared with the actual payments last year is quite fatuous. The actual payments last year included appropriations out of the

Treasurer's Fund. Therefore, we should be comparing the amounts voted last year with the amounts voted this year, less those one-off payments. If one takes into account those one-off payments, the increases are fully taken into account with the inflation rate. If one transfers that to the numbers in each area one can see on page 260 of the programme papers all the categories listed and an estimate that manpower will increase in almost every category, apart from the one headed "Recruitment, Selection, Training and Staffing". Can the Minister say why there is a decrease in that area? Does it imply that there are fewer cadets being taken on? If it does, why are fewer cadets being taken on? Does it imply that there has been some change in the rate of resignations from the Police Force in the last year compared with previous years?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** All figures are averages and are not actual staffing levels. The reason for these averages instead of actual levels is to indicate how many full-time staff on average are to be paid out of the funds provided. Note (a) in the programme papers states:

Average of full-time equivalent staff for the 1979-80 financial year. It should be noted that, although a total of 87 additional positions were approved for 1979-80, the majority were not filled until the latter half of the year and this has resulted in some deflation in the average of full-time equivalent staff for that year.

**Dr. BILLARD:** What is the resignation rate from the Police Force? Has it declined from the rate in the previous years? I seek reasons for the decline in relation to recruitment, selection, training and staffing.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask Mr. Draper to answer that.

**Mr. Draper:** One of the difficulties that comes about in taking an average situation can be highlighted by my quoting the actual strength at 30 June 1980, which is 3 880, whereas the average number in the department at that time is taken to be 3 829: there is some variation between the average and actuality that I cannot explain without an involved analysis of the figures. That was the basis upon which we were asked to submit our figures, the actual average. Regarding the resignation rate within the Police Force, it is basically the same. In the last two years it has been approximately 1½ to 2 per cent overall.

The reason we are not taking on as many cadets this year, or last year, as we have in previous years is that for some three years we have had a manpower ceiling which has meant that the number of people in the department in total was fixed. There has been some movement between categories, as I explained earlier, in that there is a movement of cadets to active strength as constables. However, the sum total in the department remains basically the same. Therefore, we can only take on that number of cadets to replace those people who separate for one reason or another.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Is it possible for us to get accurate figures on the resignation rate for the past four years?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes, that can be done.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Have there been any changes in the level of computerisation of the department which would have allowed the reallocation of manpower from one area to another?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Again, that is a technical question and I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

**Mr. Draper:** There has been some increase in computerisation in the department, but the extent to which this has permitted a reallocation of staff has been minimal and restricted, basically, to office assistants.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I want to refer back to an answer given to the Committee by the Commissioner of Police which I think is the most important statement that has

been made here this morning. It relates to the Commissioner's statement that there has been an increase in crime in South Australia over the past 12 months. Just to give a bit of background to the question I remind the Committee that it was a plank of the Liberal Party's policy prior to September 1979 that it was going to make the streets of South Australia safe for citizens to walk again. In fact, a statement in Italian in some political propaganda put out by the candidate for Norwood was as follows:

A Liberal Government will make the streets safe for your daughters to walk on, without being molested by those hooligans who have been acting as if they owned the place for the last 10 years.

"The last 10 years" quite clearly refers to the period that the Labor Government was in office; it could mean no other period. An article appeared in the press under the byline "Jennifer Adamson, Liberal M.P. for Coles", as follows:

The Government—  
referring to the A.L.P. Government of South Australia—  
has done little or nothing about public concern about violent  
crime and lenient sentences.

Quite clearly, that was an issue at the last election, and it is an issue about which the people of South Australia have had their expectations raised prior to the election, an expectation that this increase in crime which we were experiencing in South Australia and which our opponents seemed to suggest only South Australia was experiencing would be overcome by a change of Government. We want to know just what the current Government has been able to do to overcome this problem, and I have a series of questions that I wish to ask the Minister about this. First, would the increase in crime be reduced only by the provision of more police officers?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The honourable member's question involves one ingredient of law and order: that is, more police officers. I think I remember him interjecting at some time that it is not a bad start to have more police officers. The honourable member prefaced his remarks by saying he wanted some input from the Commissioner. The Commissioner is the No. 1 policeman in South Australia, and I am going to ask him whether he cares to answer that question.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Would more police reduce the incidence of crime in South Australia?

**Mr. Draper:** I do not know that it is possible to answer that question conclusively. I believe that any Police Force must have a certain level of numerical strength which permits the performance of its duties in a proper fashion and so that it covers the hours of the day, and covers the State in a geographical sense, adequately. Once a Police Force reaches a level which is reasonably adequate, the extent to which additional personnel will decrease crime and provide more protection to the public is purely hypothetical. Tests which have been carried out in other forces throughout the world have indicated to us in our research in South Australia that it is questionable, once you have reached this level I have mentioned, whether or not an increase in strength is going to reduce the problem of crime generally, on an economic basis related to the cost of additional personnel.

When one considers that 50 policemen, costing something like \$1 500 000 at the present rate of salaries, would only provide four additional patrol cars in the metropolitan area of Adelaide throughout 24 hours, then the economics of the situation come into sharp review. I think it is worthy of mention that any Police Force, if it is asked, will say that it needs more men and that it could well do with more men; I have not known any Police Force in my 40 years of experience that has not said that, but I

think that, on the other hand, in South Australia in the last 10 or 11 years we have gradually reached a stage where our ratio of police to population compares more than favourably with every other State in Australia except Tasmania. On that basis, while I would not refuse additional personnel, I think that one must fairly look at the economics of the situation and at what one hopes to achieve as a result of their employment. I am afraid that on that basis at present, unless we tested it, I could not give a conclusive answer.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I thank the Commissioner for his answer. The Commissioner is a man for whom I and I am sure all members of the Committee have a great deal of respect. I think it is a shocking thing that the Commissioner is being required to answer questions of this nature that are put to the Committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Questions are directed to the Minister, who has had the Commissioner answer.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I am not questioning the right; I am questioning the motive. The questions I am asking are policy questions which the Commissioner of Police, or any public servant in South Australia, ought not be required to answer. The Minister is part of the Government that makes that policy, and his officers implement that policy. For the Minister to offload the more difficult questions on to his public servants is neglecting his responsibility.

**Dr. BILLARD:** You complained the other way last week.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** There is a difference between straight-out questions and questions of policy. I would have thought that members on the other side of the House would realise that, but their Party has not had much recent experience in Government, so that may account for it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member to continue his questions.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** In reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, the Attorney-General, on 6 November 1979, clearly indicated that there would be an increase in support for the police. That support has not been forthcoming, if one looks at the Budget documents. I was interested when the Commissioner, in answering a question for his Minister, said that whenever one considered an increase in the number of police officers, one must look at the economic factors.

Economic factors are a matter on which the Government has to make a decision, and the Government has told the people that it is prepared to make those decisions. The Government, more than any other body in South Australia, must be held responsible, because of its pre-election advertising, for the concern in the community about crime. No other body has been as responsible for frightening the people as has the current Government. Having frightened the people and told them how dangerous the streets were, this Government ought to follow through by providing the police officers and support for them to overcome the crime rate that it has highlighted.

Will the Minister tell the Committee what he and his Cabinet are doing to solve those problems? I should be pleased if on this occasion the Minister was able to tell us, because it is a decision for him and Cabinet, not for the Commissioner of Police. If Cabinet provides the wherewithal for the Government to give a more effective service, the Commissioner and his force will do that. That is not in question. What is in question is that the Liberal Party is prepared to make political capital out of scaring people about crime in the street and, when that Government has been elected, nothing is coming forward.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The member has raised some politics, and I accept that in the spirit in which he does so.

The Commissioner gave an independent professional opinion regarding an input of manpower. I think it was a matter of 50 officers costing \$1 500 000 to provide so many patrol cars. In the good old days when I, as Minister, was asked these questions, such as happened last year, I would have to say that I did not carry the figures in the top of my head.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** There is room for them.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There is room for them, but the member should try being Chief Secretary and everything else that is tacked on to him.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Why don't you resign?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** That is uppermost in the member's mind. The member for Stuart has asked me a question, following the Commissioner's answer, about whether the Government is going to provide a big input into the Police Force. This Budget has been carefully worked out. I have had my allocation from the Treasury and that is put forward with the cut-up in the way the officers of the various departments see best use of the money. If we had more wherewithal, perhaps I could do the things that the member seeks.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I first asked whether the position regarding the increase in crime would be improved by more police. The Chief Secretary said that, if he had his way in Cabinet, the Treasury would vote more funds for the Chief Secretary's Department and the Police Department. In view of that answer, can the Chief Secretary tell the Committee what areas the majority increase in crime has been in, what additional funding he would wish to be directed towards those areas, and what benefits he could see flowing from that additional funding?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am not a walking encyclopaedia on crime statistics. The member has referred to what I said about my having my way, and I had better qualify that. If more funds were available, they would be shared and a supplementary division would come to the Police Force. We are in the area of hypothesis now. These matters would undoubtedly be discussed with the Commissioner and his officers, and a decision would be made on their advice.

**Mr. OSWALD:** My questions are related generally to the Police Force and manpower planning. I refer to the move to regionalisation and should like to know how effective regionalisation has been, particularly in savings regarding manpower.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I take it that the member is speaking about suburban area regionalisation.

**Mr. OSWALD:** No, the State.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I have had some discussions with the Commissioner in these areas of regionalisation, more particularly in the city. When we have those sections of the force at Holden Hill, Elizabeth, Port Adelaide, and Darlington, with the headquarters in the city, the varied deployment of the force makes for an easier operation in the specific areas rather than if there was one major area. Each region runs its own area, and this applies also in the country.

I take the point made by the member for Stuart. The purpose of these Budget performance Committees was to enable the experts in the departments to be present to answer questions in an expert way, and I ask the Commissioner whether he would like to comment.

**Mr. Draper:** It is difficult to quantify the value of regionalisation but it is an absolute physical necessity because of the number of people involved and the impossibility of centralisation. Decentralisation is expensive in regard to supervisory manpower but it has advantages, in that people work in the area in which they operate and carry on their activity in that area. There is a

fixation of responsibility at all levels. It also enable a closer relationship of coverage of the 24 hours over a geographical area with the amount of work load in any Police Force.

Before regionalisation, about eight years ago, it was apparent that there was a wastage of manpower concentrated throughout the metropolitan area. Regionalisation has brought about decentralised centralisation by wiping out small stations where the personnel were unproductive and incorporating those people in a decentralised base.

We have been operating on a regionalisation basis, particularly in the metropolitan area, for the past six years. I see nothing in the immediate future that would suggest to me that there was any necessity to change to a significant degree from the present method, but this would depend on the future of energy, the energy crisis, and the mobility of the population.

If mobility is reduced to what it used to be some 20 or 40 years ago, then one would expect to see the reinstitution of localised suburban police stations, which would then be far more economical in their activities than they are at present.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Has there been any material increase in the use of overtime in the department over the past one or two years? Is it a slowly growing trend, has it levelled out, or is it declining? I would be interested in some figures on the increase in overtime over the past 12 months.

**Mr. Draper:** I cannot answer that immediately. My impression, from seeing papers pass through my hands in relation to overtime, is that there has been some increase in the past 12 months.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Could figures be supplied on the number of man-hours overtime worked over the past four years?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I would be interested to know the reason, certainly as it probably is tied up with manpower restraints, why the motor squad was disbanded within the department and to ascertain how many other squads have had to be disbanded because of manpower or similar restraints. How will it affect the efficiency within the department?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Commissioner will answer the question.

**Mr. Draper:** The motor squad and one or two other squads in the Criminal Investigation Branch ceased to operate several years ago as a result of an investigation into C.I.B. activities and the plan for its reorganisation. The deletion of motor squads and other squads from C.I.B. headquarters had nothing to do with manpower restraints and was based solely on efficiency. There are several squads within headquarters and C.I.B., and sections like the motor squad operation come, where necessary, under the overall designation of major crime. While there is a consensus of opinion among certain members of the C.I.B. that we should revert to the squad system, it is not my opinion or the opinion of senior officers responsible for the C.I.B. At present there is no intention to go back to the squad system as it was several years ago, but there is an intention to set up specific squads where the extent of serious crime suggests that they are warranted.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to the fact that there has been an increase in crime over the past 12 months. I tie that in with the Minister's comments and point out that, with the change in method of collecting crime figures, the crime figures for any month of this year cannot be compared with crime figures for last year or the year before. Will the Minister say whose decision it was to change the method of

collecting crime figures and what was the purpose of that decision?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am not familiar with the statistics and will ask the Commissioner to reply.

**Mr. Draper:** I cannot give a detailed answer to that question to indicate the difference between crime statistics calculations at the present time and the past, but it would have been a departmental decision based on our internal requirement and allied to the requirements of uniform crime statistics related to the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** This is my last question and, in fact, the Opposition's last question on this line. Am I to understand that information requested by Parliament as to the crime statistics will be given under the new system and the decision to change the method of reporting those statistics was one made by the Police Department and not by the Chief Secretary or the Government? I ask the Chief Secretary to answer whether the decision to change the method of collecting crime statistics is one in which he, as the responsible officer to Parliament, was involved and, if not, why was he not involved? If he is aware of the change, will he say why the change was made?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** I remind the honourable member for Stuart that it is the responsibility of the Minister to decide whether he desires to answer the question. He can ask members of his staff to answer if he so desires.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is a question that I am not familiar with. I will get an answer for the honourable member.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Will the Minister say whether there is a detectable increase in white collar or sophisticated crime? If there is, what measures is the department taking to counter it?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** That is a professional question, and I will ask the Commissioner to answer.

**Mr. Draper:** I am not sure which category of crime is being referred to. To give a general answer, we are concerned with the complexity of certain classes of crime, particularly in the computer field. In order to provide ourselves with the capacity to handle these crimes, it is envisaged that in the coming months an overseas trip will be sought for a detective to attend a course in America to investigate computer-based crime. As to other types of crime, it is our intention, as a matter of policy, to maintain the numerical strength in the Forensic Science Branch and a strength in technical capacity to handle all those types of complex and scientific crimes that require that sort of treatment.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** The Commissioner alluded to computer crime. Could he supply figures as to the increase in computer crime and other white collar crime in the State?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Commissioner to answer.

**Mr. Draper:** I do not know the extent of computer crime in South Australia, and I doubt that anyone does. In those cases in the last 12 months, for example, I am not aware that any computer-based crime was reported in South Australia.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Was there an increase in the detection of white collar crime in South Australia?

**Mr. Draper:** I would ask for a more definitive description of white collar crime, as I am not sure what we are talking about. The term "white collar" is used in the community, but for me to answer the question I would need to know more positively what the honourable member is referring to.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** I refer to the misappropriation of funds.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Commissioner will answer.

**Mr. Draper:** The misappropriation of funds is a matter not handled by the Police Department; it is handled by the Department of Corporate Affairs. We have police officers attached to that department and in general terms they handle those types of crime.

If we are talking about the misappropriation of funds, the more simplistic matters are handled by the CIB Fraud Squad. However, I am not aware whether there has been any significant increase in the types of crime in that area in the last 12 months.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** In a previous answer, the Forensic Science Branch was referred to. I draw attention to page 260 of the Estimates of Resource Allocation, where it can be seen that for crime detection and investigation 531 is the estimated manpower allocation this year, compared to 515 last year. Why has this increase occurred?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Commissioner to deal with that matter, as he is familiar with it. The figures do not appear to have been isolated.

**Mr. Draper:** The proposed increase involves four people in Support Services, including Technical Services (which is forensic science), and 12 additional people on crime detection and investigation.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Could you expand on that, please? Several years ago, there were great complaints from members of the Forensic Science Branch that they were tremendously overworked. A child care centre with which I am involved in the southern area had its premises broken into several times and had to wait for some time for officers to come and take fingerprints. Those officers complained that they were very much understaffed and that they did not have the necessary staff at their disposal. If we are to detect these offenders, it is imperative that the police get to the scene of a crime as quickly as possible in order to conduct the necessary tests.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I ask the Commissioner to answer that question.

**Mr. Draper:** I question the necessity for speed being an absolute necessity in relation to the attendance of forensic science people at the scenes of this type of crime. Certainly, in some cases, although not in all cases, speed is necessary. However, one must remember that, in staffing any organisation such as the Police Force, one cannot staff on absolute peaks of manpower demand. The staffing must be based on average day-to-day requirements. Therefore, the staff will at times be overworked and at other times it will have comparatively (and I stress "comparatively") little to do.

The number of people attached to the forensic science section is based on an examination of that section's workload, which is carried out periodically. It involves a mathematical assessment based on the frequency of the job type, and this is multiplied by the amount of time that it takes to deal with certain classes of call. This is the best method that we have been able to devise. We are the only Police Force in Australia that does it on this basis, and I suggest that our manpower allocation is far more realistic in relation to anyone else's in Australia.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I refer to the traffic and road safety programme, and to page 270 of the Estimates of Resource Allocation, where there is a breakdown of the programme. Recently, one of the techniques has been to use comparatively short, intensive campaigns on specific issues. Has any assessment been made of the success of this technique and, if it has, what are the results?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will give a general answer. I know from experience in my own district in the South-East that these campaigns have been effective. It is no secret that, for some reason, the South-East has a high accident

rate, and speed, road curves and trees on roadsides are probably involved. There has been a concentrated campaign by special squads in that area, and this has had quite a salutary effect on motorists. As the honourable member is looking for a specific reply, I will refer the matter to the Commissioner.

**Mr. Draper:** It is very difficult to quantify on a numerical or money basis exactly how successful any of these types of campaign are. One can only say that it is the opinion of senior officers in the traffic enforcement area that these campaigns are successful. If one looks at the accident rate (after all, this is the area in which these enforcement programmes are pitched), one sees that, whether it involves fatal accidents or accidents generally, there has been a decrease in both these areas in the past 12 months. Based on that, one would assess that the programme has been successful.

**Dr. BILLARD:** May I suggest then that perhaps one of the best ways of assessing the effectiveness of an intense campaign, for example, on lane hopping or something like that, is to do it two or three times and, if there is a decrease in the number of offenders on successive occasions, obviously the campaign must be having some success. That might be a useful technique that could be employed. However, I take your point that there has been a considerable decrease in the number of accidents, and that is one indicator.

I notice from page 270 of the Estimates of Resource Allocation that quite a substantial increase in manpower is planned in this area. Recognising that these figures are provisional and may contain inaccuracies, a substantial increase is, nevertheless, planned in this area. Does that mean there will be an expansion of this programme in the future, or perhaps some modifications? First, will there be an expansion of this programme and, secondly, is it intended to modify the programme in any way?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Mr. Draper has referred to the success of the programme, which has been acknowledged by the honourable member. There have been far too many deaths on the road. The Government's policy is not to reduce the effectiveness of the manpower, which is increased by a net average of 29. Some aspects of this involve the Minister of Transport. The Police Force provides manpower in this area, and I will ask Mr. Draper to comment.

**Mr. Draper:** The simple answer is that it is intended to continue and expand these enforcement programmes in the next 12 months.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Also in regard to the same road safety traffic programme, one hears from time to time from the media of various devices available overseas in relation to the enforcement of speed limits; for example, cameras which can be mounted in police cars and which can photograph and register the speed of offending cars instantaneously with great accuracy. Doubtless, there are other devices that come to light from time to time. Is there any plan by the department to utilise any new technology for law enforcement in the traffic area?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We have talked about funding this morning, and that is the yardstick in relation to this matter. In regard to the innovations to which the honourable member refers, our officers have been away and I have not yet had a report from them. Perhaps Mr. Draper can say whether any reports are at hand concerning the use of such equipment.

**Mr. Draper:** We monitor overseas development in technology in these areas and, where we think it has an application in South Australia, we obtain and test such equipment under our own conditions. Presently we have

one piece of equipment in mind which is currently before public notice in other Australian States, but generally we are satisfied with the equipment we have and we do not intend, within the next 12 months, to go into the areas of speed detection raised by the honourable member.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I refer to community drug education and the role that the Police Department is playing in it (page 266 of the programme papers). Can the Minister indicate the financial and physical resources that the department intends to put into this programme? I seek information about the actual number of officers to be involved in community drug education. How much money will the department allocate to community drug education? What priority is the department and the Government placing on community drug education, not only in relation to the new Community Drug Education Liaison Committee, which has been established by Cabinet, but also in relation to the normal role of the Police Force in the community in promoting this aspect?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There have been discussions with the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education and myself regarding the drug question. Officers from the various departments have a small committee looking at this matter. I will ask Mr. Draper whether he is in a position to advise the Committee about the final conclusions regarding the Police Force. I speak of a tripartite committee in this area.

**Mr. Draper:** For some years members of my department have been involved in what can be described as drug education. This has mainly taken the form of lectures to interested groups, including schools. I do not have a special staff to do this type of work, which has been the responsibility of selected members of the Drug Squad from time to time to give lectures and exhibit films. I do not intend to expand our activities in this area until there is an indication from the Government committee, which has been referred to, about what our true role should be and whether or not it needs to be expanded. When that is clear I will consider the availability and priority of personnel. We would be contributing in every way that we saw possible.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is a matter between my colleagues and myself.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Can the Minister provide figures concerning the drug problem in regional areas, particularly the Darlington area?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Again, this is a specific question and I will ask Mr. Draper to comment on the situation in the Darlington area.

**Mr. Draper:** I have no figures with which I can compare one district to another. The problem in one district or another would be difficult to calculate or ascertain, and one can only speculate on the basis of offences detected, and this would not necessarily be a true reflection of the extent of the drug problem in any particular district.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Can the Minister provide a set of figures to indicate whether there are significant drug problems in metropolitan areas?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will seek to obtain that information, but bearing in mind that it may have to come from some other departments.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Is the department involved in any sophisticated methods to detect the growing of drugs such as aerial photography and the like?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Police Force has been extremely successful in locating areas where drugs have been grown. I will ask Mr. Draper to comment on that matter, but I know in my own district we had this problem become apparent and, upon investigation, it was found to be there.

**Mr. Draper:** I understand that in other parts of Australia there are investigations in relation to aerial detection of marihuana, but it certainly is not progressing in South Australia. I anticipate that, whatever benefits may in the future flow from research being conducted in other States, we would get the benefit of it in due course.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I refer to page 50 of the Estimates and refer to the "Central Finger Print Bureau, Sydney—South Australian Portion of the cost". Although \$74 000 was allocated last year, less than half the allocation was actually spent. Why was that? Does it mean that co-operation between the Australian States is falling down, or is the programme behind schedule? Why are the costs lower than the amount voted?

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

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Prior to the luncheon adjournment the member for Newland asked a question about the fingerprinting bureau. The answer is that the 1979 appropriation on this line was based on actual expenditure during 1978-79 and allowing for the 15 per cent inflation factor. This was the common basis for the recharge to all State Police Departments for the operating costs of the bureau. During 1979-80, the terms of recharge were reassessed, the inflation provision reduced to 9 per cent, and the department charged \$37 367. This resulted in the saving of \$36 000 that the honourable member queried.

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

Auditor-General's, \$1 712 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr. E. K. Russack

**Members:**  
Dr. B. Billard  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr. G. F. Keneally  
Mr. J. Mathwin  
Mr. T. M. McRae  
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald  
Mr. I. Schmidt

**Witness:**  
The Hon. W. A. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine.

**Departmental Advisers:**  
Mr. M. A. Wildy, Deputy Auditor-General.  
Mr. K. J. Bertram, Chief Administration Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Are there any questions?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Having read the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year 1979-80, I would like to know whether there was any instruction given to the Auditor-General about the way he presented his report to Parliament, because a check of any of the Auditor-General's Reports over any number of years shows that this is the most bland Auditor-General's Report in history. It makes very few criticisms. In fact, being a member of

the Public Accounts Committee, I believe that, if it was left to that committee to find areas for investigation recommended in the Auditor-General's Report, that committee would be out of work. I ask the Minister whether there was an instruction given to the Auditor-General that there ought not be any contentious matter contained in this year's report to Parliament.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I issued no such instruction.

**Mr. OSWALD:** At page 279 of the programme papers under the heading "Functions", one of the functions of the Auditor-General's Department is listed as follows:

To monitor and report on the effectiveness of financial management employed in Government departments.

What percentage of audit office resources will be applied to this function in this financial year?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Deputy Auditor-General to answer that question.

**Mr. Wildy:** The effectiveness role of the Auditor-General's office has not yet been finally determined, but in all audit inspections some consideration is given to questions of effective use of resources and expenditure. If any examination shows a deficiency, or some sort of area in which a further investigation should be made, those investigations are carried out by the audit staff engaged on the departmental audit.

**Mr. OSWALD:** On page 280 of the programme papers I notice that it states that five additional staff will be employed on auditing in this financial year. What will be the salary levels applicable to these positions?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Deputy Auditor-General to answer that question.

**Mr. Wildy:** The salary levels range from about \$24 000 per annum to about \$10 000 per annum. This is a reorganisation of staff resources. The resources have been redirected from administrative activities to field audit activities. We have accumulated a group of five comprising one audit section to be moved into the field in A.D.P. areas.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I am trying to ascertain the breakdown of the five additional staff to give some indication as to how fair dinkum the Auditor-General's Department is in investigating audits within departments. If we are to have the majority of these extra five officers in the \$10 000 or \$11 000 range, they will not be in a position to carry out the type of investigation audit that perhaps somebody in the \$23 000 to \$25 000 range can. I am interested in the AO gradings of these officers. I want to know whether you are appointing people at the top of the range, AO-3 or AO-4, to carry out this work, or officers of relatively lower classification?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am not familiar with those details. I will ask Mr. Wildy to answer that question.

**Mr. Wildy:** There are two officers in the AO level salary range. The redirection of effort has been within the approved manpower budget. Our efforts are within the manpower budget allowance of 101 officers, and redirection of those efforts into field audit work rather than administrative work which was previously needed in the department.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Could the Committee be supplied with those details of actual gradings when they come to hand?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes, we will supply them.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I ask the Minister whether any instruction was given to the Auditor-General as to how he should present his report to Parliament. My reason for asking that question is that this is the most bland report Parliament has had presented to it for many years. The Minister said that he gave no instruction. My question is whether any instruction has been given to the Auditor-General, because the instruction may have been given from somewhere else.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** So far as I am aware, there has been no instruction given to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General has his charter, and as far as I am aware he operates by it.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Could the Minister advise us how many audit staff have been assigned to the Health Commission audit in this financial year compared to the previous three years?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We all know that the Health Commission is a big area. I will seek that information from my officer.

**Mr. Wildy:** During the last two years, at least, there have been 10 officers assigned to health commission work. Those 10 officers are responsible through section heads to a director of audit, who is responsible to the Auditor-General for the control and operation of those audit applications. I am not aware of the numbers involved in previous years but I believe that they were the same.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Is it the Auditor-General's intention this year to continue the audit of all Government hospitals?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am not aware of that, and I will ask Mr. Wildy.

**Mr. Wildy:** The Health Commission Act provides for every hospital to be audited at least once a year, and the auditor is an auditor appointed by the Hospital Board. In most instances, the auditor must also be approved by the Auditor-General. We, as a department, carry out the audit of a number of hospital functions. The question of appointment under the Act is still under consideration, and at this stage we do not know how many hospitals we would be obliged to audit during the current financial year.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Does the Minister think it may be premature to take the audit away from, perhaps, Flinders Medical Centre? Also, I think the Port Augusta Hospital has had its audit taken away. Is that system working well as far as private auditing is concerned?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I would have to inquire of Mr. Wildy.

**Mr. Wildy:** A private firm of auditors was appointed auditor to the Port Augusta Hospital four or five months ago. At this stage we believe the audit facilities will be satisfactory but there has been no opportunity to measure the ability of the auditing firm. As the firm is a registered firm of auditors and as the principals are qualified in accounting practice, I have no doubt the firm's report will be acceptable. The Auditor-General is responsible for the audit of Flinders Medical Centre, and I see no reason why we should not perform equally as well.

**Mr. OSWALD:** On the Public Service Board notice dated 1 October 1980 there were three positions advertised for Chief Internal Auditors for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Department for Community Welfare, and the Department of Services and Supply. Included in the job description is:

The preparation of recommendations which promote operational efficiency.

Will the Auditor-General's staff monitor the work carried out by departmental internal audit staff?

**Mr. Wildy:** The job circular has been promulgated. At this stage, all the jobs have not been decided. The original arrangement was that a committee would examine the applications for the position of the internal audit and, secondly, the results of the internal audit operations. That committee has been established, and there is a member of the Auditor-General's staff on it. There has been a request that the results of internal audit be made available to the Auditor-General but it has not yet become operational.

**Mr. OSWALD:** Will the Auditor-General report to

Parliament if he finds that the internal audit is not being carried out to his satisfaction?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I understand that would be so, but I will check with Mr. Wildy.

**Mr. Wildy:** Yes, if any problems arose where any matter needed reporting or information to be put before Parliament, that would be in the Auditor-General's Report.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions from Committee members? Are there any questions from other members?

**Mr. EVANS:** Is the Minister satisfied that the money allocated and the personnel and equipment available to the Auditor-General are such that Parliament can be reasonably assured that, in any computer crime that is likely to take place because Governments have moved into the computer field, the Auditor-General will have at least a reasonable chance of picking up such crime?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** In discussions with the Auditor-General, no request has been made in this regard and it has always appeared to be a happy and well satisfied department, but the member for Fisher probably has some reason for asking his questions. It is a matter that causes some concern to the community, with the expansion in crime, and I ask Mr. Wildy whether he can comment.

**Mr. Wildy:** The department has maintained its staff within the manpower budget laid down by the Government but, to meet the obligations and responsibility mentioned, we have redirected the staff resources into an A.D.P. group of field auditors and the group has become operative only in the past month. It is our intention that these four officers will undertake a complete review of A.D.P. procedures and operations within various Government departments and statutory authorities and report on the effectiveness of those operations.

**Mr. OSWALD:** In 1975 a committee of inquiry into the Public Service was conducted by Professor Corbett and one recommendation I recall was that he suggested that the Audit Act be amended so as to make Public Service heads more accountable to Parliament for expenditure of funds. Is the Government giving consideration to making departmental heads more accountable for expenditure of public money?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I think it fair to say that all Public Service heads met the Premier and Treasurer soon after he took office, and he spelt out his requirements to them. I think that that message has been well and truly conveyed to them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions? There being no further questions, I declare the examination concluded.

#### Correctional Services, \$12 380 000

##### Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

##### Members:

Dr. B. Billard  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr. G. F. Keneally  
Mr. J. Mathwin  
Mr. T. M. McRae  
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald  
Mr. I. Schmidt

##### Witness:

The Hon. W. A. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine.

##### Departmental Advisers:

Mr. W. A. Stewart, Director of Correctional Services, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. R. McG. Durant, Assistant Director, Probation and Parole, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. M. J. Scandrett-Smith, Assistant Director, Treatment Services, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. B. Cunningham, Manager, Prison Industries, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. K. P. Daly, Senior Administrative Officer, Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. K. J. Bertram, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

**Mr. McRAE:** I ask the Minister whether he is aware of any corruption, graft, misappropriation, or irregular practices—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Members will be aware that a Royal Commission has been appointed to inquire into a number of allegations regarding the South Australian prisons system. Although Standing Orders—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I rise on a point of order. You will be aware of the Standing Order in relation to the reading of documents and I understood from the way you were performing that you were reading from a prepared text that apparently had been prepared long before the member for Playford asked his question this afternoon. I draw that to your attention.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The procedure of this Committee is similar to that of a Select Committee. As far as I am aware there are no rules of procedure pertaining to a Select Committee where a statement cannot be read. I will continue. Although the Standing Orders are silent, the practice of the House is quite clear that matters referred to a Royal Commission may not be discussed. The only latitude allowed in recent years has been for motions which seek to expand the terms of reference of a Royal Commission. This Committee must observe the same rules of the House except where expressly provided by the Sessional Orders, and I rule that matters referring to a Royal Commission are *sub judice* and must not be discussed.

**Mr. McRAE:** I move:

To dissent to the Chairman's ruling that the matter of the Royal Commission into Correctional Services is *sub judice* and move that it be not followed.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I accept the motion, and it is not necessary to be seconded. The mover has indicated that he wishes to speak to the motion but before he does I wish to point out that only the Committee members may vote, although the Minister has the right to speak in the debate if he so desires.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I rise on a point of order. I ask that the motion be read again as we have only heard it once, and I would like the opportunity of hearing it again.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The motion states:

To dissent to the Chairman's ruling that the matter of the Royal Commission into Correctional Services is *sub judice* and move that it be not followed.

The mover was the honourable member for Playford.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I rise on a point of order. I was not here a moment ago, as I am trying to cover both Committees.

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

**Mr. Millhouse:** The point of order is that pursuant to

Sessional Order 15, I suggest, with the utmost respect, members of the House who are not members of the Committee (not only the Minister but other members such as myself) should have an opportunity to take part. Sessional Order 15 states:

Members of the House, not being members of the Committee, may participate in the proceedings of the Committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum . . .

With the greatest respect, I submit that a motion—any motion—comes within the definition of proceedings of the Committee. I therefore suggest that I be allowed (I cannot vote, obviously) to participate in the debate on this motion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I uphold the point of order. Members who are not members of the Committee, according to Sessional Orders, can participate in the debate. I did not mention that previously, but I uphold the point of order.

**Mr. McRAE:** I mention one or two background matters before moving on to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. We are well aware that the Royal Commission was set up late last night, on the very eve of Estimates Committee B sitting to deal with the Correctional Services vote. I have not even had the courtesy extended to me (nor, at the last time I spoke to my Leader, had he had the courtesy extended to him) of seeing any documentation other than newspaper reports to be in any way aware that a Royal Commission had been set up or to be aware of what its terms of reference are. In fact, I would ask whether you, Sir, have any evidence before you, apart from the article in the *Advertiser*, that there is a Royal Commission correctly appointed and indicating what its terms of reference are. Perhaps in due course you will answer.

It is a gross contempt of Parliament that we, the Opposition, should be treated in this way and that we have to rely on a newspaper report which may or may not be accurate, depending on information fed to it by the Government of the day, as to whether a Royal Commission has been effectively set up within the terms of the Royal Commissions Act and as to what its terms of reference are. None of that surprises me, because all of this is in the background of what has happened in the last week or so where we have seen filibustering by Government Ministers, the misleading of Parliament by the Attorney-General and various other sorts of quite improper matters.

Turning to your ruling, Sir, and in no way casting a slur upon you personally but considering your ruling objectively, I say it is a very unfortunate ruling which goes against the whole weight of discretionary rulings made by Speakers and Chairmen in the whole of the English-speaking Parliamentary world. There is considerable evidence to support what I am saying. Ironically, by way of background, these Sessional Orders under which we are working were moved on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Tonkin, Premier and Treasurer. I quote part of what he said from page 683 of *Hansard* of 27 August 1980 as follows:

That policy—

that is, the establishment of Estimates Committees—

I would remind the House, has several principal objectives.

First, and most importantly, the Government is dedicated to improving both the efficiency and the effectiveness of all public expenditures. Secondly, the Government is committed to presenting the Budget papers and the public accounts in such a form as will permit that standard of performance to be properly measured. Thirdly—

this is somewhat ironic—

the Government is determined to restore to Parliament the means by which this institution can more effectively

discharge its constitutional responsibilities.

Now, we have seen an action taken overnight which has frustrated Parliament from effectively carrying out its constitutional responsibility. The Premier continued:

In this respect, it must be said that in recent years the principle of responsible Government has been weakened in this State because Parliament has not been provided with either the comprehensive information or the time needed to acquaint itself fully with Government activities. In these circumstances, Governments of the day have retained the confidence of this House more from a sense of Party loyalty and Party discipline than from an informed Parliamentary judgment of Government performance.

In urging the acceptance of Sessional Orders, the Premier said, on page 685 of *Hansard*:

The Government trusts that all members will participate gainfully and in a spirit of goodwill and political neutrality. I emphasise that those words come somewhat ironically to my mind. The Premier continued:

For one thing is certain—the major advantages to be gained, which stand above Party politics, will never be realised if Party politics are permitted to dominate proceedings.

The Leader of the Opposition also commented on page 686 of *Hansard*:

We welcome the experience as an opportunity and an experiment. We do see some problems in it, but we are not prepared to do other than enter wholeheartedly into the exercise to try to make it work and make it effective.

It is necessary for me to advert to this background because, if it is a case of you, Sir, exercising a discretion (and I submit, with respect, that you have no discretion to exercise), these matters may well be relevant. I ask you, Sir, to take up your copy of Estimates Committee Sessional Orders, and I point out that you simply have no discretion to exercise. I submit that the House laid down these rules as a complete code of conduct. Let me give two examples to verify that. You may recall or may have heard that, on one small technical detail on one occasion, Committee A wanted to extend its sitting time from 12.30 to 1 p.m. to convenience the Master of the Supreme Court. However, the Chairman of that Committee ruled (and I believe rightly so) that that was simply not possible, because Parliament had laid down a complete code of conduct and they could not go beyond it. Nor was it possible, until an agreement was reached between both political Parties, on the occasion of a visit by a member of the Royal family, to suspend a sitting without a special convocation of Parliament.

I am, of course, referring to tonight's sitting of both these Estimates Committees. In terms of statutory interpretation and your interpretation of any document, this is not an unusual situation. It often occurs (and I am sure that the member for Mitcham would support me in this) that inside a document there will be a special code which can conflict with other rules that will otherwise govern the proceedings.

The orders to date have been that this document, having been made by the Parliament, is in fact a code in itself. For instance, you, Sir, cannot even swap the Chairmanship under these Sessional Orders. That is how strict they are. However, even if that is not the case, I then go to what I would consider to be the strongest part of my case, namely, that, if we look at the attitude that has been adopted throughout the English-speaking Parliamentary world of recent years, we will find uniformly in the House of Commons, in this Parliament, in the Australian Senate and in the Canadian Parliament an attitude that Parliament should not be frustrated by governmental actions of this sort in its role as the supreme investigation

body.

I refer you, Sir, to our own House of Assembly, where Mr. Speaker Langley allowed debate on a matter that was *sub judice*. That was a matter in which, I would venture to say, every South Australian had an interest, whatever his view on the matter. I refer to the dismissal of Police Commissioner Salisbury. I now refer (*Hansard*, of 14 February 1978, at page 1493) to the following ruling by Mr. Speaker Langley:

In recent years in the House of Commons the tendency has been for the House to realise that it has tied itself hand and foot with hard and fast rules which prevented discussion on matters *sub judice*, but the press and others outside Parliament are not so handicapped, and an effort is now being made to break the bonds with which Parliament has tied itself.

On September 23, 1970, Mr. Speaker Hurst allowed a motion to be debated which in effect would have added a further term of reference to a Royal Commission's terms of reference, although the previous day he had ruled that matters referring to a Royal Commission could not be debated. *Erskine May* says that more recently the House has resolved to allow reference to be made to matters awaiting or under jurisdiction, subject to the discretion of the Chair. The Speaker then went on to say that he would allow the urgency debate moved by the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) to proceed and, I suggest, rightly so, in the light of all the precedents that were then before him. The then Leader of the Opposition said:

I very much respect the ruling that you, Mr. Speaker, have given today in respect of the *sub judice* rule.

Of course, so he should have, because it was perfectly correct. Turning to the House of Commons, there is specific reference in *Erskine May* to the new discretion on which Mr. Speaker Langley replied on the advice of his officers. In particular, the following observation was made (and I rely on this most strongly):

The fundamental responsibility of Parliament to be the supreme inquest of the nation with the overall responsibility to discuss anything it likes. . .

The distinction that is made (and I do not want to weary everyone with long references to *Erskine May*, Odgers, and authors of other text books) is that in today's circumstances Parliament ought not to be fettered in relation to judicial inquiries of a general kind, as distinct from civil actions, party and party matters, if I can use that expression.

That is the basis on which the differential has been made. It is followed in the House of Commons, in our House, in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and in the Canadian House of Commons. There are references from a number of places which accept that, unless some grave prejudice can be shown, the *sub judice* rule should not be allowed to oversway the primacy of Parliament.

With the greatest respect, this is obviously a blatant attempt by a desperate Government to cover up its misdeeds and to suppress the supremacy of Parliament. The Opposition, and indeed no reasonable member, can tolerate such a thing.

In the Senate of the Australian Parliament, the then President (I think it was Mr. O'Byrne) made similar comments. I do not want to read everything that he said, but it followed what I have said. His ruling was that the modern trend is that, just because a matter is before the courts, it does not follow that every matter is *sub judice* and should not be brought into debate, and that, in any event, the public interest should prevail over the *sub judice* rule. Everything that I can find in all the Parliaments at which I have looked suggests that the modern practice is

said to be quite the contrary to the discretion that you, Sir, have exercised.

I briefly put these two points to you. First, I question that you have any discretion at all. I suggest, with respect, that you are dealing with a code of practice set down by the House of Assembly which neither you nor anyone else can vary or suspend in any other way and, therefore, that I should be able to continue with the question that I tried to ask and, unless it was for some other reason, it should be answered.

Secondly, I put to you, Sir, that, if I am wrong on that, your ruling goes against the spirit of rulings made by the English-speaking world and that there is every reason for every South Australian to feel the greatest fear that the supremacy of Parliament is being thus tampered with, and that Parliament and this Estimates Committee are being treated with such contempt. There is no conceivable way that anything that is raised this afternoon could in any way prejudice the proceedings before the eminent Royal Commissioner if, in fact, he has been properly appointed (again, in the arrogant fashion of this Government, no documentation is available to show that he has been appointed). In any event, you, Sir, in the exercise of your Chairmanship, would have every right to consider each and every question with that in mind, if it got down to that.

I know that you have made this decision in good faith, but I am afraid that it is a decision that may very well, if it is supported, and with good cause, bring this whole Committee, and everyone of us who supports it, into justifiable contempt in the eyes of the public.

I ask Government members who are members of this Committee to examine this matter carefully and to think precisely what their constituents would consider they had done when an action was taken by Executive Government at the very last moment to cast a blanket of silence over an Estimates Committee of this kind, which was set up by the Premier in a justifiable exercise to bring the truth to light.

I suggest that it must bring to the public mind the question: what is there to hide? If the Government has to go to these extreme lengths, then there must be extremely bad things to hide. Why should not Parliament exercise its proper scrutiny?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before calling on other members, I indicate that it will be my policy during this debate to first call on Committee members and then Assembly members who are in the precincts of the Committee area. Normal rules of debate will apply. Each member will have the right to speak once, and the mover has the right of reply. The member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I do not want the call yet.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I seek your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Even though we are set up under the same rules as a Select Committee, are members able to speak to this motion only once? I understood that members could speak on as many occasions as they feel they need to.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I uphold the point of order. In a Select Committee or the Committee as a whole, members are permitted to speak more than once. The member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I do not wish to have the call yet.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I have listened with great interest to the member for Playford. I find it strange that the Opposition is querying the Royal Commission, because it has been on its knees seeking a Royal Commission. The member for Playford says that this matter should be forgone, and he asked me, before moving his motion, a question about corruption under the terms of the Royal Commission that I would not answer. I do not know. In recent days there have been extensive

newspaper articles pointing up problems in Yatala. In the past few months there has been a running spate of allegations about what has gone on at Yatala involving allegations against officers and allegations that prisoners are being illtreated. During my term as Minister we have had the Tognolini affair, which pointed out that something had to be done to prevent things from without. The Government has taken steps, and from the time it came to office it found that things were not there.

I was surprised to hear the member for Playford talking about the Government and its misdeeds—this is something which we have inherited and which has been there for many years. Over the weekend and in recent days there has been running commentary in the daily newspaper, which makes all sorts of statements and which has created much disquiet. It is only natural that the Government felt that something had to be done.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It could have done it tomorrow night.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Government has done it! The honourable member can say that it could be done tomorrow night, but a Royal Commission has been asked for, although I do not want to name those people who have asked. Only yesterday I received a letter addressed to me as Chief Secretary. The letter, which was written on 3 October, states:

Dear Sir,

I advise that members of the Gaols and Prisons Branch of this association are most perturbed about the allegations that have been made in the Coroner's Court this week, in relation to the alleged behaviour of some prison officers.

Our members are most anxious that this matter be settled and, on their behalf, the association demands that a full judicial inquiry be held to examine and investigate these allegations.

Yours faithfully,

R. F. MORLEY, General Secretary

This firm request was made on 3 October. There has been great disquiet in the community, not only in Adelaide but throughout the South-East during the weekend. Many people asked me what was going on and asked, "What are you people doing about it?" That is the sort of situation that the Government faces, and there have been many requests for it. Now someone wants a bloodbath in this Committee. I have received many requests for action about a situation that I have inherited. The Government gets no pleasure from this situation, which is a darned disgrace on the people who have had custody and responsibility of these institutions for the past decade.

This Government has done more in 12 months than was done in the previous decade. We have taken some immediate action. On the first day that I was sworn in (18 September 1979) and met the heads of my departments, the then Director of Correctional Services said, "I want to have a chat to you." On the morning that we were sworn in I had a ring from the A.B.C. and another radio station asking what I was going to do about a fellow called Houston. I wondered who he was. I found out that he was one of Australia's foremost criminals, who had made a getaway—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the Minister not to encroach upon incidents that could be embodied in the Royal Commission inquiry.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** These matters are *sub judice*, and I can assure the member that this document and the Royal Commission were properly and constitutionally considered and constituted.

**Mr. McRAE:** When was that done?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I understand it was done last evening.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** You understand?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I was not present. I uphold the action of the Government, because the Government is concerned—

**Mr. McRAE:** On a point of order. I am most concerned about this situation. I do not think that you, Mr. Chairman, should or can continue with your ruling until you are satisfied that the Royal Commission has been established. Is there any proper documentation that this Committee can look at? Is there any documentation before the Committee?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! As Chairman of this Estimates Committee I am satisfied that the documents necessary for the formation of the Royal Commission were signed by the Governor, Mr. Keith Seaman, at a special meeting of Executive Council after a Cabinet meeting yesterday.

**Mr. Millhouse:** On a point of order, how are you so satisfied?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I am satisfied. I do not feel that the Chairman has to give a reason why he is satisfied, but I am satisfied that the necessary documents are available.

**Mr. Millhouse:** On a further point of order, and with the utmost deference to your exalted position, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that, on matters as serious as this, you should be prepared to disclose to the Committee and others of us who are interested in this matter what is the source of your satisfaction, to use your own word. Were you told something by the Premier? Has there been a special issue of the *Government Gazette* that you have seen? Have you seen the commission which was signed by His Excellency?

**Mr. McRAE:** It is the only evidence.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Yes, it is probably the best evidence. Those are the only ways that you could be satisfied. My suspicion is that you have been simply told by someone else, or you have read it in the paper, and you are going to impose that. With the utmost deference, that is not sufficient. This is a matter of the utmost gravity. You are in a position, Mr. Chairman, where you have to try to hold the position between the defensive action by the Government and legitimate request of members of Opposition Parties to get to the root of things.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I can assure the member that I have seen a copy of the document.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Which document?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The necessary document. I have told the Committee that I am satisfied from the document that I have seen that the Royal Commission has been established.

**Mr. Millhouse:** On a further point of order, Sir, if I may, and I apologise for persisting: could you show the document to anybody else—have you got it with you?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have given my assurance, and I appeal to the Committee to accept that assurance, that I have seen the document and that I am satisfied that a Royal Commission has been set up.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Mr. Chairman, can you tell us—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for Playford was on his feet, and he is a member of the Committee.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Will all honourable members please be seated. I saw the honourable member for Mitcham, who had a point of order, on his feet and I called him.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Can you please set out, then, if you have seen the document, and I presume by that you mean a copy of the Commission itself, precisely the points of reference?

**Mr. McRAE:** Hear, hear! That is my point.

**Mr. Millhouse:** All I know is what I read in the *Advertiser*, with great respect to the people from the News.

There is no doubt now (and I speak now with respect to those from the *Advertiser*, skilled reporters though they may be) that the terms of reference set out on the first page of the *Advertiser* are not the full terms; there must be more. There is no requirement in what is published in this morning's paper for any recommendations to be made. Can you, Mr. Chairman, as you have seen the document (and presumably that must be the Commission and must contain the terms of reference of the Royal Commission), let the Committee know what those terms of reference are? Otherwise, it is impossible for them, or any of us, to know what the bounds may be of questioning.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Yes, I will read the terms of reference from the document, as follows:

HIS EXCELLENCY KEITH DOUGLAS SEAMAN, ESQUIRE, Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, B.A. LL.B., Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John, Governor in and over the State of South Australia and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia:

To

THE HONOURABLE GRESLEY DRUMMOND CLARKSON, Q.C., of 54 Marine Parade, Mosman Park in the State of Western Australia.

Greeting:

WHEREAS there have been allegations of graft, corruption, misappropriation of goods and irregular practices at prisons under the charge, care and direction of the Director of the Department of Correctional Services.

WHEREAS there have been allegations of sexual and non-sexual assaults committed at the said prisons.

WHEREAS there have been allegations relating to the security of the said prisons and the discipline of the prisoners held therein.

WHEREAS there have been allegations relating to the presence of unauthorised material within the said prisons.

I, The Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the State of South Australia DO HEREBY APPOINT YOU to be a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the matters referred to above, including where appropriate the prevalence of the occurrence of such matters, the periods over which they have occurred and the persons responsible for such occurrences, and in the event that any such allegations are found by you to be true, to recommend such legislative or other action as you consider appropriate.

And I give you full power and authority to do all such other acts and things as may be necessary and which may lawfully be done for the due execution of this Commission.

They are the terms of reference.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I take another point of order, Sir. I appreciate your having read out the terms of reference. Obviously, what is in this morning's paper is merely the preamble to the terms of reference. Have you any evidence that this gentleman (whom I had never heard of before this morning and who is in another State and therefore not under this jurisdiction)—

**Mr. MATHWIN:** He's probably never heard of you, either, Robin.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Probably not, and he may be the better for that. Have you any evidence that he is prepared to accept the Commission?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have no other evidence, but I understand that acceptance has been made by the gentleman.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Can you give the source of your understanding on that matter, Sir?

**The CHAIRMAN:** No, other than that I have been given the understanding that that is the fact.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not want to go on unduly,

but I can assure the Committee that the Government is very concerned about the allegations that have been made. The Government, and I stress "the Government", not me as Minister, is concerned about this. If there are things wrong they should be examined, and examined forthwith, and that is why the Government took action. I want to assure the Committee that that action has been duly taken and has been taken because of all of those strong expressions of concern that have been made.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I oppose the motion, which might surprise the member for Stuart. I oppose, particularly, the reasons given by the member for Playford, who said that a Royal Commission was set up to stifle debate. In actual fact, he said, to "gag the Committee", and not give its members any opportunity to ask questions on this line.

**Mr. McRAE:** Do you say that it is a coincidence?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I think those are shocking reasons and that the member for Playford should be ashamed of himself for even thinking along those lines. I will give the reasons why I believe his reasons are shocking. The honourable member was a member of a Government which appointed countless Royal Commissions; some of them were really silly ones, at that. The Government decided to set up a Royal Commission in this case because of the many requests and demands made of it over some time, and particularly at this stage, because of the extreme pressure it was under last week particularly, and also over the weekend from a lot of members of Parliament. I would not be surprised to hear that some members on the other side would readily admit that they had been pressuring the Government for this type of inquiry. There have also been pressures from the public and concentrated criticism over the past few days, particularly with the publication of the *Advertiser*s of the past few days which has been running special features on the Yatala prison. Fresh demands are being made all round. It is equally important in my mind, and I point out to the Committee, that the Government over a period did not want to jump at any particular shadow and did not want to do what was done by the previous Dunstan Government—

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Corcoran Government. What about the *sub judice* motion?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Let us look at the demands we have from the prison staff on 3 October, this month.

**Mr. McRAE:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is any of this relevant to the *sub judice* motion?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member is presenting points in developing his argument that he opposes the motion. At this stage, I do not see anything irrelevant in what the member is saying.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I understand the uncomfortable situation of the member for Elizabeth. He is trying to forage around and bring in red herrings. On 3 October, the prison staff demanded an inquiry. A report states:

Prison staff at the Yatala and Adelaide Gaols have demanded a full judicial inquiry into allegations that prison officers . . .

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I do not wish the member to mention any particular incidents or matters that would relate to the terms of reference that I have read.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I apologise. It was not intentional. The member for Elizabeth was a most powerful man in the Dunstan Government. He was the most powerful law keeper in the State, yet he hardly put his nose inside Yatala in the 10 years his Government was in office.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I was not the Minister.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That was done by his own Government, and that is very interesting. Recently there was a strike at Yatala, when changes were demanded. The

situation caused all kinds of demands by people in the prison and members of Her Majesty's Opposition, even by former Ministers who have now been removed from power. After 10 years of doing nothing they have said that we want a Royal Commission. The member for Elizabeth is a solicitor and barrister but was not able to move Cabinet to have a Royal Commission. Suddenly, because the previous Government has gone out of office, within 12 months the member for Elizabeth says that there has been such a deterioration that we should have a Royal Commission.

I have said that my Government believed that it would be better not to jump at shadows. I remind members of what one would term a ridiculous situation. That was when we had a Royal Commission into the suspension of a high school student. That Commission cost the people many thousands of dollars and it was proclaimed all round, even by the Royal Commissioner, that the Royal Commission was not needed. A press report states:

A South Australian Royal Commission into the suspension of a high school student, Jacquelyn Willcox, was ill-conceived and should never have been held . . .

Members opposite, particularly the member for Playford, have asked why the prison Royal Commission should have come about within the past couple of days. If the honourable member has forgotten, I can give him information to refresh his memory about the farce of his Government's appointing a Royal Commission, the only reason for which was the suspension of a high school teacher.

**Mr. MCRAE:** What has that to do with the *sub judice* rule?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It has a lot to do with the member's argument that the Royal Commission should not have been appointed. I can deal with the member when he is sitting in another place but I cannot deal with him when he is sitting where he is now. The member for Playford knows that it would not be proper to allow this motion to go through. He is a legal man, and I appreciate him as that. If he has been concerned in the past, as he obviously must have been because the matter has built up to a stage where it is boiling over, why has he not brought the matter up in the House of Assembly and tried to alter these rules?

The member for Playford is a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and I served with him on that committee for some years. How many times has he wanted to alter the rules of that committee? I should like to know why this has come about suddenly. For that reason and the others I have given, I oppose the motion.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I say for the benefit of those present today who may have forgotten that this is part of the Parliament of South Australia. I think it behoves me to remind everyone of that, after hearing the lamentable and deplorable defence put by the Minister and the member for Glenelg. Neither member who has spoken on behalf of the Government has dealt with the merits of the motion. They have both dealt belatedly with the reasons why we are having a Royal Commission but no-one has dealt with the nub, which is the timing of that Royal Commission.

I want to pursue the history of the setting up of this Royal Commission, if it is set up, because in the Government's blundering and blustering, there has not been correct notification to this Parliament or this Committee that the Royal Commission has been set up. The correct way we have been to table a copy of the *Government Gazette* or of the minute that set up the Royal Commission. Neither course was followed and we have had only a statement by the Chairman. It is relevant to pursue the way this cynical announcement has been made.

There were calls (and I was one who made such a call) for the appointment of a judicial inquiry into the Department of Correctional Services. The Government belatedly has decided to acquiesce, but not before the Chief Secretary had said, only on 25 September, about 10 days ago, that no judicial prison inquiry would be held. A report states:

The Government would not bow to cries for a judicial inquiry into South Australia's correctional system, the Chief Secretary, Mr. Rodda, said yesterday. He was commenting on a statement in the Assembly on Tuesday by Mr. Duncan (ALP, Elizabeth). Mr. Duncan had said a judicial inquiry was needed into the State's prison system . . . The Government has commissioned a very thorough inquiry into the correctional system and we are certainly not going to bow down to Mr. Duncan's continuing cries for a judicial inquiry, Mr. Rodda said.

About 10 days later, the Government has decided to override its Chief Secretary and Minister in charge of correctional services and to establish a Royal Commission into the department and the serious allegations. The decision was made at a long Cabinet meeting yesterday. After delaying for at least a month, the Government suddenly has decided that there is some urgency about this.

Here, in the middle of a Royal tour, we have Princess Alexandra at Government House as a guest of the Governor and last night the Governor was called out to an Executive Council meeting to urgently set up this Royal Commission. I understand that frantic phone calls went through to Charlie Court, the Premier of Western Australia, with the Premier saying, "Charlie, can you please urgently suggest somebody that we can get to hold a Royal Commission on the prison service here? We have to set the thing up by tomorrow to avoid the situation where our Minister will be challenged in the Estimates Committees in the Parliament". That was the way that the cynical exercise of timing was undertaken.

So, we have the Governor dragged out last night from his Royal entertaining and required to attend an Executive Council meeting so that the whole dirty deed could be undertaken in the appropriate time to save the neck of the Minister before he had to appear before this Committee today. What a cynical performance it has been. What a disgusting example of political expediency—that it is all it has been. My friend, the member for Playford, said that it has been a contemptuous exercise to try and usurp the powers of this Committee to investigate and probe the accounts of this department in the most extensive way possible. I believe that this brief history that I have just related to the Committee is the whole basis of why we are having this debate this afternoon.

It is a sad day for Parliament when we see ignored every legal tradition, every legal principle and every law which one could think of that could apply to these circumstances on the side of the Opposition and which supports the motion moved by the member for Playford. Not one suggestion has been made why this motion should not be supported by Government members or the Chairman of this committee. Yet, no doubt they will wheel their numbers out in the most cynical attempt to uphold this example of political expediency. If one needs any greater evidence of the fact that it was a cynical exercise, one need only look at the way that it was raised this afternoon in this Chamber.

First, the member for Playford got up to ask his question and, without the Minister even raising a point of order, without his having to raise the fact that it may or may not be *sub judice* to ask the question, the chairman jumped in with a prepared document that he read to the Committee stating fully and factually, as it had been prepared for him

by one of his officers, what the Government's position was going to be in this matter. It is a sad day for Parliamentary democracy when this happens. We are not exactly in the situation where this panic had to arise. Cabinet met yesterday and apparently made its decision. Further allegations occurred in the press this morning. The matter was not of such grave urgency that it could not have waited until the normal Executive Council meeting on Thursday of this week when such matters are normally dealt with. I bet that there was no other decision in Cabinet yesterday that required the Governor to come out to a special Executive Council meeting to sign the necessary documents that required public servants to work late last night preparing the necessary charter and documents for the Governor's signature.

Why was it necessary to set the commission up in such haste and with such urgency? No Government member has suggested a reason to us. The decision was made yesterday and, in the normal course of events, it could have waited until the proper normal weekly Executive Council meeting on Thursdays before those documents were signed setting up the Royal Commission. Why were phone calls necessary to Western Australia late yesterday to speak to the Western Australian Premier? Why was it necessary to get the commissioner appointed yesterday? There can be only one answer and one answer alone to questions about the cynical timing of this exercise. The reason was, as the Premier saw it, to save the neck of the Minister sitting before us and confronting the Committee this afternoon.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I agree with some of the comments made by the former speaker. I agree with him that in this issue the timing is most important, because the timing has exposed the real motives behind the actions of the Opposition on this issue. It is the timing that has frustrated members opposite in what they wanted to achieve. In the past we have been led to believe that they are white knights in shining armour and that they seek truth and justice but in fact now we can see quite clearly that all they wanted to do was grandstand politically and, as the former speaker said, get the neck of the Minister. That is the Opposition's motive and reasoning, and that is why it has been frustrated by the timing, which has exposed the motives of members opposite.

The member for Playford made great play of quoting the Premier when he expressed the purpose of these Committees, which was to question Ministers and officers in an atmosphere of political neutrality. I ask whether anyone could believe that the actions planned for this afternoon were politically neutral. It is quite clear that members opposite were seeking to saddle this Government with a situation that was set up during their period in office. As the member for Elizabeth said, they were seeking the neck of the Minister.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I rise on a point of order. I said no such thing, and I have been misrepresented by the honourable member.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order. If the honourable member considers that he has been misrepresented he will have an opportunity for the call again.

**Dr. BILLARD:** If the member for Elizabeth would like me to explain more clearly, his exact words were "save the neck of the Minister". He was charging that our actions were simply to save the neck of the Minister. If he wants to construe it any other way that is up to him. He has suggested that there was no reason why the Government should have appointed the Royal Commission at this time. The fact is that since the statements of the Minister some days ago there has been some new information. In fact, over the last few days and over the weekend, quite a lot of

information, charges and allegations have been made. I will not go into those allegations, as that is the role of the Royal Commission. I believe, therefore, that it is quite fatuous to assume that there was no reason for appointing a Royal Commission at this time. Indeed, if the Royal Commission had not been appointed we would have seen this Committee today turned into a witch-hunt and away from its true purpose, which is to question the Minister and his officers on the funding of departments in an atmosphere of political neutrality. The aim was to get at the Minister. Who are the people hurt in this situation? I believe that the real losers are those workers in the department who are honest professional workers.

I know that some of my constituents are employed in this area and that they are most concerned about the charges that have been made. They would welcome an inquiry, and so do I.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Why didn't you set it up a month ago?

**Dr. BILLARD:** I have just told the honourable member why that could not happen.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Why didn't the Opposition set it up two years ago?

**Dr. BILLARD:** That is a good point.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** But it does not actually fit in with the motion.

**Dr. BILLARD:** The motion has been moved to try to circumvent the due processes that have been put in motion.

**Mr. McRAE:** But a pretty good argument was put about the *sub judice* rule. I have not heard a word about that.

**Dr. BILLARD:** Let me put something specifically.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The motion before the Chairman concerns dissension from the Chairman's ruling on the *sub judice* matter. However, when the mover of the motion spoke, I allowed a certain latitude. The mover specifically raised the point about the time when the Royal Commission was appointed, and I am therefore allowing honourable members to pursue that argument.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I conclude by saying that the previous speaker objected to the fact that the Chairman had prepared himself. I consider that, on the contrary, the fact that the Chairman had prepared himself and sought advice before a situation that would obviously emerge some time this afternoon did arise speaks well of his competence, and I commend the Chairman for that. I hardly think that it could be a point of criticism of the Chairman. I oppose the motion.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** In common with my colleague the member for Playford, I have been trying to work out why, for the life of me or anyone else, members are not really prepared to address themselves to the motion. Opposition members do not mind if Government members go on with all these irrelevancies. However, we simply make the point, for their own good, that this is not helping them in the argument that is now before the Committee.

I believe that the people who should be ashamed of themselves this afternoon are the Premier and the Attorney-General, because they have not briefed their colleagues on this Committee properly. That is why we are not getting an answer to the questions that are being raised. Government members cannot answer the questions that have been put to them because no-one has gone through the Sessional Orders and Standing Orders with them and said, "Look, you are dealing with four Opposition members with, collectively, 37 years of Parliamentary experience, two of whom are solicitors. McRae will ask you this and this, and Duncan will ask you that and that, and you must be ready. These are the

answers that you must get." They have not been given that sort of background information.

So, Opposition members are being fobbed off with irrelevancies about ancient Royal Commissions, the number of Royal Commissions that have been appointed by various Governments and about the findings of Royal Commissions. I am trying to help the Committee. We have heard nothing on this motion from the member for Glenelg. It is a matter not of our embarrassing anyone but of our trying to help the Committee to come to a rational decision on the matter that is before us.

I return the Committee to the points made by my colleague. His substantive argument was that you, Mr. Chairman, are not in a position to be able to rule on this matter because the Sessional Orders do not allow you to rule on it and because there is no nexus between these Sessional Orders and the general orders that govern committees or the Parliament in general. I should have thought that, if the member for Newland had been properly prepared in this matter, he would be willing to pick us up on that point, but he has not done so.

My colleague has suggested that neither you, Sir, nor this Committee is in a position, under the Sessional Orders or the general orders of the House, to be able to adjourn this Committee whenever we want to adjourn it, or to swap the Chairmanship with your colleague, the member for Eyre, on Committee A; that is being denied you.

I suggest that there are real problems in relation to the discipline of members of these Committees. I have looked through this matter fairly carefully. Not being a disorderly member myself, I thought that I would be able to stand here without any taint of suspicion if I gave evidence that I had checked up on this matter. However, one finds that, under the rules that guide the Committee and the House, you, Sir, would be in a position to name someone, but you would then have immediately to adjourn the Committee and report to the whole House. How would that be possible, because the House does not sit until next Tuesday week?

Would it be possible to operate on that Standing Order, and, if it was not, what other sanctions are available to you? The Opposition contends that these Sessional Orders are complete and entire unto themselves. Of course, they should not be. Certain people have made certain omissions in drawing up the Sessional Orders. However, the nexus that needs to apply where the Sessional Orders are silent on certain matters is just not there. That is the substantive point, and the Minister was silent in rebuttal on that matter, as were the members for Glenelg and Newland. That is something with which this Committee must grapple.

My colleague went on to the other matters in relation to the general trend of interpretation and rulings on this matter in the mother of Parliaments, in the Senate and, indeed, in this very Parliament. So, I ask the Committee members to return to the substantive point that was raised, and, if they are not in a position to answer, then perforce our arguments prevail. If Government members vote against the motion, it is an exercise in naked power rather than in logic.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I intend to vote against the motion, and to take up the challenge made by members opposite to bring us back to the motion, which is whether this Committee can, in fact, discuss the situation in the correctional services area today or whether, because the matter is going before a Royal Commission, it is *sub judice*. In doing so, I will quote at length, because I will be referring to Erskine May and rules governing the content of speeches as laid down in the House of Commons. My research is fairly brief, having occupied only the past few

minutes. However, it appears that you, Mr. Chairman, are fully justified in rejecting this proposal. I now refer to the fourth report of the Select Committee on Procedure (members can refer to this in detail later) which, in 1972, said:

Your committee share the view of a committee of 1962-63 that, in relation to all courts exercising a criminal jurisdiction, to courts martial and to tribunals under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921, there is a presumption that matters awaiting or under adjudication may be prejudiced by question and debate in the House.

At page 24 of its report the committee said:

Your committee consider that, with the exception of those civil cases included in the previous paragraph, the presumption in regard to civil cases should be that questions or motions should be allowed unless it clearly appears that there is "a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the cause".

I point out that, with the allegations that have appeared in the *Advertiser* alone over the past few weeks, there is no doubt that there will be a serious prejudice to various people in the correctional services area if a debate, which would be a bloodletting debate on the part of the Opposition, was allowed to proceed today. The report continues:

Your committee recommend that matters awaiting or under adjudication in all civil courts, except defamation proceedings, may be referred to in questions, motions or debates unless it appears to the Chair that there is a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the proceedings.

Once again, that point keeps coming home. I refer to Erskine May, 19th Edition, page 427 where, under the heading "Matters pending judicial decision", the following statement is made:

Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate, subject to the right of the House to legislate on any matter; see page 368.

Following the First Report of the Select Committee on Procedure, 1962-63, the House passed a resolution (23 July 1963) which set out the rule in detail (*n*). This resolution bars references in debate (as well as in motions and questions) to matters awaiting or under adjudication in all courts . . .

The resolution of 23 July 1963 also applies to the civil courts, and in general it bars reference to matters awaiting or under adjudication in a civil court from the time that the case has been set down for trial or otherwise brought before the court, as for example by notice of motion for an injunction (*p*); such matters may be referred to before such date unless it appears to the Chair that there is a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the trial of the case;

Once again the same principle applies. The report continues:

. . . and that in exercising its discretion the Chair should not allow reference to such matters if it appears that there is a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the proceedings; and should have regard to the considerations set out in paragraphs . . .

There is no doubt that this exercise, if allowed to develop in this Committee today, will result in allegations and counter-allegations from both sides of the Committee, and will do no good whatever in solving the problem. There is a strong desire and a need to have the Department of Correctional Services investigated. I doubt that there is a member of this Committee who would disagree with the fact that there is a need for urgent investigation of the whole department.

In the interests of the public, this inquiry should be allowed to proceed, and it should be allowed to proceed under the auspices of a Royal Commission, as suggested by the Government. That is a right and proper process.

This Committee is not the place for members to be throwing around allegations which we cannot substantiate. Such allegations require evidence to be put before the Royal Commissioner so that conclusions can be drawn. Parliament can do no good whatever in regard to the people who will come under the influence of the Department of Correctional Services in the future if it does not let this inquiry by a Royal Commission get under way, rather than Parliamentarians and members of this Committee sounding off for political gain. It is almost an area that should be apolitical—the non-political and non-Party area.

**Mr. McRAE:** Heavens above!

**Mr. OSWALD:** If members opposite have any consideration at all for the humanity side of it, they will consider the prisoners concerned; that is whom we are talking about. The department has to be sorted out, and there is no doubt about that. The department involves the need for much research and correction to be undertaken. More leadership needs to be re-injected into all levels and, until that leadership is developed and recognised, we will not have an effective correctional services system. We will not do any good whatever venting our spleens from one side of the Committee to the other. The proper course is a Royal Commission, and that is where the matter should rest—not here in a bloodletting political exercise. There is no joy to the future inmates from that. I oppose the motion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Mitcham.

**Mr. Millhouse:** At last!

**The CHAIRMAN:** I pointed out the procedure to the member.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Yes, and I have had lots of exercise each time hoping that I would at last get on. May I say this: only a very stupid person would accept the protestations of the Liberal members of the Committee that the timing of this appointment of a Royal Commission had nothing to do with the inquiry before this Committee today. Of course it had something to do with it, and it was well known yesterday that Cabinet was considering the matter and wondering how on earth it could save poor old Allan Rodda from what he himself described as a blood bath.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the member to refer to the Minister as "the Minister".

**Mr. Millhouse:** Certainly, I will refer to him like that. Let me say that if it were not for the fact that the Liberals, with the numbers on this Committee, were going to win the vote, and if there was going to be any questioning of the Chief Secretary, I had proposed to squeeze information out of him until the pips squeaked. Let there be no mistake about that. I have no doubt that that was the intention of members of the Labor Party, who are on the Committee, and others, and that is the very reason why a Royal Commission was hastily constituted last night, as we all know. Any members who say anything else are dishonest. They know as well as I know that it is not coincidental that a Royal Commission was set up last night. I have little doubt that the sequence of events set out by the member for Elizabeth was pretty correct—that is why it all happened last night. It had to be done before today. Now there are only the points raised by the member for Playford—

**Mr. MATHWIN:** You solicitors stick closely together.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Neither of us is a solicitor.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Tell us the difference.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It's \$200 a day!

**Mr. Millhouse:** I can assure the member that it is often far more than that. I congratulate the member for Playford on his speech, although I am not sure there was much in his argument about the Sessional Orders. In my view this

Committee is a subordinate body, and the rules that govern a Committee of the whole House or a Select Committee, as referred to by the member, govern it and do preclude any suggestion that these rules are a code. I do not think we can get around it in that way, but the substantive point is this: bearing in mind the political expediency of the Government in setting up a Royal Commission last night, the question is whether or not the *sub judice* rule ought to be applied in this Committee. The rationale behind the *sub judice* rule is that something that may be said in Parliament may influence later on a court of law, or a Royal Commission in this case. I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, and of course I know that you will not accept it, that it is extremely unlikely that anything that is said here would influence the subsequent deliberations of the Royal Commission. It is extremely unlikely. You must balance that extreme unlikelihood against the fact that Parliament should be able to question a Minister on matters that are within his jurisdiction, and this is the first opportunity we have ever had in this Parliament to question a Minister closely.

We have this Minister with this department with more to answer for than any other Minister and any other department, yet the House of Assembly is being denied that right. Nothing is ever all black or all white: one must balance, and you must balance the two. I suggest that if you did balance impartially the two, you would rule that the *sub judice* rule did not apply to questioning of the Minister which should go on in this Committee. That is the crux of it, and in that I support entirely the member for Playford in what he said. If I were a member of the Committee I would certainly vote for the motion, but I cannot do that.

There are only one or two points that I want to add. There has been much talk about when it was decided to establish a Royal Commission and why we have to have it now, and all that sort of thing. Unfortunately, I cannot do as well as the member for Elizabeth regarding the statement 10 days ago that there would be no inquiry, but I do have a letter from the Premier to me, because I have had a good deal of correspondence with him since the Tognolini escape, and I must say that most of it has been complaining about the ineptitude of the Chief Secretary. I received a letter from the Premier on 8 August in which he said the following:

I refer to your letter of 2 August and advise I am not aware there has been any suggestion of a Royal Commission into the correctional institutions of South Australia.

Admittedly, that is a couple of months ago, but up until that time the Premier had set his face explicitly against a Royal Commission. We had an announcement by the Chief Secretary that there was to be an inquiry into correctional services. I do not think it has ever got off the ground and I do not think we ever knew any more about it. What will happen now is that it will go the way of all flesh, completely forgotten, swallowed up in the Royal Commission. There is no doubt, and I only mention these things to emphasise what Dr. Billard said (and he was honest enough at the beginning of his speech to admit that it is the timing that everybody is complaining about), that this Royal Commission has been set up simply to block this Committee today. Let me remind members of the Labor Party that they are not blameless in this matter.

I can remember that in 1970 we had a moratorium demonstration. It happened on a Friday afternoon and just as it was happening out here on the steps the then Premier, Mr. Dunstan, flew away to Sydney. But before Parliament got together on the Tuesday he had got together a Royal Commission so that there could not be one question asked in Parliament that day about the

moratorium demonstration, so the Labor Party is no stranger to tricks of this nature. Nor have I noticed any difference in the arrogance of one Government or the other. One of the Labor members complained about the arrogance of Government members. To me, they are both completely arrogant when it suits them, and I suppose I am in a better position than most members to understand that.

On this motion, there is no doubt that those who will vote in favour of the motion, although they will lose, are dead right: there should be an inquiry but the Government should not have set up an inquiry last night to save the neck of the Chief Secretary to answer for his negligence, and the negligence he inherited from the Labor Party of the past seven or eight years, because both Parties must share responsibility for the appalling situation that has arisen out at Yatala, and everywhere else; there is no doubt about that. That is all I can say, or I think I need say, but this is a cynical exercise in political expediency. It is done at the cost of the taxpayer. It is bad enough having a Royal Commission at all, in my view, because all one needs is action out in the prisons, not more words. The timing compounds that hypocrisy and political expediency.

**Mr. Evans:** I would speak against the motion even though I do not have the right to vote. I accept the Sessional Orders. I accept the point the member for Mitcham made in relation to Standing Orders. If the argument used by the A.L.P. was correct and our Standing Orders do not operate and this Committee is not subordinate to the Parliament, we would have some difficulty with our libel and slander laws where members would place themselves in a difficult position in this Committee in anything they may say. The other thing is that the member for Elizabeth said that this committee was part of Parliament, he argued that in this debate, and he was quite definite that it was part of Parliament, so he was accepting the point that the Standing Orders of the Parliament would be part of the scene.

The timing is important. There is no doubt that, because the Royal Commission was set up last evening, this Committee (and I believe quite correctly) is denied the opportunity of raising matters that relate to that Royal Commission. The member for Mitcham was quite correct in saying that the A.L.P. is not exempt from any criticism because it set up this practice and set the precedent, I think on more than one occasion, in fact, of setting up Royal Commissions to save debate in the Parliament, and this Committee is part of Parliament.

The member for Mitcham and I were fortunate to be members of this Parliament when we were in Government and there is no doubt that his political cunning would be such that he would think of anything that would make it easier for him to act as a Minister at any time. If we did have opening questions on this matter this afternoon it would only be a farce; we know that. Anybody suggesting that before we got here today you, Mr. Chairman (as was suggested by the A.L.P.), should not have certain information in your hands would be a fool. The member for Elizabeth knows that. He knows that, in every case where there is some statement in the press before we come to meet as a Parliament or a Committee, everybody is forewarned, and quite correctly.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** We were not forewarned today.

**Mr. Evans:** The statement in the press this morning said that the action of the Government would deny this Committee the opportunity to ask questions this afternoon. That was in the press, and to say that members were not forewarned is not correct because it was from his own side of politics that the statements were being made.

So, quite obviously, they knew the likelihood of the events this afternoon. It is obvious from the research that members opposite have done that they have searched for every argument to see that their arguments today were prepared if you, Mr. Chairman, said that the matter was *sub judice*.

We all know that that was the case, and accept that. What if the other thing happened? What if we did what the member for Mitcham suggested and debated this matter this afternoon? He said that that would save the taxpayers' money, but would the A.L.P., and the member for Mitcham, be satisfied in questioning this Committee that that was sufficient without a Royal Commission being held? We know that that is not the case. They wanted two bites at this cake; that is what they were after.

I do not accept the argument of the member for Mitcham that it would not have an effect on any inquiry in the future conducted by a Royal Commission. I believe it would. I believe it is a matter we should leave well alone, because each and everyone of us in this Chamber asking questions of the Minister, and the Minister himself, has a political interest in the subject. If it is going to be heard by an independent person, let it be heard by an independent person and let us not touch on it.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** What you are saying is that the Royal Commission was brought on to stop this debate.

**Mr. Evans:** I will answer that interjection. I am not a member of Cabinet. I am not a member of the Executive. We can draw our own conclusions as individuals and, if the timing is such that the Government decided that a Royal Commission would be the best way of handling the matter to protect those involved, it is not just talking about the Minister—there are other people involved, many other people, and it affects their families and their lives. They are the people involved, and to have a Committee here comprised of people who are politically oriented asking questions would affect those people in their lifestyles, in all probability, and particularly in their work. There is no doubt that that would occur with no protection whatever and to suggest we should allow that to happen in lieu of a Royal Commission once the Government accepted it would be improper.

I pick up the point raised by the A.L.P. and the member for Mitcham. They asked for a Royal Commission earlier. In one case the Minister said he would not appoint a Royal Commission. That was 10 days ago. What about what has been in the papers in the past 10 days? The circumstances known to the Minister at that point have changed. The press decided to keep the matter running, and running they did, and the A.L.P. was helping, so the Minister, through the Government, decided to set up a Royal Commission. That does not mean that the Executive or Cabinet overrode the Minister. The Minister may have reported to Cabinet that a Royal Commission was necessary, so to make the allegation that the A.L.P. made was unfair and sheer guesswork.

The member for Elizabeth said, first, that you do not have any discretion at all in this matter, Mr. Chairman. I believe that you do. I believe that this is a matter that is *sub judice* and that you do have discretion. I reject the first point because the member for Elizabeth was tying the matter to our Sessional Orders saying that they were all-encompassing to this Committee and that Standing Orders had nothing to do with the operations of this Committee. I do not believe that that is the case, and neither does the member for Mitcham. At least the member for Mitcham and I agree on that point. The second point raised was that your ruling, Mr. Chairman, goes against rulings throughout the English-speaking world. Your ruling, Mr. Chairman, would go against those selective areas that the

member for Playford referred to as happening throughout some of the English-speaking world, but, just as the honourable member has used those examples, one can find many other examples where your ruling would be supported on many more occasions than the member for Playford could raise on this particular issue. As far as we are concerned, a Royal Commission has been established and is operating. Why the Government acted has nothing to do with this Committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member for Playford. If the honourable member speaks, he closes the debate.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I do not know that that is necessarily the case, Mr. Chairman. You ruled earlier that members could speak as often as they wished, and that would apply to the member for Playford.

**The CHAIRMAN:** In the interests of the Committee, I did say that, to bring the debate to a conclusion, but, if some other member wished to speak, I would have to give him the call.

**Mr. McRAE:** No-one accepts the attempt by the member for Morphett to deal with my argument on the exercise of your discretion. The member for Fisher says that I have been too selective, and I will quote from Odgers (page 251), who states:

Former President O'Byrne's private ruling reflected the modern trend (1) that just because a matter is before a court it does not follow that every aspect of the matter is *sub judice* and should not be brought forward in debate, and (2) that in any event the public interest may prevail over the *sub judice* doctrine. The Senate has no Standing Order on the matter and whether a matter is allowed to be discussed is in the discretion of the Chair, whose decision of course is subject to the will of the Senate. In interpreting the *sub judice* doctrine, the Chair is likely to keep in mind what is the greater good and, in the ultimate, it is submitted that the greater good must be the public interest.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (4)—Messrs. Duncan, Hopgood, Keneally, and McRae.

Noes (4)—Messrs. Billard, Mathwin, Oswald, and Schmidt.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There are 4 Ayes and 4 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**Mr. McRAE:** In those circumstances, I now move:

That this Committee condemns the Chief Secretary and his Government for their contempt of the Committee.

All the matters behind the motion have been canvassed. We all know that the Government, throughout the Estimates Committees, quite contrary to what the Premier said when introducing the concept, has done everything it can to frustrate the gaining of access to information. The Deputy Premier spent hours filibustering to prevent Opposition members from getting information that they wanted. The Attorney-General, in Estimates Committee A when I was a member, misled the Parliament in the morning session concerning construction of court buildings and remand centres.

He was caught in an awkward predicament when his colleague the Minister of Public Works at lunchtime issued a press release that contradicted what the Attorney had said. Now we have this disgraceful incident which, as the member for Mitcham has said, only a fool could deny has been a decision made under cover of darkness—

**Dr. BILLARD:** He did not say that.

**Mr. McRAE:** The member for Mitcham said that only a fool could deny that this disgraceful incident had been used to gag this Committee. That reminds me of the lead-

up to the election of this fraudulent Government, when some supporters in this law and order area (I know you would not support this sort of technique, Mr. Chairman) put out disgraceful advertisements, with hooded bandits and hooligans. People were paying for these advertisements under cover of darkness.

Adrian Brien and others were involved. The Government has been a disgrace on employment and law and order. This morning we heard the shameful situation regarding police officers. Now we have correctional services. We cannot get to all of it, because the gag has been effectively placed on us. The Government has treated the Committee with contempt and we will not get any information from the Committee.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I oppose the motion.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** You will probably talk about *sub judice* this time.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That is great, coming from the once removed solicitor. The Minister of Education was so obliging that he enabled a member of the Committee to bring forward two motions about the immediate supply of material given to the Committee. If that is trying to frustrate a Committee, I am sorry for the member for Playford. On the Committees of which I have been a member, the Ministers have been co-operative.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Not specifically though, that is the problem.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** They have been helping as much as possible. If they have been asked for information, they have given it immediately or as soon as possible. The member for Playford well knows that questions asked in this place are sometimes impossible to answer immediately. This morning the Chairman read out some of the answers to the questions asked last week. The member for Playford mentioned, and it has become an obsession with him, some of the advertisements by members of the community before the last election.

I can understand the honourable member's comments, because the previous Government was turfed out of office after 10 long years in Government. I can understand his being sore about it. But he must not keep on about it time and time again. In fact, it was the action of the public. He indicated to the Committee that there really was not too much concern in the areas of correctional services. The honourable member knows far better than that, and he knows that there is great concern about it. There was great concern in the area of juvenile crime. The honourable member is well aware of that situation. That has changed since this Government came into office. I am referring to the treatment of young people, which will change even more dramatically in the future.

What does the honourable member expect to have happened within a period of 12 months, when his Government did practically nothing in the area of correctional services? Its record was disgraceful. The previous Attorney-General, the man who was the boss of this State, the king-maker, himself admitted that he never went into Yatala when he was Attorney-General. Yet, I believe that he is trying to see whether he can get a comfortable cell to eliminate travelling time, as he is there so often. It is not good enough. The honourable member for Playford's remarks are deplorable. I suggest that he forget about the situation and let us get on with the business that we are here for—debating the lines.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I support the motion. On two occasions this afternoon we have had to listen to the member for Glenelg who, along with the Minister, has been well known over the years for making irrelevant contributions to Parliamentary debates—sometimes amus-

ing, always irrelevant—and never more so than today. We have just heard the member for Glenelg defend the actions of his Party prior to the election by saying that members of the Opposition ought not to carry grudges about the sort of advertising that the Government took part in prior to the election. Government members believe that, because we were beaten, we ought to be good fellows. The Liberal Party is allowed to get down into the gutter in its advertising and to use quite slanderous allegations about our side of politics, yet we are not supposed to respond. I have news for the member for Glenelg. Every time the Opportunity presents itself, the members of his Party will be reminded of the depth that they are prepared to sink. The Federal Government is about to unleash its dirty tricks campaign right now after reading the opinion polls. I am prepared to make that forecast.

The motion is a good motion and it quite clearly states how the Minister has treated this Parliament. He has treated it with contempt. The member for Mitcham said that only a fool would believe that the timing of the announcement of the Royal Commission had nothing to do with today's sittings. Four people on the Government benches have argued that the timing had nothing to do with the Committee hearing. That quite clearly proves what the member for Mitcham said—that only a fool would believe that the timing had nothing to do with the Committee hearing.

Parliament should not be treated with contempt. There is no argument that a judicial inquiry should not be set up to look at correctional services in South Australia. It is a fact that there has been considerable disquiet expressed about this department during the last few months. It might very well be argued that things within Correctional Services might not have been as they ought to have been for some time, but all these problems have surfaced and they ought to be looked at now. But, for the Government to make a decision in the way that the honourable member has quite clearly pointed out to the Committee is a contempt of Parliamentary processes. We, as members of Parliament on the Government side and the Opposition side, ought to be concerned about that, because the decision to have a Royal Commission could have been announced tonight—after today's proceedings had been completed. That would have allowed the South Australian Parliament to question the Minister and his department as to their stewardship since he has become Minister. Surely the Parliament is allowed that right. To deny Parliament that right is a contempt of Parliament. I do not think that the Government members on this Committee are in a position to argue otherwise. There is no question that could be asked at this Committee hearing that would prejudice a decision brought down by a Royal Commission. There may well be some answers that might influence a Royal Commission's decision one way or the other and, if that is the case, the Minister or his departmental advisers could claim *sub judice*, or the Chairman could point out the complications that the *sub judice* ruling might bring about.

However, there is no question that could be asked at this Committee hearing that would influence a judicial inquiry, unless Government members themselves had questions in mind to ask the Minister and his departmental advisers. I can assure the Committee that the questions we were about to ask would not have influenced the judicial inquiry, although perhaps some of the answers that the Minister would be required to give might have influenced such an inquiry. In that case he could have claimed *sub judice*. It is quite clear that the Government has announced a Royal Commission to inhibit the ability of Parliament to ask questions of a Minister of the Crown.

The member for Fisher acknowledged that, and he also acknowledged that there was some value in doing that. He then reflected on the Committee to the extent that he said that the questions we were about to ask could have had some repercussions on families of officers who worked for the South Australian Government. The member for Morphett argued the same case.

That argument can be made in every hearing of the Estimates Committees. It could be argued about every Minister appearing before the Committee. It could be argued about every departmental officer that every Minister brings before the Committees. What is so special about this Committee that this argument applies today and did not apply last week and, I suspect, will not apply on Wednesday and Thursday of this week? It is a completely selective argument that the Government wishes to use, and I do not believe that it has any foundation at all and only reflects on the Government, on the Committee and on the Parliament. This Parliament is being held in contempt. The Committee ought to express its concern about that. We, as an Opposition, are concerned. I trust that some members on the Government benches will share that concern. I fear that they will not, because this is another blatant political exercise, and they will use their numbers to the detriment of the Parliamentary system and to the detriment of an innovation that they were so proud to claim as one of their achievements in the first 12 months in office. The Government has done its darndest to ensure that that achievement will not work. That is certainly a strange way in which to act.

**Dr. BILLARD:** I should have thought that, if the member for Stuart was so concerned to see that these Committees were working, the Opposition would sit down and get on with this Committee's work, instead of moving stupid motions all afternoon, as it has done. If the Opposition is serious about wanting to ask questions before this Committee, let them get on and ask those questions.

**Mr. MCRAE:** We cannot; we have been gagged.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Dr. BILLARD:** The member for Stuart suggested that he had a whole stack of questions that were not related to the subject of the Royal Commission, and I suggest that nothing is barring him from asking those questions. Instead, we have sat here for two hours debating motions that Opposition members know they will not win. They are just wasting the Committee's time. I suppose that I should be pleased, in one sense, that Opposition members have done this, because they have proved the point that I made earlier in the debate, namely, that they do not want to discuss the real issues before the Committee. They have sought to make political capital out of what they thought would be a nice juicy scandal and out of the issues that arose during the term of office of the former Labor Government.

Perhaps members opposite are embarrassed to ask questions about what the Government has done in this area in the past year, as they may find that the Government has been taking action in this area. Indeed, if they look at page 57 of the Auditor-General's Report, members opposite will see that there have been increases in staff over and above the levels that obtained during the term of office of the former Labor Government. That report contains a table which indicates that there was an average daily increase of 46 prisoners between 1977-78 and 1978-79, and that, during that time, the staff was increased by 11 persons. In the year just past, there was an increase of 45 prisoners and an increase of 25 staff. Perhaps members opposite are embarrassed to focus on those issues or to question the Minister on the decisions that

have been taken about security measures.

**Mr. McRAE:** Have they caught Tognolini yet?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Dr. BILLARD:** It is quite apparent that they are not interested in pursuing the real purpose of this Committee. They are simply interested in trying to scrape up scandals and issues that might score them very cheap political points, when they were the ones who were responsible for the situation that has been set up.

**Mr. Evans:** I agree with the member for Stuart that this whole matter is a blatant political exercise. The motion was moved to get publicity and to make allegations against the Minister and the Government. Members know that the present Minister has been in office for only 12 months and that many of the problems occurring in the area over which the Minister has responsibility have been occurring for more than 12 months. We also know that, regardless of what happened this afternoon, an attempt would be made by the Australian Labor Party to pin all this on the Minister. Labor members, perhaps understandably, would not have wanted to accept any guilt for what had happened in the past. However, the Government and the A.L.P. know what the position is.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Has the Parliament been treated with contempt?

**Mr. Evans:** I do not believe so; nor does the motion suggest that, as it refers to "this Committee" and makes no reference to the Parliament. The member for Playford said that the Committee was being treated with contempt, and all the way through this matter the member for Stuart has referred to the Committee.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Committee is the Parliament.

**Mr. Evans:** Earlier, the member said that the Committee was separate from the Parliament. The Minister is present this afternoon, and he has not treated this Committee with any contempt. Indeed, he is sitting in the Chamber and will, if you, Sir, allow him to do so, answer any questions which are asked of him and which will not place the Royal Commission in jeopardy. You, Sir, have acted within the rules of the Committee, and the Committee has supported your ruling.

**Mr. McRAE:** No, it did not; it divided equally.

**Mr. Evans:** The Committee agreed with the Chairman's ruling, as the motion moved by the member for Playford was negative. The Committee agreed that the matter was *sub judice*. The Minister is now here to answer any questions that you, Sir, allow, so there is no contempt on his part.

The Government has set up a Royal Commission, as it has power to do it if it believes that the matters involved are sufficiently serious. It chose last night to appoint the Royal Commission, and that action is not in contempt of this Committee. Indeed, the Government acted properly and within its powers, and it is improper for Labor members to vote in favour of this motion, which is a blatant political exercise.

**Mr. McRAE:** Like the member for Stuart, I was absolutely amazed by the suggestion of one member that we should lie down and cop it because we were beaten, and that we should say nothing about the scurrilous activities of the Liberal Party leading up to the last election. I shall do everything in my power to keep on and on raising these matters in the correct form, and in seeing that people who deserve to be exposed are exposed. I was astounded to hear the member for Newland say that, if we did not have the numbers, we should not waste the Committee's time debating the matter. That illustrates the honourable member's attitude towards Parliamentary democracy.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** I oppose the motion, because this is a

deliberate attempt to delay the Committee's debate. I agree with the member for Stuart, who said that there was no argument that the Royal Commission should be set up. I am pleased to see that the member for Stuart supports morally a Royal Commission being set up. I hope that the honourable member and his colleagues do not see this Committee as being a power higher than a Royal Commission and that they are not setting themselves up as an arbitrary authority to decide what matters should and should not be brought out into the open. A Royal Commission would be in a far better position than this Committee to draw out that sort of information.

It is obvious that we have just concluded the football grand final in South Australia, because members opposite have been kicking a political football around to try to make as much political mileage as they could out of this matter. Of course, we have heard plenty of this before. I was surprised when the member for Playford moved the motion.

He referred to unemployment and, with his paranoia about the lead-up to the last election and the advertising campaign, and with his paranoia about certain personalities (he has been obsessed with this ever since he has been in Parliament) he uses motions—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** On a point of order, I am terribly sorry to interrupt the flow of the member's argument, if it was an argument, but if I do not raise this matter now I am sure you will rule me out of order later. To suggest that the member for Playford was paranoid must surely be unparliamentary language. The member did that on two occasions, and I ask that the member withdraw that term.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I cannot uphold the point of order. That word has been used on many occasions.

**Mr. SCHMIDT:** Not once did the member for Playford refer to his motion, yet in his previous motion he condemned members who were debating this measure for not sticking to the point. Again, we have a blatant example of his accepting things when it suits him, but when matters do not suit him it is against the rules. The member for Playford then spent much time talking about how this committee system has been flaunted and misused, yet he was not prepared to refer to the fact that the member for Florey came here with a cup of coffee, wasted time and was sent out of the Chamber, and to all those little innuendos and other tactics that the Opposition has used throughout the Committee to demonstrate that wherever possible it will disrupt this Committee system and say at some future time that it does not work. We should conclude this debate and get on with the business. If members opposite are sincere in what they are trying to do, they would desist from supporting such motions.

**Mr. McRAE:** I draw attention to the fact that the Minister has not been given an opportunity to speak, and that may be a denial of natural justice.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister has the right and he has not indicated that he wanted to speak.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (4)—Messrs. Duncan, Hopgood, Keneally, and McRae.

Noes (4)—Messrs. Billard, Mathwin, Oswald, and Schmidt.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Can the Minister explain why there is a difference in the figures in the Auditor-General's Report for items such as expenditure on salaries for "Yatala Labour Prison" in comparison with the actual

payments shown in the Estimates? Which figures are correct, and why is there a difference? I refer to page 56 of the Auditor-General's Report under the heading "Yatala Labour Prison" and the amount of \$3 031 000, and to page 52 of the Estimates under the heading "Labour Prison" where actual payments in 1979-80 amount to \$3 154 193.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Director, who is familiar with that situation, to indicate the position to the Committee.

**Mr. Stewart:** I cannot give an answer without some investigation. I will have to consult the financial people who prepared the Estimates. We received our copy of the Auditor-General's Report after the Estimates were prepared. I will obtain the answer as quickly as I can.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** From my reckoning most of the answers seem to be in conflict, and I suggest we should get information about all of the figures in relation to salaries and wages, comparing those set out in the Estimates with those set out in the Auditor-General's Report.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will get that information for the member.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Government recently announced, and it is referred to in the Loan Estimates, through the Chief Secretary that certain works are to be undertaken at Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol in relation to new security, so-called integrated security systems. I was interested in the Chief Secretary's announcement about that, particularly in the way that it gave—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** These matters relate to matters to be dealt with by the Royal Commission. Are there any further questions?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Can you point out to me which term of reference my question allegedly transgresses?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** The terms of reference state:

WHEREAS there have been allegations relating to the security of the said prison and the discipline of the prisoners held therein.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not referring to any allegations whatever in relation to the security of the prison. I am referring to moneys set down in the Loan Estimates of this State for expenditure in the forthcoming year. I am not referring to anything that has gone on in the past. How you can rule me out of order for being in transgression of a term of reference, I simply do not know.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Would the honourable member care to rephrase his question? He must ask the question again, but I remind the honourable member that it involves security within the prison and the discipline of the prisoners held therein.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** But, Sir, the term of reference involves allegations relating to the security of the prison and the discipline of the prisoners. I am not making any allegations, or referring to any allegations, relating to the security in the prisons. What I am referring to is the announcement by the Government that it intends to install 90 cameras and various other pieces of security equipment at Yatala and Adelaide Prisons in the future. They are not allegations about the existing situation. These are matters of fact referring to announcements that have been made by the Government. The question I want to ask relating to that matter, if you permit me to, is whether the Chief Secretary in fact made the announcement in relation to new equipment, including all of the fine details to which I will not particularly refer, about where that equipment is going to be installed, where the T.V. surveillance system is, which areas they will cover, etc. I

ask whether the Chief Secretary made such an announcement.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** At Adelaide Gaol there will be \$220 000 of Loan moneys spent on an integrated security system, and at Yatala Gaol \$239 000 of Loan moneys will be spent on an integrated security system.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I remind the member to keep a straight course, if he will.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I always endeavour to do that, Sir, and I am usually very successful in that. Has the Chief Secretary received complaints from the Public Buildings Department, or is he aware of the grave concern which his announcement caused in the Public Buildings Department, because in making that announcement and giving those details the Chief Secretary gave away the very important details of the security system that is going to be installed? As I understand the position, this news has appalled members of the Public Buildings Department who are working on this system. The very fundamentals of the system are that they be kept secret so that intending escapees, or alternatively persons who might seek to get into the gaol, will not know the details. Yet, on the front page of the *Advertiser*, all the details were set forth for all and sundry to see. Has the Minister received comment from the Public Buildings Department, or is he now aware of the fact that grave concern has been expressed within that department? If he is not aware of even that, I suggest that he contact that department urgently to see what steps he can take to remedy the ill feeling he has created and the problems that have arisen as a result of his statements.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** This, of course, is in the province of my colleague the Minister of Public Works. I have received no complaints from the Minister. I have had discussions with the principal officer concerned with this installation and he has made no complaint to me, either. One of the major issues we looked at on coming to office was the installation of this sort of equipment. I visited Tasmania to see an integrated system that operated there. It works quite well, and it is one of the major improvements needed in our system here.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** No doubt it is, but the Minister did not answer the question I asked. I asked him not for a further detailed general analysis of the system being implemented, but specifically whether he was aware of the fact that by making this announcement he had, in effect, blown the gaffe on the whole security system and that the details that were printed in the *Advertiser* are of such magnitude that he has virtually destroyed the whole effectiveness of this \$450 000 Loan expenditure by releasing the details publicly. If he is not aware of that, then I ask him to get on to the Public Buildings Department urgently to ascertain what can be done to remedy the damage already done by this gaffe.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am not aware of such a gaffe but, knowing the honourable member as I do, I shall be pleased to take the action he has requested.

**Mr. OSWALD:** The annual report of the Comptroller of Prisons shows a staff of 366 as at the end of June 1970, while the average number of prisoners at that time was 929. The Auditor-General's Report shows that the staff had increased to 566 as at June this year, which is a 45 per cent increase, while the average daily number of prisoners in 1979-80 was 840, a decrease of 10 per cent. In what functional areas (custodial, rehabilitation and administration) have these increases in departmental staff taken place over the past 10 years?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There is an effective desirable ratio that is aimed at 1.83 staff per prisoner. For a long time there had been discussions between the department and the Government about reaching that ratio.

**Mr. Stewart:** I would have to analyse the figures to give a better answer about the areas in which they have increased. As the Minister has said, the ratio of 1 to 1·83 really means that it takes 1·83 to keep one man at work, owing to the shift system. That has increased considerably in the past 10 years from about 1·4 and 1·5, because of increases in annual leave and sickness, and for a variety of other reasons. The department naturally has had to increase its prison staff, as well as its instructive staff.

In addition, there has been a considerable increase in the professional staff in probation and parole. That probably accounts for the increase in total staff compared to the number of people in custody. However, the probation and parole staff, who deal with people not in custody in the major part of their work, have also increased in number. There are now about 2 500 people on probation and parole and we have had an increase in staff in that area. That, as well as a certain amount of clerical and administrative people, probably accounts for the general increase.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to the proceeds of prisoner labour. The estimates of receipts show that for 1980-81 it is expected that \$200 000 less will be received than was estimated for 1979-80. The actual proceeds were only \$617 361. The Auditor-General's Report, at page 57, states:

Receipts from sale of goods and services from Yatala Labour Prison decreased by \$117 000 mainly due to reductions on purchases by Government departments.

Will the Minister give a break-down of the proceeds of the various prisons as to their produce, fruit and vegetables, and also the proceeds of their various workshops? Will the Minister also tell the Committee why the reduction in purchases by Government departments has taken place and whether work normally done by prisoners is not now normally done? Why has there been a reduction of \$117 000 in the proceeds at Yatala, and why is work previously done by prisoners not now being done?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not know why there was a drop but the Manager, Prison Industries, may be able to throw light on the matter.

**Mr. Cunningham:** The main down-turn in work is caused through the general industry outside. There is a down-turn in productivity. We are not receiving from the Group Laundry at Dudley Park the amount of work that we received 12 months ago. It really follows what is happening in outside industry.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will look at the break-down institution by institution.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister more clearly tell the Committee why the Group Laundry activity has had a down-turn? Has the laundry currently got the contracts for all departments? If not, where is the work obtained and where has the reduction occurred?

**Mr. Cunningham:** The work at present done by correctional services is basically 1 per cent correctional services. Previously the work we received came from the Group Laundry, which is no longer involved because of the down-turn.

**Mr. Stewart:** I understand that we did operate as an adjunct of the Group Laundry for many years. I understand that the Group Laundry introduced an additional shift at Dudley Park, which made its demand for work much greater. The only way to achieve that was by taking work from us. We lost work on the laundry's behalf and returned to laundry for the department.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Will the Minister tell the Committee what happens to the produce that is produced in the prisons, how it is costed, and who are the beneficiaries of the produce and the income?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I understand that the bulk of it goes to the institution.

**Mr. Stewart:** The returns for produce from the various prisons are basically from Government departments. State Supply Department is under contract to us for the supply of numbers of items. Produce from Cadell is sold locally to the canneries. Most of our trade is to Government departments. There is a little trade to some municipal councils and, in general, it all passes directly from one Government department to another.

**Dr. BILLARD:** It has been said that there have been increases in the number of staff, and I ask a question regarding methods of selecting and training staff. It would be helpful to know the methods by which prison staff, especially, are selected and the staff training they are given, so as to get an idea of the level of professionalism exhibited. I do this to try to help the situation of those prison officers who, I know, have been caused considerable distress by current events. It would be beneficial if those people could be publicly reassured that the public should be able to have confidence in them. Knowing the methods of selection and training would assist in that.

**Mr. McRAE:** I take a point of order, because this is contrary to the Chairman's earlier ruling. This is a matter *sub judice*. I do not want to cast aspersions on the officers or otherwise, but a clear indication is given to usurp what was said earlier about the role of the Royal Commission.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We can give an answer in writing. It is in the grey area.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**Dr. BILLARD:** I will rephrase it by asking what are the methods of selection of prison officers and what training do they undergo.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am entirely in the hands of the Committee. I will have to ask the Director, bearing in mind that he can give an answer that does not infringe on the *sub judice* ruling.

**Mr. Stewart:** The method of selection of staff is by application from an advertisement in the paper. The people we look for are people with second or third year standard at high school, and we attempt to select people with leadership abilities who have had some experience in supervisory areas. They are medically examined and are checked for previous history with the police courts or any other court before they come into the department. They then enter a five-week training course in which they are educated in the skills of security and the legislative procedures under which the department operates under the current Prisons Act and regulations as well as a number of other aspects of supervision, human management and aspects of psychology that people in those positions are required to have some skill in. They enter the prison system and, after six months, return for a week's course, known as the Stage B course, in which they do further study in aspects of management and a recap on the previous course.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** What plans has the Government to implement its election promise to introduce a three-year C.A.E. course for prison officers, bearing in mind most C.A.E. courses these days require matriculation before the colleges are prepared to accept students?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Assistant Director to answer that question.

**Mr. Scandrett-Smith:** Discussions are taking place with the Police Department, the Law Department, and ourselves in regard to establishing a diploma course at the Institute of Technology. Those discussions are not

finalised at this stage.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Is it proposed, when these negotiations are finalised, that that will become the entry requirement for all prison officers in the department in accordance with Liberal Party policy?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not think that has been developed up to that stage.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Is it just your policy that has been developed?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** No, I am not saying that. I do not think that I can indicate to the Committee that I have progressed that far down the road.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Has the Minister resiled from the policy upon which he and his Government went to the last election?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** No, we have not, but we hasten slowly.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I refer to the Auditor-General's Report and develop the member for Stuart's earlier question in regard to proceeds of prison labour. I will break the figures down a little more than the honourable member did. In 1978-79, the proceeds from the whole of the department for prison labour were \$440 000, of which Yatala's share was \$273 000, which is approximately half. In 1979-80, the figure for the whole of the department decreased to \$338 000, of which Yatala's share was \$156 000, which is just marginally half. In 1980-81 there is a figure of \$250 000, of which Yatala's share is \$125 000. We have seen Yatala drop from \$273 000 to \$156 000 to \$125 000. The value of material used in the trade shops at Yatala over that corresponding period is as follows: for 1978-79, \$224 000; for 1979-80, \$202 000; and for 1980-81, \$213 000.

So, we have seen a steady decline in the proceeds from prison labour at Yatala while, at the same time, materials used in the workshops have been static and are now starting to rise. Why has there been a major reduction in the proceeds from prison labour at Yatala at a time when the cost of materials is going up?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Director to answer the question.

**Mr. Stewart:** Sale of goods from trade shops at Yatala and its relationship with the value of material for manufacture are related to the return from other areas in which we operate. Trade shops are not directly related to the areas from which material is purchased. For instance, the laundry was one area where there was a considerable reduction in income. There is very little trade material purchased for the laundry. There has been a reduction in the expenditure by other departments in other areas. We have lost a considerable amount of time due to staff shortages in the workshops in which our manufactures have not been as great as in previous years; hence we have not had the return from manufactured goods.

Also included in our proceeds from labour is a figure from the Commonwealth for sustenance of prisoners. Although it is not strictly labour, it is revenue to the department. We have a number of Commonwealth prisoners—somewhere in the region of 40—at Yatala. In 1979-80 there was a reduction of about \$40 000 in the payment by the Commonwealth due to the fact that their prisoners are not coming to South Australia any more. Any person who completes his sentence in South Australia is discharged, but prisoners are not being fed to us from the Northern Territory any more, as the Northern Territory has its own prison. That covers the general reduction in returns, although the cost of materials is about the same.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** In the light of the appointment of the Royal Commission, is it proposed to

proceed with the so-called independent review of the department to be undertaken jointly by a consultant from the private sector and officers of the Public Service?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Why was it not made public that that review was, in fact, to be co-ordinated by a steering committee consisting of the Director and a senior officer of the Public Service Board and by a private consultant? Nowhere in the publicity given to the appointment of this committee was it intimated that the department would play an active and important part therein. Many people were led to believe that this would be an independent review. I did not realise otherwise until I came across a document signed by Mr. Durant, the Acting Director, on page 2 of which the following appears:

The review is to be undertaken jointly by a consultant(s) from the private sector and officers of the Public Service and will be co-ordinated by a Steering Committee comprising the Director and a senior officer of the Public Service Board. That review can hardly be held to be a creditable independent review when the work of the consultants and the officers of the Public Service is to be co-ordinated by the Director and a member of the Public Service. This means that all the information that will be given to that review team will, in the final analysis, be available to the Director.

I have read carefully through the Minister's public statement on this matter, and at no stage was that information made available to the public. In fact, we were duped into believing that this would be some sort of arm's length inquiry into the system. If it was not for the fact that a few people in the department are concerned about the truth and about the future of correctional institutions in this State, this information would not yet have become public. Why did the Minister not make this fact public and state when he made his press statement that the review would be co-ordinated by the Director?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The press statement to which the honourable member has referred was made on 10 September. I said therein that there would be a joint review by an independent consultant and the Public Service. Its terms of reference would be as follows:

(a) The adequacy of existing security measures and the need for further measures in the light of decisions for upgrading taken by the Government.

(b) A review of the organisation structure and staffing levels (other than those associated with institutional management) of the department, with particular attention to the executive management needs of the department.

That term of reference has been going ahead, in consultation between the two unions concerned (the Australian Government Workers Association and the Public Service Association) and officers of the Public Service Board. The consultant is also asked to look at the cost effectiveness of the South Australian prison system by comparison with other prison systems in Australia, with particular reference to prison industry activities. The other terms of reference are as follows:

(d) The adequacy of training of prison officers at various levels of classification, with special reference to the need for succession planning to ensure an adequate supply of appropriately experienced prison managers.

(e) The recruitment process for prison officers, and desirable standards of recruits.

(f) The need for, and scope of, a research function to meet the information requirements of departmental specialists and senior managers.

(g) The adequacy of existing management information systems and procedures.

(h) Any other matters which are likely to improve the

efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the prison system in the next 10 years. Obviously, there must be a co-ordinator, and these people must have access to the various institutions. This will be achieved through the Director of Correctional Services. The major input will be by an independent consultant, and the Public Service representative and the Director are there to assist in the co-ordination.

This system has been used in other departments, including the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I assure the Committee that in this respect there is no looking over one's shoulder. We want an independent report.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Will the Minister say whether the previous Administration decided to build a remand centre at Regency Park, and whether that decision has been changed? If it has, was the Minister a party to that decision and, if he was, what were the reasons for changing the original decision?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The former Government of which the honourable member was a member had selected a site at Regency Park and, to be fair, it was a very good site. However, with the advent of the Crystal Brook railway line, the spur line for which will go into the port of Adelaide, the site at Regency Park was considered to be of more value as an industrial site. Also, it was thought that it might not be best to have a remand site in the area. Security was another concern.

Two departmental officers have been overseas and have conducted considerable research into high-rise remand centres and, when we looked at their findings, we concluded that this matter should be examined. Sites near the courts are being considered. Against that background, it was decided not to proceed with the Regency Park site but to look at a site within the city area.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$3 015 000

**Chairman:**  
Mr. E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Dr. B. Billard  
The Hon. Peter Duncan  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr. G. F. Keneally  
Mr. J. Mathwin  
Mr. T. M. McRae  
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald  
Mr. I. Schmidt

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. A. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr. K. J. Bertram, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr. I. J. Lees, Acting Secretary, South Australian Fire Brigades Board.

**Mr. McRAE:** Would this be an appropriate time for me to suggest that the Committee should complete this vote no later than 5.30 p.m.? I draw your attention to the time

that is now available for the Committee to consider the votes for Fisheries; Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous; Marine and Harbors; and Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous. On my calculations, by the time that the Committee is reorganised, just over two hours will be available. I suggest that this would be a reasonable proposal.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin):** Very well. I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board. There has been considerable criticism in relation to staffing the board in South Australia. Not only has this criticism come from the relevant unions but also concern has been expressed in the community.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** That amount is the Government's proportion of the input into the brigade's funding. Insurance companies and local government also make a considerable subvention to the brigade's total revenue.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Are you going to be increasing the number of people in the brigade under that vote?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Not within that vote.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The Minister has said that within that vote there is no provision for an increase of officers in the brigade. Is it the Government's view that there are sufficient officers now to provide an adequate service for Adelaide and other cities serviced by the brigade?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** No, but the amount appropriated is the figure based on the budget submitted by the South Australian Fire Brigades Board. Legislation is now before the House in terms of the independent report sought by the previous Government. The Government has adopted a portion of that report to establish a new board, and the two matters that the new board will be asked to look at concern manning and funding.

**Mr. McRAE:** Am I right in assuming that negotiations are presently going on between the Government and the fire officers and their association and the firemen? If I am right in assuming that, can the Minister say what progress is being made towards solving what apparently is a conflict?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There have been discussions about the new Act, and officers and firemen have not been happy about it. The Bill is now in the House and it is intended to proceed with it. The Budget has received a higher priority but when that is disposed of the Bill will be proceeded with.

**Mr. McRAE:** Has the Government managed in some way to meet the objections raised by the firemen in relation to certain provisions contained in the Bill? Is it likely that there can be some compromise proposal to satisfy the complaints of officers and men staffing the brigade?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is the Government's intention to proceed with the Bill. Officers seek to preserve the *status quo*. The Government intends to proceed with the Bill and appoint a new board which can then examine the two major issues, funding and manning. That is where this situation stands.

**Mr. McRAE:** I understand from a fireman—not a fire officer—in my district that his association (there is a difference between the associations involved) has made certain points to the Government which seem to be capable of some form of compromise. What progress, if any, can be made regarding the various demands of firemen as distinct from fire officers?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There has been argument about the method of recruitment. There is a pool in the brigade, and there is a transfer list. I think it was the association representing the firemen, of which Mr. Doyle is the

Secretary, which insisted that they should not have to be part and parcel of the job transfer pool, their arguments being that they select people over a long time, that they have a waiting list, and that they do not want to have to go through the job list. An instruction was issued through the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. It is highly likely that there will not be candidates in that pool reaching the high standards required, but they have been told that they must comply with that requirement. I understand that that is proceeding.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I seek information on the provision of helicopter services. What rules or instructions has the Government issued in relation to the use of the helicopter?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The note I have is that provision was made in 1979-80 for the lease of a helicopter, together with pilot(s) and all necessary support services, for a period of one year, and during this period an evaluation was to be made of its value to the police and organisations involved in emergency health and rescue services. The amount provided was \$300 000.

No contract was entered into by the previous Government; however, the present Government decided to enter into a sponsorship arrangement with commercial organisations and charter a helicopter for a trial period of 17 weeks. This resulted in a substantial saving of approximately \$260 000 in 1979-80. Following the trial period, a review committee was established, and its recommendations were submitted to the Government. The Government approved a full-time helicopter rescue and emergency service in conjunction with commercial sponsors to commence 1 July 1980 or as soon as practicable thereafter. The Bell Long Ranger is the approved helicopter with patient-carrying facilities and winch at a net annual cost to the Government of \$230 000 plus \$10 000 for contingencies. A three-year contract was negotiated with Lloyd Helicopters Pty. Ltd. The combined package with the sponsors has been co-ordinated by Lloyds with commercial sponsorship amounting to \$80 000 for the first year. In addition to the Government's commitment of \$240 000, approval has been given for the sum of \$21 000 to fund certain items of equipment which fall outside the contract with Lloyd Helicopters and which are considered necessary in the operation of the Helicopter Rescue Service. Those items include a night light, a special type of hook that is necessary for sea rescue, and night binoculars.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** What rules or instructions did Cabinet issue concerning who uses the helicopter? Who has the right to use it and what are the rules prescribed for its use?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will have to get that information for the member and give him a report.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** How many times has the Premier used this helicopter, and by what arrangement does he use it?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not have that information. I do not know how many times the Premier has used it, although he has been picked up at the Channel 10 helipad.

The only two occasions on which the Premier and I have been in the helicopter together were when we were picked up in the Bell Long Ranger from the Channel 10 helipad, and at the inauguration of the railway.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Will the Chief Secretary get for the Committee a copy of the passenger manifests since its inception?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will get that for the honourable member. I ask Mr. Bertram, who is a member of the helicopter committee, whether he can throw more light on this matter.

**Mr. Bertram:** There is a steering committee which manages the operations of the helicopter service. I cannot recall the whole membership, but it has members on it from the St. John Council, the Health Commission, C.F.S. and the Police Department and calls for its use are directed through C.F.S. An assessment is made at that point to determine whether it is a genuine need and what is the appropriate method of dealing with a particular inquiry or emergency. If it involves an ambulance service, the St. John Council decides whether road or air transport is appropriate. Procedures have been properly recorded and documented to deal with every particular type of call and to determine an appropriate means of dealing with a situation. There are procedures to ensure that, where appropriate, the cost of the service is recouped, in addition to the funds provided in the Estimates to meet the running costs.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If that is the case, where in the Estimates does the income from this appear?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is not shown in this line.

**Mr. Bertram:** There has been only one payment so far, although I am not sure that funds have actually been received. The line under which this matter is to be placed is a matter to be determined by Treasury.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Notwithstanding the fact that no moneys have been received—

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! Will the honourable member wait for the call, because there are other members waiting.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I will make this my last question. The fact that no money has as yet been received is not, in fact, the point. Surely this is revenue that is to be received in the ensuing year and, as such, should be shown in the Estimates of Revenue for the year ending 30 June 1981.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will get a report from the Treasurer for the honourable member.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I received correspondence almost 10 months ago regarding the Fire Equipment Service Division of the South Australian Fire Brigade. At that time it was suggested that the Government was going to sell off that part of the brigade's activity to private interests. Can the Minister tell me what is the present position with the Fire Equipment Service Division and whether it is intended that this should remain an activity involving the South Australian Fire Brigade?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There has been considerable discussion about this matter. I will ask Mr. Lees to inform the Committee of the situation.

**Mr. Lees:** The Fire Equipment Service Division was still operating in the financial year that ended in June and made a small profit. It is the board's intention that the division shall continue to operate and, hopefully, that it will remain a profitable source of income for the brigade.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** In view of the reply we have just received, which I am heartened by, I might add, because it shows that contrary to the Government's view Government instrumentalities can make a profit, will there be no reduction in that section as a result of last year's profitable operation?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** No.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Are there any further questions? There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

**Fisheries, \$2 067 000**

**Chairman:**

Mr. E. K. Russack

**Members:**

Mr. Lynn Arnold  
Dr. B. Billard  
Mr. Max Brown  
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood  
Mr. G. F. Keneally  
Mr. J. Mathwin  
Mr. J. K. G. Oswald  
Mr. I. Schmidt

**Witness:**

The Hon. W. A. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Marine.

**Departmental Advisers:**

Mr. R. A. Stevens, Director of Fisheries.  
Mr. J. J. Dadds, Senior Administration Officer.  
Mr. K. J. Bertram, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Are there any questions?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister tell the Committee the cost of renovating the vessel *Joseph Verco* and the reasons for renovating that vessel?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will make this a general discussion and ask Mr. Stevens to elaborate. The *Joseph Verco* is the research vessel of the Fisheries Department. I think it was originally a prawn vessel. It was found that certain things had to be done to it to bring it up to standard with its equipment, furnishings and research facilities on board, and reducing noise because the boat is terribly noisy. That work was done. It was then slipped at the North Arm Slip at Port Adelaide and had been there for some months undergoing this refit. I think the cost of that work was \$186 000. It was due for the slip about a fortnight ago, but suffered from a mishap and is in the Port River. I ask the Director to give a resume that will cover the points raised.

**Mr. Stevens:** The research vessel *Joseph Verco* was in the throes of undergoing a refit. The refit specifically included new navigation equipment, direction equipment, radar, and echo sounders. The work has carried over from last year as those concerned were behind in refitting the vessel.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Is it fair to say that, if the vessel had been lifted within a short time after it sank, some of this equipment may have been salvaged but that now all equipment will be lost, with considerable loss to the Government? Also, what would be the position now regarding motors?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** This is a complicated business, as one finds out when one becomes involved in accidents. Mr. Stevens has had considerable negotiations on the matter.

**Mr. Stevens:** Marine law is very complicated as it applies to the salvage of vessels. There are certain legal complications regarding responsibility for the vessel's capsizing, and we have written to the various contractors involved advising them that we would proceed, without prejudice, to salvage the vessel. Tenders were advertised last weekend and are closing this coming Friday.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Parliament anticipate that there has been considerable loss to the Fisheries Department in valuable equipment which was attached to the craft and which will need to be replaced when the

department commissions a new craft or rebuilds the *Joseph Verco*? What is the department's intention regarding rebuilding and redesigning, or purchasing a new craft? If it intends to purchase a new craft, how does it propose to do so?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The decision to raise the vessel has been taken, as the Director has said. It is a loss to the industry, the department and the people. I ask the Director to answer further.

**Mr. Stevens:** The vessel is insured. The refit was also insured. The loss of the vessel has been a severe blow to our research work. The commercial fishing industry, through about 10 approaches to date, has offered its vessels to assist in the programme, but we will have to look at a bare boat charter, if possible, to undertake the research programme that commercial vessels cannot handle.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Is the Minister aware that fishermen in South Australia have predicted that, if the *Joseph Verco* was taken out into any sort of sea and a current was running, the boat would capsize, as it did? That seems to suggest that the average fisherman in South Australia knows a fair bit more than the department knows about what should be on the superstructure of a craft of this nature. If the Minister was aware that this prediction had been made, how seriously did he take the advice given?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** No, I am not aware, nor do I know to whom the honourable member is referring. A lot of kerbside opinion was given but, through the Department of Marine and Harbors, we have established an inquiry that will look at all those questions.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I was told prior to the event, not after.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It was never made known to me. The vessel operated for a long time when the member's Government was in office and it did not go to the bottom. Apart from the noise, the opinion I had was that it was fairly seaworthy.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Can the Minister say how the specifications for the refit were drawn up, who was consulted in drawing them up, and whether the fishing industry at large or any segment of it was consulted on what should be done?

**Mr. Stevens:** I cannot say whether the fishing industry was consulted prior to my time as Director. It has made allegations that it was not consulted as fully as it might have been.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** You know what the Australian Fishing Industry Council said.

**Mr. Stevens:** I am aware of the criticism by the Australian Fishing Industry Council over the past three or four years, as I was involved in some of it. Subsequently, the two gentlemen nominated by the council have been over the boat inspecting it and have made certain suggestions as to the refit. Unfortunately, they were made too late to be incorporated in the refit.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Can we be told whether the suggestions they made would have affected the operation of the *Joseph Verco* after the refit? Could they have avoided the mishap?

**Mr. Stevens:** I would say "No". The requirements of the research vessel generally were of a research nature, not a commercial fishing nature.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Regarding suggestions that the council and other bodies made, did they feel that any other changes should be made to the refit?

**Mr. Stevens:** I am unaware of any such suggestions.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the entire vote but also to the provisions for research, law enforcement, administration expenses, transfer to Research and

Development Fund, and other matters which represent increases in the amounts proposed for the coming year. The Fisheries vote as a whole shows a significant increase from \$1 670 000 voted last year to \$2 067 000.

One wonders why the increase has been larger than the increase in many other Government departments. One should also note that in the receipts that are estimated or anticipated to be received by the Department of Fisheries, a heavy revenue increase is anticipated. Indeed, the figure indicated by the revenue figures is the sum of \$354 000. Therefore, in real terms, after providing for inflation and after taking into account this increase in revenue that is expected to be paid by the fishing industry, the contribution by the State Government has actually fallen. We understand that the Department of Fisheries has planned an expansion of the activities undertaken and indeed the very existence of the position of Minister of Fisheries was a part of the platform of this present Government. It can be taken as an indication that it proposes even further expansion in the future.

Can it be anticipated that the increase in expenditure by the department will be able to be sustained from the Consolidated Revenue of the Government, or is it proposed that there will be further increases in the imposts that are put against the fishermen and that they will have to bear any increases in the years ahead?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask the Director to answer the question.

**Mr. Stevens:** I am not quite sure of the line of questioning that Mr. Arnold has taken. Fees from the prawn industry will increase significantly this year to some \$260 000.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** You are obviously delighted.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Questions will be channelled through the Minister and interjections are out of order. Opportunity will be given for other members to ask questions.

**Mr. Stevens:** I might say that the arrangement with the prawn industry was a most amicable one this year, and I leave it at that. Apart from that, I am not quite sure of the direct line of questioning that Mr. Arnold is taking.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** In making an explanation on this I would like to make one comment. My question related to whether it would be Government policy in the future for heavy imposts to be made on the fishing industry. We have had a heavy increase in revenue from fishermen over the last financial year. Should not this be a question answered by the Minister rather than by the Director, as it is a policy matter? To what extent will the department be funding the activities of the Fisheries Department, or to what extent will the fishermen within the industry directly fund the activities through imposts? In the years ahead, will the expansion that is anticipated take place, and how will the burden of that increased cost be borne? Will it be borne through the Consolidated Revenue under the Fisheries vote or through the imposts to be imposed on the fishermen?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I would not be the top accountant in the room. Is the honourable member asking whether we will make the fishermen fund their department? The answer is: certainly not.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I was saying that there has been an increase in revenue from fishermen as the result of the impost. There has been an indication that the department will expand its activity and, in real terms, the contribution of the Government has declined in the last year. Is it proposed that that contribution will decline in the years ahead? I am not asking whether the fishermen are going to pay the whole Budget, as obviously they are not. Is it proposed that the relative contribution will decline? That

will be so if there are to be heavier and heavier imposts placed on the fishing industry. Is it Government policy that heavier imposts be put on the fishing industry to meet the expansion programme envisaged by the Minister?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Fees are worked out each year with the industry, and that will continue to be so. If the industry flourishes as we hope it will and if it expands, there will be a corresponding input into the industry. When we look at estimated receipts, we see the sum of \$573 000, as against the input here. Is that what the honourable member is asking about?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Minister has outlined the increases in revenue fees indicated in revenue statements. I am interested that he has repeated figures like that. He seems to be telling me that there is no Government policy as such and that it is merely something that will be worked out on a haphazard basis in discussions with the industry. Is there any firm policy decision in the Government? Is it purely related to conversations each year with the industry?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There are discussions with the industry, and negotiations from year to year. Hence, I gave the example of the prawn industry. We have had examples in the industry in relation to prawn licensing, and an agreement has been reached. We are looking at input this year of estimated receipts of \$573 000. If the honourable member wants a break-up of that figure, I can get it for him.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I may be able to explain the problem to the Minister in my simple language so that he can understand. This year there has been less money coming out of Consolidated Revenue to fund the operations of the Fisheries Department and, although there has been more money funded to the Fisheries Department, a larger percentage of it is taken up through the cost to the fishermen themselves. The Minister mentioned the figure of \$573 000. Although there appears to be more money spent this year, less money comes from Consolidated Revenue. As fees increase, will the proportionate contribution out of Consolidated Revenue decrease? It will mean that the fishermen will increasingly be required to fund more and more of their own operations. It seems to suggest that the improvements that are so badly needed within the Fisheries Department, particularly in policing and other areas, will not be able to be achieved because of the lack of input from Consolidated Revenue.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I thought I answered that when I answered a question by the member for Salisbury. What the honourable members are looking for is a statement from me that there will be a big input from Treasury. Or, are they growling that the input this year is insufficient?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** What is your Government's policy on this? We are not trying to put the Minister on the rack. Very little blood-letting will occur between now and 6 p.m. The Minister believes that he has got over the blood-letting stage. We want to know what the Government's policy is as to funding. We are not trying to be awkward; we are trying to obtain a precise statement.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The members for Stuart and Salisbury will know that each year Government funding is arrived at by Treasury preparing figures and sending them to departments. Arising from that, there is a discussion at Treasury level through the Minister and officers of the various departments.

This year has been a year of constraint. However, I cannot enlarge on what I have already told honourable members. Hopefully, next year will be a better year than this year was.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I hope that Opposition members are not being too pedantic, but I wonder what

"better" means in the Minister's terms. Does it mean that there will be a greater percentage subvention from Consolidated Revenue than has occurred this year, or that there will be a greater percentage subvention from the industry? Do the Minister and his department have some sort of ideal concept of what the breakdown between these two sources of revenue should be, or is it, as the Minister has hinted, really a matter of horse trading year by year with the Treasury? The Committee would regard it as ideal that, however successful the Minister might be, he should at least have some sort of basic concept of the relevant percentages coming from industry and Consolidated Revenue. If there is such a concept, can the Committee be told about it?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The growth factor in the industry is also involved. We are dealing with primary industry, and it goes up and down from year to year. I think that honourable members are being pedantic.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Minister said that primary industry goes up and down from year to year, and that is a truism in relation to primary industry that we all accept. The figures in Revenue Account indicate that in real terms the relevant sum has gone from \$277 000 to \$573 000. The bulk of the revenue is based on a percentage fee of the gross value of the catch; I believe that it is now 2½ per cent. I understand that the export price for prawns is at present in a depressed state and probably will remain so for some months. Bearing in mind the months of the year that have already passed, it will probably not recover sufficiently by the end of the financial year to boost the return.

This brings into line the whole question whether anyone in the department is doing an analysis of the future pricing of and supply and demand for the products of South Australian fisheries, and whether any attempt is being made to look ahead to see what sort of revenue can be recouped from the fishing industry itself.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I ask the Director to answer that question.

**Mr. Stevens:** We have very little involvement in the processing side of the industry in relation to trying to determine future trends of prices and sales of products caught in South Australia. Regarding fees, the prawn fee is certainly calculated at present on 2½ per cent of the gross value of the catch. This varies on a three-year rolling average, and it is highly likely that the revenue will be less next year than it is this year, depending on the outcome of the sort of things of which the honourable member has spoken in relation to future prices and quantities that we expect to catch.

The abalone fishery is based on a similar percentage. Scale fishery licences are a set amount under the regulations, as are rock lobster fishing licences. It may well be that the figure for next year may be much less than the \$573 000 this year.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Numerous references have been made over the past few days to the fact that everything appearing in the Estimates of Resource Allocation is liable to inaccuracy and mistake. It is now said that a revenue item in the revenue statement could also be liable to mistake. It has been said that the present export price for prawns is low, yet the estimate of returns to the department is much greater. Perhaps it was logical to expect that the impost would increase in years to come.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I ask the Director to answer that question.

**Mr. Stevens:** The figure of \$573 000 will be very close. The prawn and abalone fees have been agreed, and they will be paid. I do not therefore expect there to be much variation in that figure. However, we cannot predict what the position next year will be.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** If we have a very successful season, particularly with prawns, and the revenue that goes to the Government is increased to \$600 000, the benefit of that very good year and the contribution that is made to the Government will not flow back to the industry, as the Government will reduce its Consolidated Revenue allocation to the department. So, the industry will obtain no benefit as a result of the increased fee or a successful season. I know that the Minister will say, on the other hand, that if a bad season was experienced Consolidated Revenue would pick up the tab.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The honourable member is putting an impossible question to me and, if I gave him a reply, it would be wrong. The former Minister of Education knows full well that, when one is dealing with the Treasury in the formation of the Budget, one is subjected to a very heavy hand. I should like to be able to tell the honourable member that it is a wonderful idea and that we will take it on board, but it does not work that way.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Stuart mentioned the benefit to the fishing industry from the increase in fees in real terms. I understand that on 23 September the Fishing Industry Council asked that 10 per cent of the fees from the prawn and abalone catch should be paid to it for its programmes. Is it proposed that that should happen; is the matter under consideration; and, if it is, when can a decision be expected?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** That matter has been put to me and discussed, and we are having further discussions on it. However, I have taken the matter on board, and can appreciate the arguments put forward by the fishermen. Indeed, I appreciate and value their request.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Does that mean that the Minister is not prepared to indicate when a decision can be expected?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes, that is what it means.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** That joins the long list of other reports. The question of law enforcement is referred to in the Budget Papers, there having been an increase in the vote in this respect from \$924 000 to \$1 156 414. Indeed, we are told on page 313 of the Estimates of Resource Allocation that the manpower involved will be increased from 21 to 27 persons. Other Revenue and Loan figures are also referred to. What is this increased number of officers expected to do?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I inform the honourable member that actual expenditure in 1979-80 exceeded that voted, to the extent of normal salary increases (\$924 000 to \$984 000, representing a 6·5 per cent increase). The proposed increase in 1980-81 represents an increase of \$172 000 over actual for the previous year. It comprises seven additional fisheries officers (in accordance with Government policy), involving \$81 000; four fisheries officers vacancies (three Grade I for two-thirds of the year and one Grade II), representing \$24 000 and \$6 000; four additional administrative/clerical support staff for the new department, involving \$31 000; an economist (for two-thirds of the year), involving \$9 000; and a Chief Fisheries Officer, involving \$25 000, making a total of \$176 000.

[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.30 p.m.]

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The member for Salisbury asked me what the seven additional fisheries officers will do. We found that officers on their own, when enforcing the Act, had been beaten up. It was a dangerous occupation and, in view of the gravity of the situation, the Government took steps to take on additional officers who will be stationed around the country at, say, Port Lincoln,

Whyalla and Ceduna. Fisheries officers will work in pairs for the safety of individuals and, hopefully, for more effective enforcement.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** As there is only a one-third increase in the numbers involved, and if officers are to operate in pairs, does it mean that the coverage of enforcement officers will decline because there will be fewer pairs to go around?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We have taken on seven additional officers to supplement the 21 existing officers.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** To date we have had 21 men doing the rounds and we now have 28 who could cover 28 rounds but who will be operating in 14 teams and covering 14 rounds, which seems to be a 50 per cent reduction in coverage.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Twenty-one officers on their own were ineffective. Now we will have 14 pairs, and seven pairs will be operating in country areas. We hope that will have a sobering effect on some of the louts who were prepared to bash up single inspectors.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I appreciate the Minister's concern for his officers. They have a difficult job and are subject to threatening treatment and even physical maltreatment by people who do not always agree with the inspector's task. Would it not be cheaper to employ at a base rate a big officer who could provide protection and, with the funds saved, appoint more fisheries inspectors? If the real reason for the appointment of additional inspectors is so that they can work with existing inspectors, then the inspectorate has not been improved at all. As the Minister knows, a real problem in the South Australian fishing industry is the limited resources that have been made available for the inspectorate and the enormous task that the inspectors have had over the years, with many breaches of the law going undetected. They will continue to be undetected if inspectors go out in pairs. I cannot possibly imagine the inspector at Port Pirie—he is 6 feet 4 inches and 18 stone—being in any danger. If protection is the problem, there must be other ways of doing it, and the savings obtained could provide for the appointment of more skilled inspectors.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** As the Director has had close contact with that aspect, I will ask him to comment.

**Mr. Stevens:** The prime aspect in appointing seven additional inspectors was the personal safety of inspectors. In regard to the employment of inspectors, it is envisaged that they will still be able to take one-man patrols around the South Australian coast during daylight hours. When they are particularly involved in apprehending people such as abalone poachers, who are a nasty breed of people, they will operate in pairs. It is with abalone poachers that two officers have been injured. It is with that in mind that the proposal is put forward. It is also envisaged that they will operate individually in daylight hours along areas of the coast.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Where will those seven additional inspectors be located?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** This has been determined. The Whyalla office was closed and the officer transferred to Port Pirie.

**Mr. Stevens:** In regard to the seven additional officers, the existing Mount Gambier office has a staff of one and will be increased to two; Kingston with a staff of one will be increased to two; Victor Harbor with a staff of one will be increased to two; Kangaroo Island with a staff of one will be increased to two; Ceduna with a staff of one will be increased to two; Port Lincoln with a staff of two will be increased to three; and Minlaton on Yorke Peninsula with a staff of one will be increased to two.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The mere appointing of additional

inspectors to those locations is not sufficient if they are not provided with the mobility to detect breaches of the Act. Will each of the new inspectors be provided with a new fisheries vessel to enable him to work independently of other inspectors, or will we have the same number of vessels servicing additional inspectors, which comes back to my original point, that they can only do the same amount of inspecting or checking?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I would ask the Director to answer that question.

**Mr. Stevens:** To clarify the situation following the *Cape Arid* incident, there had been a number of aspects resulting from the inquiry concerning the training of fishing officers. One of the more relevant points is that vessels should be operated as two-man vessels, which we proposed to do anyway. Secondly, the helicopter should work in conjunction with the land-based patrol vessel. This would provide a more effective enforcement of the Act. Once again, patrol vessels will be provided with a vehicle for the towing and there will also be an existing Toyota for each of the existing land-based country areas.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Before dinner, the Minister gave various figures on how much these extra employees would cost. I think that four employees were going to cost \$31 000 in the current financial year.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes, four clerical support staff of the new department, plus the seven additional persons. There are four officer vacancies, three grade 1 for two-thirds of the year at \$24 000 and one grade 2 for two-thirds of the year at \$6 000. There is one officer for two-thirds of the year at \$9 000. For the Chief Fisheries Officer to be appointed, the amount is \$25 000.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** That indicates that in 1981-82 we will see a heavier increase in expenditure, because the people will be employed for the full year. Can we have an estimate of the full-year cost of these new positions?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It will increase only in those areas. I do not seem to have the detail. The Director will answer.

**Mr. Stevens:** It depends very much on when the officers are appointed, when the economist is appointed, etc. We are interviewing for the additional seven positions of Fisheries Officer, and they are just about at finalisation. We expect that the officers will be appointed about mid-November. The new economist will start in December. I cannot say when the Chief Fisheries Officer will be appointed.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Next financial year we will have much greater costs for these people. The amount will escalate to more than is provided in this Budget, because they will be employed for the full year. That segment of the vote will increase by approximately 33½ per cent, 50 per cent, or whatever, and will increase at a much faster rate than the rest of the Budget. Is it proposed that that excess will be taken up in an increased vote from Consolidated Revenue, or may that put pressure on the licence fees?

**Mr. Dadds:** The figure provided for the seven additional Fisheries Officers was a full-year cost. The others are for vacancies, partly for clerical staff. The positions of four Fisheries Officers and the Economist are positions that have existed in the past. The cost for the Chief Fisheries Officer was a full-year cost.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The figure I had for the seven new law enforcement officers was \$81 000. Now we are being told that that is a full-year cost.

**Mr. Stevens:** That was a full-year cost.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Law enforcement officers are worth about \$11 500 each per year?

**Mr. Stevens:** They were at 30 June 1980 figures.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** That is not what they are worth: that is what they are being paid. Anyone on \$11 500 a year who was threatened with a punch on the nose from an irate fisherman would need more than a Fisheries Inspector to persuade him to stay in the service. I ask the Minister what he intends the crew of the *Joseph Verco* and the people who would normally work on that craft will do while they are waiting for something to sail on again.

**Mr. Stevens:** The position we face at the moment is most difficult. We are pursuing the possibility of a bare boat charter, whereby the crew employed on the *Joseph Verco* could be placed on another vessel that we would charter. We would have to go to tender for a bare boat charter to do our research for four to six months of the coming year.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Are suitable craft available for bare boat charter and can the Minister say what may be the anticipated cost of such an exercise?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will have to go to tender.

**Mr. Stevens:** Costs were allocated for the coming year for operating costs of the *Joseph Verco*. The costs of the crew were already incurred, so there will be no additional cost for them. We anticipate that the amount in the Budget for operating costs of the *Joseph Verco* may provide two to three months bare boat charter and we will probably have to go to the Government for any extension beyond that.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** What is the current position of the crew itself? I understand that the research people who have worked on the research craft could be put to useful work in other departmental facilities.

**Mr. Stevens:** It is very much a week-to-week proposition. They are at present in the Cowell area assisting prawn fishermen in the Spencer Gulf, which involves three nights. Six are engaged on that. Where we can use them on research work, we will do so. Otherwise, it is a matter of their assisting where they can.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I take it they are working on prawn fisheries free of charge?

**Mr. Stevens:** That is correct.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I understand that the Government has indicated that a tribunal will be set up to be responsible for the issue of new fishing licences. Can the Minister say when that will happen, whether there is any subvention in this line to cover the cost, and what the equivalent full-year cost would be?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yesterday the matter was discussed in Cabinet. Regarding the tribunal, there is no need for it at the moment and, whilst it has not been struck off policy, we do not intend to do anything about it this year, so there is no provision for it.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Earlier this year the Minister made an announcement about the number of set nets that could be operated by amateur and professional fishermen, and the Government entered into reconsideration of that matter. Can the Minister say what is the situation regarding set netting for both amateur and professional fishermen?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Following the scale fishery report, there was an across-the-board recommendation, and it is recommended that an amateur fisherman will be able to operate a 75-metre net. Cabinet is considering a resolution on that matter and I hope that there will be an announcement in the next couple of weeks.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Since this matter is connected with revenue and expenditures in the Fisheries Department, I take the opportunity to plead a case for people involved in the fishing industry, namely, the suppliers of set nets.

I have received approaches from some suppliers who say that any proposal to restrict the number of set nets that

amateur fishermen can use without a phase-in period will result in their being caught with a large amount of stock in hand which will be less saleable and lower the profitability of their enterprise. One dealer told me that he has on hand at any one time \$5 000 worth of any stock, and if there was a radical change in the proposals that would become a loss to his firm. He believes that the normal trading position of many small suppliers of nets could not bear that loss. Has the position of suppliers of these nets been taken into account?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is getting rather wide. I ask honourable members to keep as close to the lines as possible.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The consultative committee brought down a valuable report and pointed out clearly that some action had to be taken. I think that this decision will be announced fairly soon. In reply to the honourable member, however, I point out that it is a business risk that entrepreneurs take. The consultative committee made it known loud and clear that excess netting was making a big inroad on the scale fishery.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I ask the Minister whether he is aware of what are widely reported amongst members of the fishing industry as breaches of the law in regard to fishing activities in South Australia. The reason for this largely is that either we do not have enough inspectors or inspectors have been instructed that they are not able to use their craft to go out and apprehend people that might be offending against fishing regulations. I have had reports made to me in the last week; indeed, a fair amount of my time is taken up in listening to fishermen, whether they be amateur, B class, professional, scale or prawn, etc., and I try to convey as much of their submissions to the Minister and his department as I can (and the previous Minister could vouch for that).

I understand that just about every fishing regulation has been broken in the Spencer Gulf region at the moment, because fishermen there believe that there is a lapse in time before the department makes up its mind about what it is going to do in a number of areas.

Because fishermen are independent and are prepared to take a chance, it could be said that they are raping the Spencer Gulf fishing resource at the moment. Is the Minister aware of this and, if so, what action is he taking to stop this practice? My information comes from people who are breaking the regulations and who admit as much. They believe that what they are doing is not in the best interests of the fishing industry but they say that it might not be around much longer and that they will go in and get their cop (at least, that is what they believed when it was thought that the petro-chemical plant at Redcliff would ruin their activity). Although some people may find this situation difficult to believe, I am sure that the member for Flinders or any member who represents a fishing port will vouch for what I say. It is a serious question and I ask for a serious response.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is the first that I have heard of such activity in recent times, but the Director will comment.

**Mr. Stevens:** It has not been reported to us directly by anyone and certainly not to me.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will take steps to see that action is taken in areas where offences are taking place.

**Mr. Stevens:** I can honestly say that no-one has reported anything to me about a mass breaking of regulations under the Fisheries Act. Breaking of the Act and the regulations goes on all the time, but we allow this grace period when people can continue their fishing so that we can issue licences with conditions on them for A and B class fishermen. We believe that this will help regulate fishing in

both gulfs. I have not heard of any mass breaking of regulations, but I am glad that it has been brought to my attention.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Is any law enforcement programme envisaged in regard to fishermen who break the regulations? Has any consideration been given to the fact that a person who works in the industry for a living and who may break the regulations is obviously under a greater penalty than those who do not depend on the industry? It seems that if we are going to follow up the question of law enforcement, there ought to be a regulation so that it is more detrimental to the person who does not depend on the industry for a livelihood than for a person who does. I do not know that the Government has given this any thought whatsoever, but I believe that some thought and assurances in this regard should be given to the industry.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** This is very much a matter for the court, which deals as it thinks fit with each matter that arises.

**Mr. Stevens:** I believe that Mr. Brown is referring to the case, as his speech in the House the other night indicated, where a B class fisherman has his licence suspended. He can go back to work and does not have to worry about the suspension, whereas there is definite injustice in the case of a professional fisherman who earns his living full-time and to whom the suspension would be a serious blow.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The Minister has said that it would be up to the court to decide what the penalty should be. However, if the holder of a class A licence loses that licence, he loses his livelihood, whereas if the holder of a class B licence loses his licence he can return to work. Surely, if we are to embark on a law enforcement programme, as the Minister has implied, he should be able to consider this matter in relation to penalty. Those people who depend on the industry for their livelihood want to see some guidelines regarding penalties.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The honourable member is giving me a tall order, suggesting that we should legislate for two classes of offender. However, the court system would not wear that. We would merely dispense with class B licences. It would be irresponsible of me to say that we could dictate to the courts in that manner.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** It seems to me that an anomaly exists in relation to the law enforcement system. I am not asking too much of the Minister, who could investigate the form of penalty system. Surely, a penalty could be devised in respect of a professional fisherman who depends on fishing for his livelihood, compared to a class B licence holder who does not depend on fishing for his livelihood.

The member for Mallee can shake his head; I do not know what is wrong with him. Surely, if the same offence is committed by two types of fisherman, the matter of penalty could be examined. I am merely asking the Minister to assure the Committee that he will examine the matter.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Director has a comment to make.

**Mr. Stevens:** I think Mr. Brown is suggesting that the penalty for taking under-sized fish should be, say, \$200 for a class A licence holder and that, if a class B licence holder commits the same offence, he is out.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes, that could be.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** That would be about the limit to which one could go.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** That would be all that you would need to do.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes, it would be most helpful.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** My question relates to the tribunal issuing new fishing licences. Was this an election

commitment by the Liberal Party; what is the background behind the adoption of that commitment; and what has changed in background to force the Minister and his colleagues to think again in relation to this matter? If I may, I will answer the question myself in my own way and invite the Minister to say whether my answer is a fair one.

It seems to me that this was an election commitment by the Liberal Party and that that Party's concern in having this matter placed under the jurisdiction of a tribunal rather than the Director involved the very wide powers that were attached to licences. I suppose that, if in some way the Government had acted to restrict the area of discretion available to the Director, one might well say that the reasons first brought forward for making the commitment were no longer relevant and that it would be quite reasonable for the Government to think again about that policy.

People who know the industry rather better than I do have put to me that the general thrust of the regulations under this Government has been to widen further the ambit of the powers available to the Director and, that being so, by the Liberal Party's own logic, the need for such a tribunal is thereby strengthened rather than weakened. I should be interested to hear something about what was said regarding this matter around the Cabinet table earlier this week.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The policy was as follows:

A tribunal will be responsible for the issue of new licences as well as for the transfer of existing licences. The tribunal shall apply the competency criteria laid down by the Government in the appropriate legislation and regulations. There has not been a great need to issue new licences in the fishery. To set up this tribunal would be expensive and, bearing in mind the present situation, it is not considered that that expense is warranted.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It has been outlined that this was an election promise by the Liberal Party. So, presumably, a need was perceived by the Liberal Party at that time. However, it is now being said that there is not a need. Is the Committee being told that a previous need has now disappeared?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There is no need at this time. The Government has been criticised all day for spending money. It would cost a few hundred thousand dollars to set up a tribunal. A judge, or someone like that, would have to be on the tribunal, and it would be quite expensive. Members have talked about the Director's powers, but an appeal lies to the Minister. Bearing in mind the financial restraints that obtain, this policy still stands.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It seems that the Liberal Party perceived a need before the last election and that it now realises that the perceived need did not then exist, does not exist now, and is not likely to exist in future. Therefore, the Liberal Party has acknowledged that that perceived need was inaccurate, wrong and not justified. The Minister has refused to answer the question because he perceives that there is no need now, and I accept that. The Minister is obviously going back on the commitment that was made. It is being left there in the papers so that it can perhaps be raised at some future time. At least this prevents the Government having to say that it had to abandon a policy, which is effectively what it has done.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Having explained the matter, I do not think that there is any need for me to explain it further. If that is the construction that the honourable member wishes to put on it, it must be correct.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It must be the correct interpretation. I turn now to the line, "Research, Law Enforcement, Administrative and Clerical Staff". If one refers to the programme papers at page 311 we see that the

amount allocated for industry liaison has increased from \$53 000 to \$91 000 (from the actual for 1979-80 to the proposed for 1980-81). I note that tied in with that increase there is no increase in the manpower involved in that department. How will this extra money be spent? I shudder to suggest that "industry liaison" suggests a grand round of cocktail parties. I know that the experience of the past Minister of Agriculture has shown the value of liaison with industry. How will the extra sum allocated here be spent in ways profitable to the Government, the people of South Australia and industry?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I take it that the honourable member is quoting from the programme papers at page 311?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not have the figures at my fingertips, so I will have the Director answer that question.

**Mr. Stevens:** Consultation takes place with all industry groups, but mainly with the Australian Fishing Industry Council and the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council. Much of the time of the senior management staff is apportioned to this field, which accounts for the relatively high cost of salaries. Travelling expenses are considerable, owing to the need for constant intrastate movements to discuss issues at a local level. That is all I have to say on this matter.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The increase from last year to this year was \$38 000. That is a figure of 74 per cent on last year's expenditure. What percentage of that large increase is taken up by salaries, and what percentage by travel?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will have to find that out for the honourable member and advise him.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the Minister for the offer to find out that information. I regret that he does not have it here. This programme document did outline those figures and I think that it should have been anticipated that an increase would be asked about.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** My officer has now indicated that he has that information. The Director will answer that question.

**Mr. Stevens:** The full cost of industrial liaison includes my own salary of \$33 000, Mr. Kirkegaard's salary of \$31 000, the Principal Management Officer of the Department of Fisheries, part of his salary, \$6 000, and the rest is made up of other officers within the department in "Contingencies".

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** That means that we have \$70 000 for three people's salaries and the remaining \$21 000 we are told is the salaries of the remaining officers; is that correct?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will find out and let the honourable member know.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** We have had two offers to find out; first, we were told that the information was not available and then it was available, and now we are told the information is not available again.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It will be made available.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I move:

That the sitting of the Committee be suspended until 9 p.m.

Motion carried.

*[Sitting suspended from 8.16 to 9.04 p.m.]*

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Is the remaining \$21 000 a salary component?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Director advises me that during the adjournment his officers have been able to reconcile the totals.

**Mr. Dadds:** The salary portion of the \$91 000 provides \$33 000 for the Director; \$31 000 for the Assistant Director; \$6 000 for a proportion of the salary of the Principal Fisheries Management Officer; \$4 000 which is a portion of the salary of a project officer who is engaged on a review of the Fisheries Act and Regulations, and the balance is for contingencies.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It seems that the entire salary of Mr. Stevens is provided from the industry liaison allocation. Is that correct?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Yes.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am amazed. Mr. Stevens is the Director of the Department of Fisheries. His function would cover a much wider ambit than just liaison with industry. Liaison with industry is an important part of his job—it should be, and we support that—but to expect all of his salary to be recouped from that line alone seems to give an undue emphasis to his position. How was the \$53 000 allocated last year broken down?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask my officers to comment.

**Mr. Stevens:** I cannot give the exact breakdown. I shall be happy to try and do so, but it certainly did not include the salary of the Director, as there was no Director last year. Most of the increase is the salary of the Director for this year.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** We are eventually ascertaining the basic cause of the increase. Initially I was told that the increase involved salary and travel expenses. Now one finds that most of the increase is the apportionment of the Director's salary to that line. It is unfortunate that his entire salary comes from this one line and I cannot understand that justification. Will the Minister comment on the need for that apportionment? It is unfortunate that we could not have had that information at the start of what has been a long series of questions on that one line.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It is early days in this form of Budget discussion. Hopefully we will learn from this experiment, and things will be better next year.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I agree that we are all learning: some are learning more than others, and some are learning about others in a way that is surprising; nevertheless, it is a learning experience and is valuable to that end. Why does the Minister believe it is wise to apportion the entire salary of the Director under "Industry Liaison" rather than under a more general heading to cover the more general purposes of the Department of Fisheries?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There are probably reasons for it and I will ask Mr. Dadds to explain the reasons to the Committee and the member.

**Mr. Dadds:** I refer to page 311 of the programme papers. The member will notice that the components of the Policy Formation and Regulatory Review Programme include industry liaison and Commonwealth/State relations. The description of the Director's salary and the Assistant Director's salary go under "Industry Liaison" as a very broad function of classification. It is purely a conceptual arrangement. The functions of the Director are apportioned to the Policy Formation and Regulatory Review Programme and the normal day-to-day affairs of the Director of Fisheries.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not doubt what the Director does and I accept that the job involves not only industry liaison. I am questioning whether it is wise to put it under industry liaison, when the position is much wider. I should have thought it would be easy, in drawing up this document, to have a special segment relating to the overall department.

I lament the fact that the Minister was not able to make those comments, because the prime office in fisheries is in

question. If the Minister does not know exactly where the Director's position fits into the financial accounting, that is lamentable. Of all the officers in the department, this is the one whose position the Minister should have an understanding about. An officer of minor ranking may not be personally known to the Minister in terms of job specification and how he fits into the scheme of things, and how his salary is financed.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I understand the member's lamentations and the clear and concise way he has expressed them. However, these papers have effective reflection only on the portfolios of the Premier and Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Some work had been done on the Department of Fisheries. I am surprised that it was accurate, because generally it has not been accurate. There was some dovetailing into work done on the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that the member is charitable. Drawing up this document is a big job, and next year the bits and pieces will not be so cluttered.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It is obviously lamentations for the member for Salisbury and lamingtons for Mrs. Joh Bjelke-Petersen. It is for the Minister to say what is the role of his Director and where the salary should be placed in the Budget documents. Like the member for Mitcham, I find the Minister a very nice chap and I do my best to tell my constituents that there is no way that the new Director will be making policy for the department. I say that the Minister will be making the decisions and the department will be carrying them out. However, I am delighted that none of my constituents are here tonight, because they would take me to task and tell me what rubbish I had been talking. Every question has been passed to the Director. Some of them are questions of policy and should not be put to the Director.

The Minister himself ought to be prepared to answer those questions. That is the point that the member for Salisbury was making: when the Committee asks about the position of the Director's salary in the Budget papers, it ought to be answered by the Minister. It is not good enough to tell us that the Treasurer, the Director of Industrial Affairs, or some other politician prepared these documents for the Committee's consideration. The documents dealing with the Department of Fisheries are his responsibility and no-one else's. If they are accurate, we are delighted to hear that. If they are inaccurate, again it is the Minister's responsibility, and he cannot blame anyone else. I am not taking over the areas of questioning by the member for Salisbury but if the Minister makes some attempt to answer the questions and has difficulty, we will understand his handing the question over to his departmental advisers. However, he should answer questions on policy.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I could, but I will not, take objection to the outburst by the honourable member. He and some of his colleagues have been working at this for months. If they wish to do that, good luck to them. If the honourable member looks at page 57 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9, he will find that Department of Fisheries salaries and wages are paid under special accounts. The Director of Fisheries appears there and his proposed salary is \$33 110. I repeat that the Estimates of Resource Allocation is a provisional document. It ill behoves the honourable member to say I do not know where I am going. The Government has introduced programme performance budgeting because it affords, through the Estimates Committees, the opportunity to bring into this Chamber the officers who are working in the department who are experts in their field. It is a service to members

and to the Parliament, and it ill behoves the honourable member to make the statement that he has just made.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out to honourable members that the official document used in the Committee is, as the Minister has just stated, Parliamentary Paper No. 9. At the outset of the Committee's proceedings, it was pointed out that the document we know as the programme papers is provisional and is only indicative: it is not an accurate account. The official document is the Estimates of Expenditure, Parliamentary Paper No. 9. I have allowed considerable latitude on this matter, but I now ask any member speaking to quote the line to which he is speaking and to keep to that line.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am speaking to the line "Research, Law Enforcement, Administrative and Clerical Staff", the same line to which I addressed myself previously. I have to come back to this yellow book.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member can refer to the yellow book, or programme papers, but I point out that it is not the official document of the Committee.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It has become quite clear to us that it is by no means official in any way. I take the point made by the Minister and I look forward, if this is the format to be followed next year (and at this stage I will not say whether or not that would be a wise decision), and can expect within the Minister of Fisheries line, to having information provided to us in the programme papers which is more correct than it seems to be this year.

I accept that this had to be done in a hurry and that much of the information in the Estimates of Resource Allocation should be treated with the proverbial grain of salt. However, I now refer to the departmental support services programme, on which \$300 000 is to be spent this year compared to \$131 000 spent last year. According to the official papers, this relates to an increase from nine employees to 11 employees. The sum of \$169 000 is indeed a large increase for a net increase of only two employees, and I should be interested to know how that extra money is being spent, other than for the salaries of two people.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We will have to consult the manpower lists and equate them to the amounts listed. It will be a long exercise.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Is the Minister saying that that is being done now?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I am asking the officers to give me that information.

**Mr. Dadds:** The predicted increase of \$169 000 can be attributed to the following. I refer, first, to the salaries of four additional staff. The figures in the programme papers are averages. The four additional staff are expected to be recruited by November, so that seven-twelfths of a full year's costs are provided for. Also, \$74 000 is provided for the purchase of motor vehicles, this having been previously provided for in the estimates for the Department of Agriculture. The figure also involves establishment expenses as a result of setting up the new department, and an increase in normal administrative costs, such as travelling and accommodation.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** As the \$74 000 for the purchase of motor vehicles previously came under the aegis of the Department of Agriculture, presumably there will be an equivalent matching point in that department's figures.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** You will have to ask the Minister of Agriculture about that.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I will.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** One of the objectives involved is to provide equitable distribution of the fish resource to cater for the specific needs of a variety of interests in the community. Bearing that in mind, will the Minister tell the Committee what is the policy regarding the management

of the St. Vincent Gulf prawn fishing industry?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The story regarding St. Vincent Gulf is not a happy one. There are a number of authority holders and permit holders in the southern area, and we are looking at an arrangement whereby permit holders will be able to fish until the end of the year. There may have to be a closure in that area.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** If it is expected that there will be a closure of the Investigator Strait prawn fishery at the end of this year so that the prawn nursery supplementing the St. Vincent Gulf fishery can be more fruitful, does it also mean that those prawn fishermen operating under Commonwealth licences will have those licenses taken away?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** We have no power to take away Commonwealth licences. With regard to closures, we can only operate in those areas within the State franchise.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I understand that the Minister accepts that the activities of people holding prawn licences or permits in Investigator Strait have a detrimental effect on the St. Vincent Gulf prawn fishery.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** It appears that there has been a draw down on stocks.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** As a result, the South Australian Government will be considering at the end of this season whether or not it will provide fishermen with the right to fish in the new prawn season. What representations has the Minister made to his Federal colleague pointing out to him the deleterious effect upon our fishing industry that Commonwealth licence holders are having? Has he asked his Federal colleague to do something in line with the action that the Minister himself may have to take?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will be having discussions with the Federal Minister in the near future. It is not for me to tell him what to do with his Commonwealth fishing licences, and it is not for him to tell me what to do with ours.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I take issue with that—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the member to tie his question to a line. He has referred to the matter of policy, but has had much latitude.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to the line "Research, Law Enforcement, Administrative and Clerical Staff" on page 57 of the Estimates. I am sure that that is the appropriate line for this matter to be debated under. I take issue with the Minister: it is his responsibility to tell his Federal colleague of the effect that Commonwealth licence holders have upon the South Australian fishery.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I indicate to the honourable member that that line deals with salaries and wages and related payments.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It deals with law enforcement and research. Are you telling me, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot debate this matter under that line?

**Mr. Lewis:** You can ask questions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I am asking the member to relate his comments to the line.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I take the comment of the member for Mallee that it is not a matter of debating but it is a matter of asking questions. This is an important part of the Minister's administration of the Fisheries Department. Part of the department's responsibility is to ensure, as one of its objectives, that the resource in South Australia is spread as equitably as possible amongst the South Australian fishermen, and to ensure that this occurs it is imperative that those people who fish in our waters and who are not holders of South Australian authorities should have explained clearly to them what effect they have upon the fishery. Obviously, that is a matter for the State fisheries administration.

I take issue with the Minister when he says that he cannot tell his Federal colleague what he ought to do with his fishermen. I am asking the Minister to discuss with his Federal colleague the effect that those fishermen have on South Australian fishermen. Will the Minister ask his Federal colleague to take similar action to that which the South Australian Minister intends to take? That is clearly a matter of administering the fishing stocks in South Australia. It is of considerable importance. I believe it would be difficult for the Minister to justify reducing the activity of authority or permit holders under his control whilst at the same time Federal licence holders were permitted to continue their activities which are obviously affecting one of our most vital industries.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The member is talking about people who have Commonwealth fishing licences and who fish in Commonwealth waters, not in State waters.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We have about 30 minutes remaining today and other votes have not been considered. Secondly, some members who are not members of the Committee have been waiting a fair length of time to speak. I cannot order members, but I ask them to consider this matter.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I refer to the transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. The Liberal Party policy statement at the election last year announced that there would be an increase in research into the pilchard and leather-jacket fisheries. I cannot find any reference to that in these documents. I would appreciate information on whether that promise has been carried out and where we can find the information.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** There have been dropline investigations into this area and I ask the Director to indicate the success or extent of them.

**Mr. Stevens:** The South Australian Government and the Federal Government made available \$5 000, being \$2 500 from the State and a similar amount from the Commonwealth, for a dropline survey in the South-East, off Robe. The major areas that the State will look at are through the Fishing Industry Research Account, a Commonwealth account, under which \$850 000 to \$900 000 a year is made available Australia-wide for research into new fisheries. This year, only \$2 500 has been allocated.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Is that part of the transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund?

**Mr. Stevens:** Yes.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Another election promise by the Liberal Party last year was that it would build a marine laboratory and regional laboratories to help the development and study of fisheries. What progress has been made with that and is it covered under the transfer to fisheries research? If not, what other item is it under?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** These matters are under investigation but no allocation has been made in that area.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I refer to page 312 of the yellow book, under the heading "Licensing and registration programme". There has been a revenue increase of \$6 000, which is a real decrease in money made available for the programme. The new legislation that the House debated recently gives the Director power to impose conditions on any licence. How can this activity be undertaken with reduced capacity? The amateur fishing activity is continually increased, yet we have a reduction in real terms for the licensing and registration programme. Revenue is now \$119 000 and was \$113 000 last year, which is a reduction in real terms in connection with what one expects to be a busier departmental programme.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I will ask Mr. Dadds to give the figure.

**Mr. Dadds:** The figure provided in the document is for salaries only of the Licensing Branch in the department, and the 1980-81 figures proposed reflect the salaries in force at 30 June 1980. Therefore, they do not take into account any inflation of salaries over 1980-81. There is no increase in the number of staff involved.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I thank Mr. Dadds for that information. So, although we could expect an increased workload we are not increasing the number of people who will be doing that work. There has been a delay in the issue of fishing licences this year. Can the Minister tell the Committee when it is proposed that all of the renewals will be completed, and when the conditions that his Director is able to impose on them will be completed?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I understand that the licences are now being forwarded. There was a delay in the issuing of them but they are now under way. I will ask the Director to bring us up to date on the matter.

**Mr. Stevens:** As at Monday there were some 50 A and B class fishermen who had not completed the form that we expected them to complete, registering the gear that they expected to use. There have been some 500 A and B class scale fishing licences issued over the last three or four days, and I believe that some 50 people have paid by cheque and have had their licence issued to them. As for rock lobster fishing licences, they are expected to be issued at the end of October, abalone licences within the next two weeks, prawn licences within the next two weeks, and Lakes and Coorong licences within the next five weeks.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I point out to the Minister that the delay in the renewal of licences has been of considerable concern within the fishing industry. As the Director has the power to impose conditions on licences at will, in future will the fishermen themselves be advised of what the Director has in mind, so that, when they receive their licences with the conditions applying, it does not hit them like a ton of bricks, to coin a phrase. That is what is happening at the moment. The individual fisherman has no idea of what conditions will apply to his licence until he receives the renewal. I ask that that unsatisfactory practice not apply in future.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The Director has been running his feet off in attending meetings. For four or five days I was with him on the West Coast. This matter was discussed fully. I do not doubt what the honourable member says. However, it is no fault of the Director. He has been most active in this area. There must be some breakdown in communication. The Director has been amongst fishermen in fishing ports and places where fishermen congregate.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** As we have made some progress, I refer back to where we started—research. Has any research been done by the department, particularly into the oyster industry, which is active in the Coffin Bay area? For some years, this industry has experienced much difficulty in relation to its administration and has had a tremendous amount of opposition, particularly in relation to the Hawkesbury River industry. Even earlier, much difficulty was experienced with the Japanese oyster industry.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** But the oysters aren't as big.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I challenge that statement.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I suggest that the member for Glenelg ought to make a few inquiries into the industry at Coffin Bay. Any research that could be afforded to the industry by the department would indeed be welcomed and desirable. It seems to me that, if we are to venture into a research programme and a managed fishery programme, we ought to do something in this area. Will the Minister

say whether any research has been done into the oyster industry and, if it has, what type of research has been done?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** The department has not conducted any research at Coffin Bay. However, a programme relating to St. Kilda has been operating for two years, and it is expected that it will last for another two years. Its objective is to assist in a revised I.C.I. design and operation of a hatchery for the Pacific oyster, to develop suitable techniques for growing oysters to a marketable size.

I also understand that the progress made on this project has been quite good. A couple of people are setting up oyster farms, although they have had much difficulty in obtaining spat. I refer, for example, to Wallaroo. The honourable member, and indeed the member for Flinders, have spoken to me about this matter. As this is an important resource, I will ask the Director to make any further comments that he thinks will help the Committee.

**Mr. Stevens:** No specific research has been conducted at Coffin Bay, although we are aware of what is happening there and liaise with them. Whether we are in a position to allocate resources to assist at Coffin Bay, I could not answer. However, I could follow up that matter and give the Committee a considered reply.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I appreciate the Director's reply. However, the Minister touched on a pretty delicate subject in relation to the oyster industry when he referred to spat. Originally (if my memory serves me correctly), the procuring of spat was a major problem when the industry at Coffin Bay was set up. It seems to me that, if we are fair dinkum about research into the fishing industry, the department would benefit the industry considerably if the issue of spat was taken up by it and pursued along the lines that I have suggested.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I would like the Director to enlarge on the question of spat.

**Mr. Stevens:** I am not fully conversant with the facts, but part of the trouble is that Tasmania and New South Wales jealously guard the spat that they themselves are able to produce.

They have not been very co-operative or generous in allowing us to obtain such spat but, as I said before, we will endeavour to look into the matter I have raised and see whether we can be of assistance.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am concerned that no provision is made this year for the marine laboratory and regional laboratories, because, as I mentioned, this was Liberal policy. This financial year will take us through to next year. That, then, will mean that we will have really very little time, perhaps one full year and a half, to the next State election. As it was an election promise, does that mean we can anticipate in the line next year an increase that will take this into account: in other words, that this vote can be expected to jump quite significantly next year, as it surely must do, as it was a policy promise? An allocation must appear, surely, if that was the case.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** These are initiatives the industry needs. I have pointed out to the honourable member that at this time, other than discussions on these laboratories, we have not taken any initiatives to construct them, because it is a question of the availability of funds. I am sure that this is not an unfamiliar thing to the honourable member. Some of the things we have been talking about today involve a priority of funding, and priorities that have to be given. I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this area, but I am not in a position to say that X amount of dollars will be put on next year's Budget Estimates, if that is what the honourable member is asking me.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I infer from the Minister's answer that that particular policy statement has a low priority and that, when it comes to assessment, by virtue of the funds and resources available generally and because it has a low priority, it will not be considered this year. That at least answers why this policy has not been implemented, and we will remember that next year as we go through all the policy statements with regard to research and the general area of the department's promotional activities, including the very aspect of a regional laboratory trying to keep contact with fishermen around the State.

The fact that that has been decided as being of low priority concerns me a bit, because there is another area of the department that is obviously an extension programme designed to go out to fishermen, namely, the education and publicity programme of the department mentioned on page 315. I am relating this again to the "Research, Law Enforcement, Administrative, and Clerical Staff" line again. I understand earlier this year, following a survey on the matter, the *Cleland Report on the South-East Rock Lobster Fishing Industry* was critical of the department's ability to explain its policies to fishermen.

Indeed, I understand that that report suggested that many fishermen, by virtue of economic circumstances, had been forced to leave school at an early stage and perhaps had not had the opportunity to develop their reading skills and, therefore, were not able to take advantage of the print medium. I understand, by contrast, that much of the department's promotional publicity material involves the print medium. That, as an extension programme, strikes me as being unwise if the bulk of it is in the print medium, when one of the department's own reports has suggested that fishermen are not achieving full value from that promotional material.

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** Fisheries liaison committees are set up for all fisheries. They have liaison with the Director and his department. I can appreciate the expressions of the member and his ambition to hold the Government to everything in its policy; perhaps we will learn something from him; perhaps we should have been doing that in hindsight. These initiatives are not lost sight of and the Director has had much discussion to that end. In fact, I attended a South-East rock lobster meeting at Robe last week. It was a fruitful meeting and the industry, together with the department, is looking at ways and means of improving the industry. Examination is being made of a buy-back scheme. That must be financed. It was believed in the South-East that a number of vessels should come out of the industry. We do not regard the industry as a cinderella industry by any means. Reference was made to the laboratory and fisheries liaison management committees, which have a big input to the industry and the Director. I do not know whether the Director wants to add anything to what I have said, but he and his officers are having much contact with people in the South-East.

**Mr. Stevens:** The matter of conversing with the industry and trying to explain the policies of the Government is important and cannot be done just through the SAFIC magazine or through the written word. As the Minister stated, management liaison committees have been established for all the fisheries. It is through that forum that we try to explain the changes that are happening in the fisheries policies and regulations.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Before I call on the honourable member for Salisbury, I appeal to members and indicate that there are other members waiting to ask questions. By agreement, preference should always be given for the call to elected members of the Committee. Other members are likely therefore to participate later in the examination of a

vote, and care should be taken to prevent repetitive questions.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Perhaps a brief comment should be made on that. There are back-benchers who have not had the opportunity and who have questions they wish to ask. I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has no fewer than 41 questions he wants to ask on marine and harbours matters. They are important questions. I hope the Minister will indicate that he will answer those questions if they are put on notice. What disturbs me about the way things have gone is that we have had for most of the session this evening an empty Government bench, save for one member—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member has the call to ask questions of the Minister. Has the member a question? This is what has been happening—there has been much time wasted in this type of discussion. If the member has a question he should ask it.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I was really indicating the number of Government members who were interested in fisheries. My question relates to the question asked earlier. Can we have an acceptance that the print medium is not the best medium for money to be spent in the promotional budget of the Ministry of fisheries? Are other avenues being looked at?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I find it strange that the member suggests that fishermen are illiterate. The gentlemen at Robe were very skilled in putting their views and they were right up with the articles in the SAFIC publication and the one from Victoria. It has not been my experience that fishermen do not get value from the print medium. The fishermen generally support the SAFIC magazine. One man had many magazines that had splendid information in them.

**Mr. Blacker:** In relation to funds being collected in fishing fees, it has been suggested that \$573 000 has been received and that 10 per cent was requested by the industry involving fishermen. How much is attributed to research as a percentage of fees collected?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** I do not think it is 10 per cent of \$573 000. I think it was said that 10 per cent on prawn fees and abalone fees had been requested. That is a matter of discussion between the industry and myself. There are new abalone fees.

**Mr. Blacker:** Does a set percentage go direct to the research fund?

**Mr. Stevens:** It is stated on page 96 of the Auditor-General's Report that this fund is credited with an amount equal to one-half of all charges or fees, with some exceptions, payable under the Act.

**Mr. Blacker:** There is an increase of \$829 000 in the transfer to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. Is any of this money going into research in the area of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant? If so, what results have been noted to this stage? It has been suggested that contamination of marine life is occurring at present. Has the department, as a result of the existence of the fund, found out about this? If not, what is it doing to see that information is collated before large-scale industrial development takes place?

**The Hon. W. A. Rodda:** In regard to the submission to Dow, it has been agreed that there will be further input on this, looking at the effect on marine life in that area and notwithstanding the announcement that no action will be taken in that area in the near future. I will ask Mr. Stevens to comment.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It being 10 p.m., discussion on the following votes is concluded: Fisheries; Department of

Fisheries (Loan Estimates); Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous; Marine and Harbors; Department of Marine and Harbors (Loan Estimates); and Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 10.1 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 8 October at 11 a.m.