

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 15 October 1981

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B**Chairman:**

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

The Hon. Peter Duncan
 Mr S. G. Evans
 Mr G. F. Keneally
 Mr G. R. A. Langley
 Mr I. P. Lewis
 Mr J. K. G. Oswald
 Mr R. J. Randall
 The Hon. J. D. Wright

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Police, \$90 466 000

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L. B. Draper, Commissioner of Police, Police Department.

Mr R. A. Henry, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr F. E. Bowering, Finance Officer, Police Department.

Mr T. J. Churchett, Buildings and Property Officer, Police Department.

The CHAIRMAN: At this stage it may be advisable to come to a decision on the programme for the day. Has any member a suggestion about the programme, because 10 votes are to be dealt with today?

Mr KENEALLY: The Opposition is aware of the 10 votes that will be taken and of the sensitive nature of many of them. There will be substantial questioning. We thought that the debate in regard to the Chief Secretary lines would continue until 5 p.m. or 6 p.m., but that is also dependant upon questioning by Government members or other members. The only undertaking that we could contemplate is that Fisheries and Marine and Harbors votes would not take place before the dinner adjournment.

Mr EVANS: It would be preferable to pick an earlier time in regard to the Chief Secretary lines initially, with an understanding of seeing how we are going but without deliberately trying to delay it until 5 p.m. We are allowing much time for one line and little time for other lines. It would be wiser for the Committee to pick a time, say, 3 p.m., to finish the Chief Secretary's line and the Committee could then make an assessment.

The CHAIRMAN: There has been a certain flexibility in the arrangement of the Committee in these matters. Previously there has been a suggested time, but it is fair to say that we have not adhered strictly to it, although I have brought the time to the attention of the Committee and I have endeavoured to follow that timing.

Mr KENEALLY: The Opposition does not intend to accept 3 o'clock as the deadline for the Chief Secretary's vote, even though the member for Fisher has said that that deadline is flexible. If Government members wish to forgo their right to ask questions, we assure them that the Chief Secretary's vote will be completed more quickly than otherwise. If that is the undertaking they are giving, we

appreciate that and will see how the proceedings go. If Government members intend to share questioning of the Chief Secretary with the Opposition and other members, then I think my earlier estimates will be much nearer the mark.

Mr EVANS: Government members are not forgoing their right to ask questions, because they have as much right as any other group or individual within the Committee or outside the Committee. We have suggested that there is nothing wrong with setting 3 o'clock as the time. If at 3 o'clock there are a substantial number of questions to be asked of the Minister and his advisers, we can review the situation. We are not saying it will definitely be 3 o'clock, but surely we should try to programme ourselves and keep questions to a minimum limit necessary to obtain the information required. We may achieve that by 3 o'clock, but if we do not we can review the situation at that time.

Mr KENEALLY: The Opposition will try to adhere to the time table that I have announced. The Fisheries and Marine and Harbor votes will most likely be dealt with after dinner, and the Chief Secretary vote will occupy all the preceding time of the sitting.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair cannot see any conflict. The member for Stuart has suggested that the Chief Secretary's vote should continue until the dinner break. The member for Fisher has suggested that at, say, 3 o'clock we should look at the matter and, if necessary, we will continue with that vote. I see no real conflict. If any member of the Committee indicates that he wishes to ask further questions, the Chair has no option but to continue to call members.

Mr EVANS: Mr Chairman, I accept that time table on the basis that all members have an equal right to ask questions right through until that time. We understand that all members can ask questions on any topic relating to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: As a result of these discussions it appears that the Minister will not need his advisers for the Fisheries vote until at least 3 o'clock this afternoon, and possibly later. I point out that all questions will be directed to the Minister and, if he wishes, his officers can give further information. The lines in Parliamentary Paper No. 9 are found on pages 57 and 58. It has been the practice of the Committee to go through the lines in order, to keep some semblance of order. However, that does not preclude any member of the Committee from referring back to a line in a particular vote.

Mr KENEALLY: I understand that it is the procedure that an opening statement can be made in relation to the general thrust of the Opposition's line in these procedures?

The CHAIRMAN: That is so. If the honourable member for Stuart wishes to do that, he has the call now.

Mr KENEALLY: I do. We have reached the last day of the second year of the Estimates Committees, as we now know them. It has been my experience, particularly in viewing the proceedings this year, that the Ministers have approached the proceedings in various ways. We have Ministers from whom it is more difficult to extract information than it is to extract teeth; and we have other Ministers who are very effusive and will speak for a considerable length of time and say even less. It would be our intention today to try and get as much information as we can about the Chief Secretary's lines and we are hoping that the Chief Secretary will be one of the Ministers whose intention it is to make the system work and so provide the answers that he can provide today and quickly follow up with answers that he is unable to provide today.

Last year you, Sir, will recall, as will the Chief Secretary, that a very important line of questioning that we wished to proceed with was disallowed because of the Royal Commission that took place at that time. The Chief Secretary's

lines have been matters of considerable controversy in South Australia over the last many months. This could be either that the Chief Secretary is just unlucky because of the nature of the responsibilities he has, or it could be that the Chief Secretary's administration leaves a bit to be desired, or it could be balance of both. They are some issues that we would hope to pursue.

The first major vote is the Police, and we are all aware that recently there has been some bad publicity for the Police Force about activities that have taken place within the Force. We think it is a matter of public importance that questions should be asked of the Minister about the Police Force and its activities. This is not to suggest that the Opposition believes that there is intrinsically anything necessarily wrong with the Police Force. We repeat what we have said on many occasions: we in South Australia are very fortunate in having the best Police Force in Australia. Nevertheless, we along with the Government, I am sure, and the Police Commissioner, I am certain, want that high reputation to be maintained, and the best way to ensure that is to convince the public generally in South Australia that everything that can be done is being done to ensure that the high standards apply. The Police Force, as we know, can only be effective when it has the confidence of the community. It has that confidence now, but I think there has been some publicity that has reflected on that confidence, and we would be happy to ask questions of the Minister that will enable information to be provided that will retain that confidence, or regain the confidence if, in fact, that needs to be done.

My first question to the Minister is in relation to a topical subject at the moment: random breath tests. Is the Government content with the procedures that are to apply to random breath tests? My questions particularly relate to the taking of offenders who are over 0.08 to the nearest police station to be searched and, if necessary, kept in the police station (in gaol, in effect) for that night and let out in the morning. There has been some publicity about this and I understand that the police procedures are there to be followed. What I am anxious to find out is the Government's policy in this matter. I would ask the Minister whether he could tell the Committee whether or not the Government is content that the procedures that have been given wide publicity are, in fact, appropriate and are to be followed?

The Hon W. A. Rodda: The honourable member expresses some fear that common sense will not prevail. I say in all sincerity that common sense prevails in the South Australian Police Force. Random breath testing will start today. The strength of the squad will be 18 persons, and three teams will operate on a two-shift basis. Two teams will be located in the city and one will be located in the country. In response to a radio programme which caused some concern, I can say that body searches where clothes are removed will not occur. Body searches will be made only in exceptional circumstances, such as when the police have reason for going to that length. I emphasise that common sense will prevail. Persons will not be detained if they have someone to pick them up or bail them out, and every person will be entitled to a telephone call. That is a broad parameter of what will obtain. The general approach will probably not satisfy the honourable member, but that is the general thrust of it.

Mr KENEALLY: As I understand it, there is no requirement to arrest placed on the police. They can take the person's name and address and a summons will be sent later. As I understand the procedure in Victoria, if a person is marginally above .05 the police can require that person to sit in their car for an hour or so until the level reduces below the legal limit and then allow him to take his vehicle home. Such people are later summonsed and will have to

appear before a court. In Victoria, I understand that the police will, on occasions, if a phone is available, phone relatives of the offender asking them to pick up the offender or, if the offender has sufficient cash on his person, the police will order a taxi to take him home. It is only in exceptional cases that they arrest a person and take him into the police station.

We are not suggesting that people charged for driving under the influence or people who refuse to respond to a reasonable request ought not to be taken back to the police station. However, a number of options are available to the police. We want to know whether the Government's policy is that all options will be available and followed. We know that it is the Government that sets the policy under which the police operate. We are not denying that the police have an enormous amount of common sense in these situations. That common sense that the police display would be reinforced by a clear policy statement of the Government. I ask the Minister whether it is the Government's view that the procedures that I understand apply in Victoria are a suitable basis for application in South Australia.

The Hon W. A. Rodda: The policy will be that, if an offender can be released into the custody of a responsible person, he will not be arrested but will be summonsed. With regard to the question of Victoria, I am not a full bottle on what they do there, but that will be the policy in South Australia.

Mr KENEALLY: I have asked two questions: whether the police will have discretion to allow somebody who is marginally over the limit to sit in his or her vehicle until the legal limit is reached (which I understand can take anything up to an hour or an hour and a half); and whether the police in South Australia will allow offenders who have cash on their person to call a taxi to take them home, rather than take them to a police station.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What the honourable member is saying is common sense. The answer is 'Yes'.

Mr KENEALLY: We need to be more specific about examples that could occur. The Committee ought to know clearly in what circumstances people will be taken back to a police station, charged and kept in custody. There should be clear examples of what circumstances need to apply before a body search takes place. These matters are of critical concern to the community of South Australia. This is an opportune time for the appropriate spokesman of the Government to explain clearly to the public what will take place. We can be sure of what will take place only if the Minister gives clear examples of what needs to apply before a person will be taken back to the police station, charged and kept in custody. There needs to be clear examples of the circumstances that need to apply before a body search takes place.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I thought I made clear at the outset that body searches will take place only in circumstances where the police have reason to do that; they will be exceptional circumstances. The honourable member is looking for specific circumstances. If an offender is bridging on an offending reading and can be placed in the custody of a responsible person, he will not be arrested. If the reading of an offender is such that it is beyond the pale, he will be arrested. The honourable member has asked me to give specific instances. Random breath testing has not started yet, and I cannot give specific circumstances, as the honourable member well knows.

Mr KENEALLY: I am absolutely amazed at that reply. The Government of South Australia sets the rules by which the community has to live. It is not the Police Commissioner or the Police Department that ought to establish what circumstances in which certain procedures will take place; surely that is the responsibility of the Government. We

have a new system of random breath testing imposed on the community of South Australia by the Parliament and Government of South Australia. The people in South Australia have a right to know in what circumstances arrests and body searches will take place.

The Minister said that it will be only in extreme circumstances, which means that the Government has absolutely no idea what circumstances need to apply. That is not good enough. That means it is placing all the responsibility on the police and, if any odium befalls anybody because of what takes place, the Government will wash its hands of it and say, 'That is the Police Department; we haven't made those sorts of decisions; we will investigate it if people are concerned.' That is what the Minister is saying: that is not good enough. We know the system is only starting today, but the Government should be clear in its own mind what it expects the Police Department to do and what it anticipates the people of South Australia, to whom the Government is responsible, will need to do.

I ask the Minister to be more explicit. I am not content (nor, I am sure, is the Committee) to be told that it will occur in extreme circumstances, if people are very drunk, or whatever. Surely it is not difficult for the Minister to tell the Committee exactly what the Government's policy is. If the Minister cannot do that, surely he should acknowledge that he cannot do so, and I suppose that the Committee will then have to act accordingly.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is being particularly nit-picking. He is putting up Aunt Sallies and expecting answers. The general policy is that no arrests will be made except in exceptional circumstances, although the honourable member said in extreme circumstances. I said that those exceptional circumstances will be well known to the police.

Mr KENEALLY: What about the community?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is being very persistent. If the community is going to be so concerned, it has a right to know. I said in a general statement that, if the offender can be placed in the custody of a responsible person, he will not be arrested. From what I know of the Victorian situation, the people there have become accustomed to the requirements of the law relating to random breath testing, and the system is working there.

I cannot give the honourable member specific instances, although I can give him the general thrust of what this scheme is all about. It has been introduced as a safety measure. Heaven knows, I state for my edification and that of the honourable member and everyone else in South Australia that I saw in this morning's press that alcohol is involved in about 40 per cent of serious accidents and in about 75 per cent of other accidents. That is why the Minister of Transport has introduced this scheme. As that Minister said, it is sunset legislation that has been introduced to save lives. I will not sit here and be nit-picked by the honourable member and be asked to give specific instances when I cannot do so. The shadow Minister should be a bit reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the Chair can, when a line is pursued, accept questions of a similar nature over and over again. The Minister has the right to answer questions as he sees fit.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Or to give no answer at all.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will give a liberal opportunity for the questioner to ask his question.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The interjection by the member for Elizabeth was not necessary.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister's enlightening reply shows clearly that the Government has no idea at all how the system will work in relation to police activities. The Minister

told the Committee in his last reply that, no matter how intoxicated one was, as long as one had someone else who could drive one home, one would be driven home. If that was not the case, one would be subjected to going to the police station, being searched and placed in custody. That seems to me to be grossly unfair. I understand that, if an offender has a sober person in the car with him, or if members of the family or friends are close by and can be contacted, he will be allowed to be driven home.

However, if an offender is not fortunate enough to have a sober passenger in the car with him or friends nearby who can be telephoned, he will be taken to the police station, searched and held in custody. Why is there this distinction? Does the Minister not consider that this is somewhat unjust to people who are unfortunate enough not to have such persons on tap to relieve them of the problem of going to the police station?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is raising not a Dorothy Dixier but an Aunt Sally. If the people about whom he speaks are unfortunate enough not to have someone to pick them up, it is quite clear. I covered that in my opening remarks. If someone can take them home, then they will be taken home. That is the general thrust.

Mr KENEALLY: The people taken home will not be searched.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member has an obsession about searching people. Surely he would have gleaned from my opening remarks that people will not be body searched. I refer to the unfortunate story that went through the State about two nights ago—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is true.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is not true, but this is what the Opposition is playing on. This is a responsible decision that has been taken to save lives in this State. The honourable member's last question was really to round off what he has been going on with since he started.

Mr EVANS: Are circumstances such that Parliament makes the law and departments are given the responsibility, whether it be the Police Department or any other department, to enact the law? What the Minister is saying is that, where a person is apprehended and found to be over the limit, and where the police believe it is unnecessary for that person to be taken to the station for any other purpose such as a blood test or for any other reason, and that person has a contact with whom that person or the police can make contact, that person will be allowed to go home. However, there may be circumstances where, even if the person can make contact that will allow him to get home without driving a motor vehicle, the police would have reason to take him back to the station for either a blood test or further questioning or for some other related matter, and the position is that body searches are very seldom undertaken but that the police must retain the right in circumstances at the time if they believe it is necessary, and that it is virtually impossible to prescribe any such circumstances until the police are confronted with them.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The short answer is 'Yes'. I think the honourable member said that, if there was a person who could be contacted, that person could go home. Exceptional circumstances could arise. We are not dealing with criminals *per se* but with the community of South Australia. The police have enough experience in these matters to make the judgment in the prosecution of their duties, and they will do that. In regard to the question, yes, they will.

Mr EVANS: The purpose of the legislation enacted by Parliament was to ensure that the wider section of the community could be protected from those people who are irresponsible enough to drive a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol and not being able to effectively control that vehicle and who could end up creating a missile to kill

or injure others. Will the police find it necessary at times when a person is found to be over the limit as a result of a breath test to take that person back to the station to have a blood test, or will the police only prosecute on the result of the breath test?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Some technical material is involved here and I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: The answer is that the legislation provides for a breath test, and it depends on the result of the test as to whether or not a person is charged with an offence following that test. There is no reference in the legislation to a blood test.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the Minister is so confident about the ability of the police to exercise this power reasonably, can he tell me why almost invariably in the past it has been the practice of the police to arrest people apprehended for driving under the influence or for exceeding .08 and not simply, as the Minister would have the Committee believe, to allow them to go home to be summonsed later? It seems to me that there is an extraordinary change of policy about to be implemented. I am pleased about that, but the suggestion of reasonableness certainly has not been apparent in the past in this matter.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What has happened hitherto is history, and we are now dealing with the new Act. That is my understanding and that is the way it will be carried out. I do not suppose that it minimises the broad spectrum if there is someone under the influence who attracts the attention of the police for driving under the influence, and that matter will be dealt with in regard to how the circumstances dictate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the Minister now believes that the reasonable course for the Police Department to take is not to arrest a person in the circumstances set out, does he believe that the department has not acted in a responsible manner in the past?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is a hypothetical question on which I will not comment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Has the Minister had the opportunity of reading the press reports and seeing the television interviews by a Ms Prue Goward, an ABC journalist. I refer to the two television programmes and the press reports where she talked about being arrested and taken to a police station. She talked about body searches and being searched in an intimate way. She talked about squat tests and how she finished up spending the night in gaol. Has the Minister read those reports? Are there any inconsistencies in those allegations by Ms Goward in regard to Government policy involved in this matter?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I saw the television segment two nights ago when Ms Goward, as she said herself, was carrying out a simulated test. She blew over the requirement—I think, .1—and she was told that she would be arrested and taken to police headquarters, which happened. She went on and made some statements there. A young lady did feel her over and felt her bodily, and said something else would happen.

I think last night's *Nationwide* programme put the matter in its true perspective. The Commissioner himself gave the South Australian public an assurance. Miss Goward gave an unfortunate version about what she believed could happen. I noticed she removed her rings and so on. I point out that Miss Goward is not a criminal, and neither are the majority of South Australians who unfortunately may come within the ambit of that situation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not believe that the Minister has adequately answered my question. Were there any inconsistencies in the allegations made by Miss Goward as they relate to the Government's policy? Did the simulated test that she was subjected to bear any resemblance

to the actual test? I would not be the only person in South Australia who now believes that the simulated test is the ordinary test conducted on an ordinary person who is not a criminal. Are Miss Goward's allegations correct? Are the procedures depicted on that programme normal procedures, and are they consistent with Government policy?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: If Miss Goward could have been placed into someone's custody she would not have been taken to headquarters. Having been taken to headquarters, she would be subjected to a search, and a further body search. I believe the young police woman who examined her said that she simply felt around her. That procedure is followed to locate concealed weapons and it is also to protect people from themselves when they are to be placed in the cells. It is not Government policy that an ordinary citizen with a blood alcohol reading over .08 should be placed in police cells. People will not be placed in the cells unless exceptional circumstances apply, and in that situation the police are competent to make that judgment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for informing the Committee that that will not apply, except in exceptional circumstances.

Mr Lewis: That was said earlier.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not want interference from the member for Mallee, either. Will the Minister inform this Committee, or if he so desires he can refer the question to the Police Commissioner, just what is meant by the term 'exceptional circumstances'? I believe that the people of South Australia have a right to know that, just as this Committee does.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: 'Exceptional circumstances', unfortunately, apply in relation to certain individuals in the community. That is why we have a Police Force and why we have regulations to meet those circumstances. The honourable member has asked a specific question, which I refer to the Commissioner. I point out that it is not Government policy but a practice of the Police Department.

Mr Draper: I am not sure what the honourable member means by the term 'body search'. I believe that he is referring to an anal search of a person's body. The 'exceptional circumstances' would apply when a police officer thought, on reasonable grounds, that an offender was concealing something which could be stolen property or evidence relating to the offence with which he had been charged.

I believe that Miss Goward has indicated that she used the wrong term when she said that she was subjected to an internal search. I understood her to mean a body search. In fact, she meant she was subjected to an intimate search. By her definition, that required her to remove her clothes. Even an intimate search, by her definition, is not the type of search that people charged with drink-driving offences are normally subjected to, unless certain circumstances apply. I am not in a position to give concrete examples of those circumstances, because that must be left to the discretion of individual police officers. It is part of a police officer's duty to use his discretion as to what type of search is necessary for the protection of a prisoner who is to be placed in the cells. That is what I meant when I stated publicly that it is only in exceptional circumstances that a person charged with drink-driving offences would be subjected to what she termed an intimate search. A person charged with that type of offence is normally subjected to a physical search of the pockets and any other crevices in their clothing.

Mr Millhouse: Unlike my friends in the Labor Party, I have supported random breath tests for a long time, and I advocated their introduction. I regret that they were not introduced earlier. I am very strongly in favour of random breath testing. I am sure we all realise that the system will

not work and, in fact, the police will suffer unless the community is prepared to accept random breath testing and the way in which the testing is administered, and the consequences facing a person found to be over the limit. I saw the programme referred to on Tuesday night. I apologise, Mr Chairman, I suppose I could have been here listening to the Committee, but, with very great respect, most of the Committee sessions have been so inordinately dull that I have not stayed. Therefore, I happened to see the programme referred to. In one way that segment was very unfortunate. In another way it was a damned good thing.

It was very unfortunate because it has created a great deal of indignation and anxiety amongst members of the public. Yesterday my office received many protests as did I personally. One of the strongest protests came after last night's segment when the Commissioner appeared on *Nationwide*. It was unfortunate because it gave a false impression about what is going to happen. It was fortunate in that the irresistible inference that I have drawn from the Chief Secretary's remarks this morning is that the Government's policy was hastily revised, and I hope that occurred after consultation with the Commissioner of Police yesterday. Perhaps the Chief Secretary or the Commissioner can confirm or deny that what we saw on Tuesday night was what had been intended to happen in this situation.

It appeared to me that what happened to Miss Goward was out of all proportion to the offence that was simulated. I noted that that segment was obviously prepared in co-operation with the police officers. It could not possibly have been filmed and the actions could not have taken place unless the police officers were co-operating with her and presumably showing her what was going to happen. We can only assume that she went to them for assistance, advice and help to make that programme. It could not have been made in that way unless the police had co-operated and told her what was going to happen. Police officers and the P.R. section must have told her what was going to happen.

There are a number of specifications, having said all that, that I wish to ask. First, was it the intention, before the outcry from Tuesday's programme, that the routine which we saw simulated on Tuesday night should have been carried out and, if so, why? It upset me to see her have to take her rings off, which seemed to be absolutely unnecessary. It was said they were to be put in safe custody but I do not know who was going to take them off her fingers; they would be safer there than anywhere else. No doubt she had a quick pat search and then she was taken away by the police girl to have the intimate search, or whatever it was—the internal bit. There is no doubt about that. Then she was finger-printed, and it seems to me to be quite unnecessary for this offence to finger-print. As I understand the position, the police have a routine whenever anybody is picked up to finger-print them, and there is no legal requirement for finger-printing, but what the police tell the people is 'All right, if you do not accept the finger-printing now you are not going to get police bail and you will stay in until you come up in court'. I always felt this was quite wrong. Perhaps the Police Commissioner can tell us about that. Was the policy on this matter changed yesterday, after the outcry, or was it modified in any way as a result of the programme? Secondly, why was it necessary or why did the police or the Government think it was necessary at any time to make a body search for an offence of this kind and why is it necessary to finger-print?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I want to say it was not the intention and there were not any hasty changes. I think the honourable member set the scenario when he said he had lots of phone calls; there was a lot of indignation expressed across the State. People naturally wanted to know. The

honourable member has raised questions that deal with police routine. That is an internal thing and I would invite the Commissioner to comment on the question that has been raised about the internal side to which the young lady was part of.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has asked the Minister, and the Minister has asked the Commissioner to supply that information.

Mr Draper: Mr Chairman, I think the unfortunate part of this television segment was that it was pitched on the basis of procedure which has been applied for a number of years in regard to offences generally—people who are charged generally with offences and are locked in police stations. After the segment had been filmed—I am not suggesting that it was deliberately changed—I was aware that Channel 2 wanted to do a segment relative to random breath testing. I feel there was a transference of the procedure which has been adopted for a number of years and casting it in the context of random breath testing when, in fact, so far as the department is concerned it was never our intention to arrest every person who passes through a breath testing station and is found to be over the prescribed limits. We have discussed our policy for quite a few weeks now and have visited Victoria on at least two occasions; those visits were by senior officers to view the Victorian procedures. Following those visits we have discussed the procedures which have applied in Victoria and which have been mentioned here this morning.

Our view is that those are the sorts of procedures which we, in general terms, should follow without specifically following every procedure which is done in Victoria. Quite apart from the inconvenience which the public may have to suffer as a result of being placed in a police station, from a police administrative point of view, the amount of labour which is going to be taken up if we arrest every person who passes through a random breath-testing station is such that it is going to deplete the police services which are available on demand to the general public. There would be a necessity for a patrol car to be taken away from its normal function and sent to the random breath-testing station to convey the individual and his motor car to the nearest police station. That, from an administrative point of view, is something we wanted to obviate, quite apart from the inconvenience to which the public would be put if they were arrested. Our general policy is, if a person goes over a prescribed limit after random breath-testing, that we should do everything possible to allow him to go on his way and take the appropriate action by summons.

I am not excusing the Police Department or any member of it, nor am I blaming any person in the Police Department, but I feel that, if there is a problem, it arose because there was a lack of understanding and a lack of communication between various levels that were involved in the television session. In consequence, that filming and the comments that were made about it are out of context in relation to the random breath-testing operation.

Mr Millhouse: Mr Chairman, that is some part of the answer I want. I am glad to know that some sort of a mistake was made somewhere, because it certainly gave absolutely the wrong impression. In the segment there was never a suggestion, as I remember it, that a person would be otherwise than arrested; that was not mentioned by anybody. It was just taken as a matter of course that everybody who was picked up with a too high blood alcohol level by the random breath test would be arrested and treated accordingly. I think these are some of the words that she used: that she would be treated, or the person would be treated, like any other person charged with a criminal offence. Now it just defies my imagination how

such a fundamental misconception could have been given by the police to Miss Pru Goward, who is an intelligent and—

Mr LEWIS: Irresponsible.

Mr Millhouse: She is not an irresponsible commentator. She is intelligent, honourable and conscientious, in my experience of her, and I have had a fair bit of experience of her questioning and so on.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr Millhouse: That is a silly interjection for the member for Mallee to have made: that is quite wrong and it reflects on *Nationwide* to say it. We will leave it at that, because we have got about as far as we can. Now concerning the searching and the taking off of rings and the requirement for finger-printing, perhaps on that last one I can widen it and I would like the Commissioner to confirm or otherwise what I understand the position to be. I have always accepted the position to be that there is no legal power to finger-print, but people are told that, if they are not finger-printed, they are not going to get police bail.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member did raise that matter and it is a question that is broadly pitched. I would like the Commissioner to comment on the latter portion that the honourable member requests.

Mr Draper: I am not in a position to comment on the last comment of Mr Millhouse that people are told certain things under a threat that, if they do not do it, something will happen to them or not happen to them. I do not know those sorts of things. Perhaps if I could be given instances I will make inquiries to see whether or not that is the case, but I cannot accept that general proposition. In relation to the taking of finger-prints, I prefer, before answering that question, to refer it to law.

Mr Millhouse: Can the Commissioner tell us, Mr Chairman, how many persons arrested for an offence fail to give their finger-prints?

The Hon. W.A. Rodda: I will ask the Commissioner to comment but he might not feel disposed to do that. It may require some further advice.

Mr Draper: Mr Chairman, I just do not know.

Mr EVANS: I would like to ask a question, and the Minister may wish to refer it to the Commissioner. Is it a fact that the present law in relation to random breath tests was a complete change in practice as far as applying the law, whereby the police now have the opportunity to stop motorists at random and conduct breath tests, whereas in the past the only way that the police could apprehend people and conduct breath tests was where the people were driving in a dangerous manner or committing some other offence? They had to be offending or drawing the attention of the police to their condition by some other action. In the past, this resulted in many offenders being of the type that were either in a stolen motor car and driving under the influence or driving in a dangerous manner; perhaps at times they had committed some other kind of offence, such as breaking and entering, and were escaping from the scene. They may have been driving fast and under the influence of alcohol. In the past, this would have resulted in the police finding it necessary to take the vast majority, if not all, offenders back to the station for further questioning and investigation because a high percentage, virtually all, of offenders in these circumstances would be committing other offences.

Under the breathalyser legislation we will find that no other offence has been committed other than driving under the influence, and therefore it becomes unnecessary to investigate other matters. It is much easier and more efficient for the department and less expensive for the community to say to the person, 'You will hear more about this in the future,' and they can then arrange for a ride home

or get a taxi. I ask whether that is not the real difference between the present circumstances today, as against the previous practice with legislation.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I made the point in reply to the member for Elizabeth that there will still be these extraneous circumstances where, in the ordinary run of traffic and movement of people, people will be under the influence or will, for some other reason, attract the attention of the police and will be apprehended. The honourable member raised the broad ambit of a technical application, and I ask the Commissioner to comment on it.

Mr Draper: As the honourable member has said, that has been the essential and basic difference between the random breath testing legislation and previous legislation in regard to driving under the influence of liquor or having a blood alcohol level in excess of .08. I do not agree that the commission of an offence before the breathalyser has been applied in .08 offences is necessarily the reason why people are taken back to a police station. In many cases, it has been necessary to take them there for a breathalyser test and, in relation to driving under the influence of liquor offences, those offences largely necessitate a medical examination. It is for those reasons that there has been a need to take people to the police station, rather than because of the need to question them about the initial offence that they may have committed.

I also point out for the information of the Committee that, although we have arrested people who have committed these two types of offence previously, it has also been our practice, and will continue to be our practice, to release those persons on bail immediately they are charged at the police station, provided that satisfactory arrangements can be made for them to travel away to their homes other than driving their motor vehicle.

Mr EVANS: I wish to pick up the point that the member for Mitcham was referring to in relation to finger-printing. Although the Commissioner said he had no knowledge of it, I take it from that that there has never been any instruction from the Commissioner or his superior officers (to the Commissioner's knowledge) that a person should be told that they have to be finger-printed before they will be allowed out on bail.

Mr Draper: The answer is 'No'.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will try to bring this matter to a conclusion. I appreciate that the Minister will not have the information but I ask him to obtain it in due course. How many people were arrested in the past year in South Australia (either the past financial year or the calendar year), and how many of those persons were finger-printed during the year? How many persons were apprehended for driving under the influence, exceeding .08 or associated offences? By that, I refer to refusing to take a breathalyser test, etc. How many of these persons were arrested?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Is the honourable member talking about the total number of people arrested, when he refers to the total arrests in South Australia?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am referring to the total arrests in South Australia made by the South Australian Police Force. The second question relates to total number of arrests for driving under the influence, exceeding .08, and possibly refusing to comply with requests.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr Peterson: I refer to the locating of breathalyser units. I believe that over 50 per cent of driving under the influence offenders prosecuted in this State are dealt with in the Port Adelaide Court. I am not suggesting by any means that we are being persecuted in Port Adelaide, but a large percentage of cases are dealt with in that area. Can the Minister

clarify what will be the criteria for the location of these units?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I was not aware that these statistics applied to Port Adelaide. If it is any consolation to the honourable member, in my portfolio I have found the Port Adelaide people to be very hospitable. I have not seen a lot of drunkenness in Port Adelaide, and they are very good drivers. In regard to the question of locating the units, I am not aware of the formula but I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: We are not completely settled on the criteria to be applied. We are commencing our operations on the basis that we should analyse road traffic accidents, isolate the cases where we consider that alcohol was a factor involved in an accident, and determine the hour of the day and the day of the week when these accidents have occurred and where it is most appropriate to place the random breath testing station. In addition, we have been examining for some weeks the possibility of getting reasonable criteria for the placement of random breath testing stations on the basis of the location where and the time of day and the day of the week, when people have previously been arrested for driving offences involving liquor. Both of those sets of criteria have either been examined or are continuing to be examined with a view to determining whether or not either one or both of them are useful in the determination of where these stations should be located.

Mr Millhouse: I come back to the demeaning procedure of fingerprinting. I say 'demeaning', after seeing the segment about it on Tuesday night on *Nationwide*, although I considered it demeaning before that. We have been round and round the mulberry bush on what actually happens.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This is on fingerprinting, not random breath testing.

The CHAIRMAN: I will determine the matter when the honourable member has completed his question. This matter has been raised during the discussion of random breath testing.

Mr Millhouse: The matter arose directly out of questions I asked earlier on random breath testing.

Mr LEWIS: Nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr Millhouse: It was part of what I and others saw on the *Nationwide* segment on Tuesday night and I thought it was demeaning then. That is why I asked the questions today. As we did not get a very straight answer, with due respect to the Chief Secretary and the Commissioner of Police, to the earlier questions we asked, I now ask what is the policy of the Government on the fingerprinting of those charged with an offence?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This is a matter that I will have to consider and give an answer on; I cannot give an answer off the top of my head. It is a practice that has been followed for many years. The honourable member, being a former Attorney-General, probably knows a lot more about it than I do. He asked me what is the policy of the Government. This policy was brought forward on random breath testing, and is now becoming extraneous. If people are suspected of some criminal offence, my common sense approach is that they would be fingerprinted. If somebody was just a poor unsuspecting member of the public who had one too many drinks, then the common sense approach is that he should not be fingerprinted. I am not saying that this is the policy of the Government; I will have to take advice on this matter.

Mr Millhouse: I will be obliged to the Chief Secretary if he will supply the information in due course. I ask the Commissioner of Police, through the Chief Secretary, what

is now and has been up to this time the policy of the police on the fingerprinting of those charged with an offence.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member asked what the policy of the police was with regard to fingerprinting. Could he be more specific?

Mr Millhouse: Mr Chairman, may I have your indulgence to put the question another way so that it may be more easily understood?

The CHAIRMAN: You have the permission of the Chair to put the question in such a way, that it will be understood.

Mr Millhouse: Do the police try to get everyone who is arrested and charged with an offence to give their fingerprints?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will ask the Commissioner of Police whether he can, or whether he is prepared, to answer that.

Mr Draper: I cannot answer for what every policeman does. All I can say is that every person is not fingerprinted. It is not the policy to take everyone's fingerprints for every offence for which people may be charged.

Mr Millhouse: Everybody is fingerprinted when they are arrested and charged.

Mr Draper: I would disagree with the comment made that in every case when a person is charged their fingerprints are taken.

Mr Millhouse: I said 'arrested and charged'.

Mr Draper: Arrested and charged. I would disagree that in every case fingerprints are taken.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the discussion on random breath testing. I will explain that the Chair has adopted a procedure that calls will be made in turn. I realise there is a call on the left from the honourable member for Stuart; he wishes to change the topic. However, I received long ago a call from the honourable member for Mallee. I feel it is right and proper now to call him. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I assure the member for Stuart and all other members of the Committee that it will not be necessary to change the subject again from this because it covers the entire Police Force, whereas no link-up was made in the direct question put by the member for Mitcham to the Chief Secretary in his final question on the random breath testing legislation. The member for Mitcham asked whether, as I recall it, historically the police had a requirement for fingerprinting. He did not relate it to the Act that is only about to come into force—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. I thought the honourable member was going to ask a question. He is now making a comment about what the member for Mitcham has said.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order in this respect: it is the Chair that determines whether a question is relative. The Chair determined that the question of the member for Mitcham was relative. I ask the honourable member for Mallee to come to the question and the information he is seeking without making a preamble on what has happened in the Committee this morning.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. On some future occasion, I will seek an opportunity to talk to you privately.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member for Mallee insinuating that he is not in accord with the decision of the Chair?

Mr LEWIS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I now ask the honourable member for Mallee to continue with the information he is seeking.

Mr LEWIS: I notice in the organisation structure chart there is indicated the outline of the way in which the Police Force is structured. The full-time equivalents of staff numbers are given. The need for the police service is not questioned; it is justified by the stated issues in the Pro-

gramme Estimates, volume 1, page 181. I ask the Commissioner of Police, through the Chief Secretary, to outline what factors have contributed to what is referred to as the continued increase in demand of the police service in their attempts to preserve civil order, protect persons and property, prevent or reduce the incidence of crime and all those other corporate management objectives.

Under 'implications for resources' there is an increased demand for police attention to reported crime. What sociological and technological factors have contributed to this increase in crime or increase in reported crime, if that is all it is? In other words, has there been no increase in crime, but rather just an increase in reported crime? This information will enable me to determine whether or not there is an increasing demand as outlined in the statements. I do not question that on the evidence available to me as an ordinary citizen and a member of this House, but that information is not adequate and that is why I am asking the question.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member has asked a broad question. I ask the Commissioner to reply in the macroscopic way that the honourable member requires.

Mr Draper: The basis of our attention can be in relation to reported crime only. I do not doubt (this is a personal opinion only, and I do not have any concrete evidence to support it; my opinion is based only on my experience gained over a number of years) that reported crime is only a part of the crime scene and that quite a number of offences are never reported to the police. I have no idea to what extent that occurs, in whatever category of crime we are looking at.

I am afraid that I do not understand in a specific sense the reasons for the increase in the number of reported crimes. I can only conjecture that part of it is economic and part is sociological. Apart from that very broad generalisation, I am not in a position to give any opinion why it is escalating. Whatever the reason is (and again I say this as a result of my general experience), the escalation is not confined to South Australia or to Australia but is general throughout the world.

Mr LEWIS: Is the preoccupation with programmes, seminars, courses and conferences on the increasing incidence of crime then a waste of time? Are we obtaining no information by participating in discussions of that kind in an attempt to determine those factors? I should have thought that the Commissioner could give cogent reasons for it, and outline and delineate the broad factors that were at work in producing more libertine behaviour, more irresponsible attitudes, and less concern for the welfare of others in the minds of those who, as the statistics indicate, increasingly commit crimes.

Are we, then, wasting our time spending money on organising those kinds of seminars, courses and discussions between police officers in South Australia and in other States, and between those in Australia and those in other countries, if we do not get anything out of them. What are we understanding from it?

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that all questions are directed to the Minister, who then has the opportunity to assist with information, of calling on one of his advisers. I am a little concerned. I make clear that I do not want it understood that any of the advisers are under cross-examination.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I think that we at the table clearly understand that. The honourable member has questioned seminars, particularly those conducted by the Police Department. In that context, I ask the Commissioner whether he cares to comment on the matter.

Mr Draper: I will answer first the question regarding the reasons for crime. It is my idea that such a subject would

require a significant in-depth and broad research project before one could come up with cogent reasons for the increases in crime. That sort of research programme is beyond the resources that are available to me. I do not disagree that it is desirable. However, I am not in a position to carry it out.

Regarding the usefulness of seminars, conferences, and so on, unless one is prepared to undertake a significant evaluation programme of these things, one can never be quite clear how much value is obtained from them. One can really relate them to crime prevention programmes, which, again, need an in-depth and significant evaluation before one can determine the real value of carrying them out.

Although it is possible that many of these things are, to some degree or other, a waste of time, it could be argued, on the other hand, that the rate of increase in crime would escalate far more rapidly and higher if these things were not undertaken. The whole answer to the question whether or not we get value on a cost-benefit basis would obviously depend on the capacity to evaluate them on an in-depth basis.

Mr LEWIS: I thank the Commissioner for that reply. Is the Minister able, in personnel terms, to explain (since I cannot calculate it myself) the reason for the difference on page 180 of the papers in the number of actual full-time equivalent staffing numbers? The figure of 3 936 which is shown is, I presume, for the forthcoming year. I cannot reconcile that with the figure of 3 879 shown in the table on page 182 of the document. I note that there is a difference of 57 there and that there is a considerable increase in full-time equivalent staff numbers in the Police Force over the figures for the previous year.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I understand that the figure of 3 936 is the average. I will ask the Commissioner or one of his officers whether he can say how that is arrived at. These programmes are made up, after which there are transfers; this is the grand total. The honourable member has drawn attention to a discrepancy and, as I cannot answer his question, I will refer it to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: The figures shown on the actual full-time equivalent staff numbers on page 180 are an average throughout the year. At the end of the year, there will be a discrepancy between the average and the actual figures. In addition, the 1981-82 figures provide for increases in the strength to the extent (and this accounts for part of the discrepancy) of 33 additional cadets, 14 additional people for random breath testing, and two additional people for the transport of bodies.

The CHAIRMAN: Although the member for Mallee has raised the broad matter of police, he has changed the subject again, namely, from the number of crimes committed to Police Force personnel. I will therefore call on the honourable member once more and then call on another member.

Mr LEWIS: I have tried to relate my remarks to the need for the continued increase that we have experienced in the Police Force. I want the Minister to understand that I am not in the least bit critical of or antagonistic towards the Police Force. It does a tremendous job and has needed increased resources. The evidence of that was the increased demand for the services required as a consequence of the increasing number of reported crimes.

Will the Minister outline, in the way the force delivers these services to the public, how many of the officers engaged in the force are not actually engaged for more than half their time in the enforcement of the law but are engaged in administering, organising and supervising in the overall structure to which I first referred? If the exact number is not available, what is the approximate number

of officers who spend more than half their time involved in such duties rather than on direct law enforcement, preserving civil order and other police matters?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This matter will take some research. A table is included in the programme papers, but perhaps the Commissioner can answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is detailed information sought that is not available, the question can be taken on notice.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: If the honourable member wants comprehensive details, it would be better for him, for the Committee and for the record if we take the question on notice.

Mr KENEALLY: I did intend to follow the line of questioning raised by the member for Mallee, but first I believe a question should be asked about intimate body searches. What is the Government's policy on intimate body searches, that is, internal anal and vaginal body searches? Is it the Government's policy that, for whatever reason the police are required to carry out such searches, there should be a medical person present? Does that happen now? If it does not, does the Minister believe it ought to happen?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: There is always a medical officer who does this. The police are already in the process of appointing a full-time medical officer. When such cases as the honourable member refers to arise it is fit and proper, whatever the circumstances, for a medical officer to do that.

Mr KENEALLY: Have I the Minister's assurance that every internal body search that the police make involves the presence of a medical person?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is my understanding. I detect that perhaps there is a trap in the question, but I understand that a medical officer is present and does this work.

Mr KENEALLY: It would be more appropriate, if the Minister has such an understanding, that he should obtain the definitive information from the Commissioner. If that has been the practice, I am content with that, because that is appropriate. The Minister said the appointment of a full-time medical practitioner was in progress, and I am content with that. Is the Minister saying that it is not only his understanding but that that is what has always happened? He can check with the Commissioner if he wishes.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the Minister, I believe the member for Stuart first asked whether it was Government policy, and it would be in the area of the Minister to answer, but then the honourable member changed his question slightly.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As there is a change in direction, I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: The policy is that a medical officer would have to be present and would have to do it. A police officer is not qualified or required to do such things. In regard to body searches, in my 40-year career I am aware of only one or two body searches that have been made.

Mr KENEALLY: I return to the question of the incidence of crime. I remind the Minister that a strong plank of the Liberal Party policy prior to 1979 was that it would be doing something about the crime rate. The Liberal Party policy speech provides:

Our aim is to protect the community, to prevent crime, to apprehend offenders and to bring them to justice.

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, I seek some clarification. When I attempted to vary the subject in regard to general matters earlier you ruled, Mr Chairman, that we should continue the questioning along the existing area. The member for Mallee began questioning on staffing, and police administration. He did relate his question to the number of officers enforcing the law and preventing crime in the community. Is it generally on the police lines and

administration, the amount of crime, the cause of that crime, or are we sticking to the specific line that the member for Mallee began questioning on?

The CHAIRMAN: When the member for Mallee was called he took, and the honourable member will understand that he said he took, the whole of the area of the Police Department as his line of questioning. Earlier I said that we would try as a Committee to follow in some sequence but that, if any honourable member wished to return to a matter that had been discussed, he had liberty to do so. The member for Stuart has done that. The only way in which I could uphold the honourable member's point of order is that the member for Stuart, after having been called, did go back to body searches and has now introduced another subject; perhaps it would be right for me to call another member because of that new subject introduced, and then come back to him. However, I did overlook that and believed that it was just a preliminary question that the honourable member asked. I will allow him to introduce that matter, and then we will follow it and conclude and then follow another subject within the vote.

Mr KENEALLY: I was referring to crime, and I refer to volume 6 of the programme papers. On page 6.2 it states:

There has been a dramatic increase in the incidence of crime.

On page 6.4 it states:

Due to the increase in criminal offences throughout the State a need exists to maintain specialist criminal investigators, etc.

Also on page 6.4 it states:

The crime trends established in the past few years have been reinforced again this past year.

These are all matters of great concern. What is the Minister and the Government doing to fight this dramatic increase in the incidence of crime? I then intend to ask in what areas has there been an increase in crime and how the police staffing will be altered to change that increase. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government acknowledges that there has been a dramatic increase in crime in South Australia, despite its policy to reduce crime? What is the Minister and his Government doing to combat that dramatic increase?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: There was a significant rise in crime in 1979-80. The statistics for 1980-81 indicate that there was a slight rise in some crimes, but generally the *status quo* has been maintained or there has been a reduction. When comparing the two years the following statistics apply: murder or attempted murder, 42 in 1979-80 and 26 in 1980-81; rape or attempted rape, 222 in 1979-80 and 281 in 1980-81 (which is an increase); serious assault, 482 in 1979-80 and 477 in 1980-81 (which is a slight reduction); robbery, 494 in 1979-80 and 395 in 1980-81; breaking and entering, 23 867 in 1979-80 and 21 943 in 1980-81 (which was referred to as 64 per cent last year when raised previously), and by far this crime occupies most of a police officer's time; larceny, 62 957 in 1979-80 and 52 975 in 1980-81; motor vehicle theft, 5 850 in 1979-80 and 5 802 in 1980-81; false pretences, fraud, forgery, misappropriation, 3 808 in 1979-80 and 3 142 in 1980-81; and drug offences, 3 198 in 1979-80 and 3 152 in 1980-81.

The honourable member asked just what the police are doing. That is a broad area and I will refer it to the Police Commissioner for comment. I am sure the Committee has heard over the last two weeks that the Government is applying tight financial restraints, so I do not have to emphasise that point. We have maintained our priority in this area as best we can, bearing in mind that we have to maintain the strength of the Police Force. The Commissioner has said that we are taking on 33 cadets and 14 adult constables. Certain changes have been made in patrol work. A lot of attention has been given to the metropolitan

and country areas to see that they are adequately policed. I refer the honourable member's question to Mr Draper.

Mr Draper: We have been maintaining our attack on crime just as we have always done. We have redeployed many officers from partial operational and administration duties to full operational functions. We have also undertaken crime prevention programmes and have revised our patrol system in the metropolitan area. Generally, that is the approach we are taking in relation to demands placed upon us, not only in relation to crime but also in relation to daily calls received from the public. Those calls have certainly increased in the last few years. We are reallocating our personnel in order to meet those demands.

Mr KENEALLY: The Programme Papers also indicate that there is expressed concern about the impact that this crime trend is having on resources, namely, the personnel of the Police Department. Therefore, is the Minister satisfied, despite the tight monetary constraints that he says have been placed on the Government, that sufficient manpower is available for the police to do the job expected by the State and which they have been charged to do? I would be disappointed, as would every law abiding citizen in South Australia, if the monetary constraints that are placed upon the Government express themselves in lessening the efficiency and competence of the Police Force in combating crime. Is the Minister satisfied that sufficient personnel is available to the Police Force to do the job that the State has charged them to do?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Of course, one would always like more resources. I would not be telling the truth if I did not say that. In relation to Budget restraints, the Police Department is doing better than some other departments. It has been given priority and the Budget allocation is the best we could hope for. I recall some criticism of me, in the fortnightly calls for my resignation, that I should be getting in and screwing someone's neck for more money. I point out that police officers are dedicated people and they are efficient. I am satisfied that they are doing better than their best to see to it that there is adequate police coverage in this city. One only has to look at the figures that I referred to a moment ago to see the magnitude of their task. I believe they are able to cover all the calls they receive. The figures for breaking and entering, for example, highlight the demands placed upon members of the Police Force. Last year there were 62 000 offences in that category and it has dropped to about 52 000 this year. That indicates that perhaps some people have come to their senses, although only minutely, but it is an encouraging reduction.

Mr KENEALLY: We agree with the Chief Secretary that the Police Force is dedicated, efficient and overworked. Is it a fact that, as the Chief Secretary has just said, every department would desire more resources? Did he not go on to tell the Committee that the Police Department is starved of some of the resources it needs? Are we to understand by that that the ability of the Police Force to combat the dramatic increase in crime in South Australia is shackled by the Government's inability, because of budgeting problems, to provide the police with those resources?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I take it that the honourable member is referring to an event which occurred two years ago and we had a repeat last year. We are heading towards another visit to the people, and I refer to the next election. There has been incessant chanting that we are not carrying out our promises. I do not wish to rake over old coals, but every effort is being made, with the funds and resources available to us, to get our share of the cake. On a comparative basis we are doing better than most departments, and I have to be satisfied with that. You cut your suit according to your cloth.

Mr EVANS: I would appreciate getting some details from the Minister as to the number of personnel employed in our Police Force as at July 1979 and as of July 1981. The 1981 figure may be readily available to some degree to us, but the first one is not. I wish to know the number of resignations from the Police Force occurring at present. I want to know whether more are resigning from the Police Force compared to the number two or three years ago. Is there more stability in the Police Force?

Further, is the number of women employed in the Police Force decided by putting a limit on that number, or is that decided by taking applications from people who wish to enter the Police Force regardless of sex and picking the number required as a total, not one sex against the other? What educational qualifications are set as a minimum for people who are accepted as recruits to the Police Force? In some areas the standard of education would need to be set at a higher level than perhaps for those who are going to carry out general duties within the Police Force and work their way through the system.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Mr Chairman, I will ask the Commissioner to advise on those figures. I do not have them at my fingertips.

Mr Draper: Mr Chairman, I do not have with me the total strength as at 30 June 1979 but I can obtain that. Likewise, in regard to resignations, I do not have the specific figures with me. I can comment generally that the percentage of resignations for the immediate past financial year is comparable to percentages in previous years. It is in the vicinity of 1.5 per cent of the active strength.

Women are recruited into the Police Force on the basis of their qualifications in competition with men and there is not a quota system for women as compared to men. The qualifications for recruits range from degrees in various disciplines, with a minimum qualification of Matriculation standard.

The CHAIRMAN: There were some statistics and information that the member for Fisher required. Would he like the Minister to obtain those?

Mr EVANS: Yes. Thank you. I ask the Minister whether he or the Commissioner is prepared to comment on another area in which I have taken an interest. I have gained the impression, rightly or wrongly, that many of our police officers are disappointed at the penalties that are imposed on some offenders who are found guilty and that this tends to breed within some members, if not a substantial number of members, of the Police Force an attitude of 'That is not a very serious offence; it can wait at the end of the line before it is investigated,' or 'There is not much benefit in putting a lot of effort into that area because the result will be a pat on the back from some person making a judgment in the end on the severity of the offence and perhaps a box of chocolates will be given afterwards.'

This has developed an attitude within the community, that it does not matter if one offends in some minor areas. I think of areas like housebreaking, for example. Some people argue that penalties are not a discouragement. There appears to be an indication that small penalties are not a discouragement, that, in fact, they seem to be an encouragement for people who want to transgress the law. There have been some examples in recent times of appeals against the penalties on the basis that they have not been sufficiently high.

The Police Force has appealed against some penalties, but in areas of smaller penalties and minor offences, or areas of offences against individuals but not the community, there have been no appeals. Is there to some degree within the Police Force a feeling that it is not worth pushing really hard in some areas to gain a conviction or to scratch up all the evidence, because the end result is that the offender

may be found guilty and let out on probation or released on a very minor penalty? I know that in saying that I am reflecting on those who make judgments in courts. I ask the Commissioner to comment, because that is a feeling that I detect within the community and I think the opportunity is now to correct or confirm it.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is discussing the matter of morale in the Police Force and I find that the morale is generally very, very high. There were some shattering things in recent weeks. I ask the Commissioner whether he would care to comment on the question.

Mr Draper: I cannot comment on the general opinion in the community generally. I do not know what their views are. So far as the Police Force is concerned, I would think it reasonable to assume that there are from time to time various individuals who have an opinion that a particular offender was not dealt with as severely as was believed necessary, but as a general opinion of the Police Force itself, I do not believe at the present time that policemen generally consider that the penalties are not severe enough. A group of people at one time may have held the opinion to which the member refers, but I do not believe that at present that opinion pervades the Police Force.

Mr EVANS: Thank you, that satisfies me. I wish now to talk about the general management of the Police force. Have we developed a system whereby very capable and well-trained officers have ended up in administration rather than in the area of detecting and preventing crime and enforcement of the law, whereby we could be using those well-trained people in the area for which they are trained and using clerical people to do clerical work? I am not saying that is a criticism: that is a system that could develop. I ask the Minister whether he or the Commissioner believes it is the case. Is there any way we can rectify that situation and make for effective use of those people whom we have trained for a specific purpose so that we make better use of the money and expertise available to us?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask the Commissioner to comment on that for the honourable member.

Mr Draper: That is a very difficult question to answer unless we can identify the people in the positions and the work they are doing. Generally, I would agree that it is always possible that there are some people who could be changed in their duties from what may be termed 'administrative duties' to 'operational'. In recent years, say the past three or four years, we have consistently reviewed the positions occupied by policemen to ensure that all those who can possibly be changed from administrative to operational levels are in fact changed. That is a continuing process, one that we constantly keep under review.

I do not doubt that, if somebody wished to make an examination of the positions occupied by policemen, that person would raise questions as to why it was necessary for a certain job to be done by a policeman. I believe those jobs currently occupied by policemen outside the operational area must necessarily be occupied by them, at least at the present time.

Mr EVANS: I am grateful that the department is conscious of that and I am pleased with the reply.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the place of Mr Randall, member for Henley Beach, has been taken by the member for Rocky River, Mr J. Olsen.

Mr EVANS: I have one more question in regard to the burden that the Police Force now carries. The member for Mallee raised the point of increased personnel employed in the force and I wish to ask the Minister whether or not it is a fact that in the more serious crime today, particularly

in corporate crime, the investigation is very time consuming and resource consuming. In the areas of more serious crime, not only corporate crime but also in other areas, a greater amount of investigation takes place. This in itself, apart from the new Acts that are implemented or introduced by Parliament increasing the number of laws, is one of the areas where there is a significant increase in the work load and in the use of resources of the Police Force.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will refer the matter to the Commissioner as it is an internal matter within the force.

Mr Draper: The short answer is 'Yes' but in saying that I would refer more to serious crime than corporate crime because corporate crime in the main is dealt with by people within the corporate affairs section. Amongst those people are a number of detectives. They are operating by and large outside my jurisdiction and therefore I confine my remarks to serious crime generally.

Mr KENEALLY: For the Minister's benefit, on page 6-7 of volume 2, under the programme title 'State security services' the component shown as Special Branch services, Crime Intelligence Unit and Star Force, shows an average full-time equivalent employment level of five. Could the Minister tell the Committee whether that is a mistake or whether the Special Branch services, the Crime Intelligence Unit and the Star Force have a manpower number of five?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Obviously I will have to refer the matter to the Commissioner.

Mr KENEALLY: You are not sure?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not need those sort of remarks straight after lunch. The Special Branch to which the honourable member referred is only a small section of the force. I presume the honourable member wants an accurate answer and I want him to have an accurate answer. Therefore, I will refer the matter to the Commissioner. When we look at the resource allocation of special intelligence services we see that in 1981 it was 118. The proposed full-time equivalent was five, and that is the matter which I will refer to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: The five people referred to on page 6-7 refers to the Special Branch only. The Star Force component is on page 6-17 and consists of 72 members. It is under the programme of rescue services because the major part of their activity is related to rescue rather than security. The Bureau of Crime Intelligence is on page 6-5 and the component there is included in the general criminal investigation and crime prevention services and specialist criminal investigation services. The number of people in crime intelligence is 24.

Mr KENEALLY: Before I refer to a more serious line of questioning I refer to pages 6-21 and 6-23. On page 6-21, for security in Government House we see that six officer full-time equivalents are engaged and for Parliament House we have one officer full-time equivalent for security. Does that reflect the Government's attitude towards the Parliament as opposed to Government House?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have only ever seen one officer here since I have been here, but on sitting days there are other members of the force that see to it that, while Parliament is sitting, the security is greater. There are sufficient people here to see to it that the place is adequately serviced. I ask the Commissioner to refer to this matter.

Mr Draper: One officer full-time equivalent is supplemented on occasions when the House is sitting by other officers depending on the level of security which is necessary. I refer to the member for Stuart's comments about the importance of one as opposed to the other; that level of importance has been maintained for the past 40 years.

Mr KENEALLY: On page 6-10 it states that the workload of the legal branch is such that its members are over-committed, and that the problem is further compounded by

the fact that vacancies within the section are difficult to fill. Could the Minister explain that statement more fully to the Committee?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This is an internal matter and I ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: The reason for the difficulty in filling vacancies in the prosecution section is one of economics. It is a day work job; on Monday to Friday these jobs do not attract penalty rates for shift work and overtime. Consequently, the only remuneration over and above the base salary level is an allowance which has been awarded by the Industrial Commission for that type of duty. Consequently, people prefer to remain in those areas of the department where there is a higher level of salary or allowance attractive because of the penalty rate.

Mr KENEALLY: Could the Minister tell us whether this problem of vacancies in the legal branch is proving to be a difficult and embarrassing problem for the Police Department in its prosecutions?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I again refer the matter to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: It is a matter of degree in the amount of effort necessary to attract and obtain suitable people to transfer into the prosecution section. I do not think it is embarrassing because, at present, although we have these difficulties, we are still able to attract just sufficient people to fulfil the requirement.

Mr KENEALLY: I have a question that deals with staff numbers of the Police Department. This question, which should have been asked earlier, is to do with the total vote of the Police Force which, in 1980-81 was estimated to be \$72 730 000. The actual payment was \$82 938 737. In 1981-82, the sum proposed is \$90 466 000. Can the Chief Secretary say why the police vote in 1980-81 was \$10 000 000 out, and whether the 1981-82 proposed vote, which is a 25 per cent increase on the sum voted in 1980-81, is an accurate vote or are we to anticipate that the actual payments will be as far out as they were last financial year?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The over-expenditure of \$10 208 000 in 1980-81 resulted primarily from wage increases and terminal leave payments, namely, \$9 618 000, and an increase of \$744 000 in administration expenses owing to fuel price increases, travel expenses, building related charges, rates, legal costs, and an increased amount of \$96 000 that the Government contributed to the lump sum retirement benefits paid under the police pensions scheme.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to the police role in accident rescue, particularly in reference to motor vehicle accidents. About a month ago, the South Australian Firefighters Association said that South Australian firemen should be involved in rescuing accident victims trapped in wreckage. The association said that lives were endangered because police rescuers allegedly arrived late at the scenes. An article then appeared in the *Advertiser* on 25 May, as follows:

The Police Department may review its role as a rescue service if other organisations have the equipment and manpower to do the work. The assistant commissioner for operations, Mr B. Furler, announced the possible review in a prepared statement on the role of police and other organisations at road accidents.

Are the police involved in a review of their role at the site of accidents? Is there any move for this role to be taken over by another department?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The police are not involved in a review at this stage. This matter was canvassed on a broad front in the Select Committee of which I was Chairman, and which looked at the Fire Brigade. Quite strong views are expressed that the Fire Brigade has a role of

operating at accidents. In South Australia, the situation is that the police attend accidents and also have the equipment (jaws of life and recovery vehicles) to handle the situation. This is only in the talking stage. We found on our trips to other States that the fire brigades had a role. In New Zealand, I noticed that the Fire Brigade was turning out to every accident. While in some areas there is quite strong feeling that the Fire Brigade should be involved, the matter has not reached the stage where there are any formal discussions.

Mr OSWALD: I presume that there is no move afoot for para-medical services or rescue services to be implemented yet. I have been advised that the Northern Territory has moved for its own State Emergency Service Act under which it will operate and which will give various organisations, including the State Emergency Service, a rescue role. The article to which I referred earlier goes on to say that the operation of some organisations in South Australia were restricted by Acts of Parliament. Perhaps that is a reason why some of the other organisations, such as the State Emergency Service, are a little less involved. Will this State ever move to have the State Emergency Service have its own Act, and play a larger role in rescue work? Is the Police Force organised to such an extent that in the foreseeable future all rescue work will be carried out solely by the police?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is difficult to predict the future. As I mentioned a moment ago, strong opinions are held in relation to the Fire Brigade. The State Emergency Service has application in the country, but not the metropolitan area. At this stage, it is all conjecture. At the moment, there are no plans in the Police Department to alter it. The State Emergency Service having its own Act has not yet been envisaged.

Mr LANGLEY: My question concerns a well-attended recent meeting of Crime Alert at the Unley Town Hall. Since then, I have been around my area and I still find that people are leaving their doors open, keys in the door and also their windows wide open. This aspect was stressed strongly at the meeting, and since then the question has been asked whether it was successful or not. I thought the meeting was successful, and brought the Police Force into high repute with the people of Unley. Has there been any decrease in crime in the area since that time, say, the past 12 months?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I cannot comment on whether there has been any decrease of crime in the area to which the honourable member refers. Crime Alert is a programme that has had the approbation of the community at large. The Police Force does a wonderful job in the areas designated by interviewing and attending on residents and drawing attention to simple things that should normally be attended to in residencies, including the locking of windows and doors and taking certain precautions. I have nothing but praise for Crime Alert. An alert community, one that has a liaison with the police, can do much to minimise this broad area of breaking and entering into and theft from households. The Commissioner will undoubtedly have some comment to add to what I have said.

Mr Draper: Crime Alert is an on-going programme in the metropolitan area. It has been operating for the better part of two years. As I said in answer to another question this morning, it is difficult to evaluate the results of such a campaign. The cost of evaluation probably far exceeds the result you obtain from the evaluation. The belief of the department is that it does a lot of good. Even though many people still leave their doors and windows unlocked, many others take heed of the advice given and take precautions and install security measures. We are satisfied that, on a reasonable commonsense assessment rather than a statisti-

cal analysis, there is value in it, and we will be continuing the exercise in the coming year.

Mr LANGLEY: I am pleased to hear the Commissioner say that it is intended to continue with the exercise. The Unley City Council and Unley electorate covers a fairly wide area, and the people concerned were mainly in the Unley and Parkside areas. Will Crime Alert assistance be given in other areas, such as Goodwood and Black Forest?

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

Mr Draper: Yes, we will be continuing with it, and I expect that Goodwood and the other districts will be included.

Mr KENEALLY: In 1976, an Act was passed in this Parliament decriminalising the offence of drunkenness in public. However, that Act has never been proclaimed. What is the Government's attitude regarding that Act? Does it intend to proclaim the Act in the forthcoming year? The Minister will no doubt take the opportunity to ask what happened in this respect during the three-year term of office of the former Government, and I will give him that liberty. Nevertheless, I ask the Minister to direct himself to his Government's policy in relation to this Act: whether it will be proclaimed, and whether, as a result of that proclamation, the important drying-out centres will be established. I ask this question as a result of a number of inquiries that I have received recently.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This matter has not been canvassed with me. I presume that it comes within my colleague's portfolio, as I do not think that this Act is administered by the Chief Secretary. I will have to take up the matter with Cabinet and the Government. One wonders why the Act, having been passed, was not proclaimed. However, there must have been very good reasons for it. I should like to canvass those reasons with the Attorney-General and Cabinet before I gave a decision on the matter.

Mr KENEALLY: Parliament having passed an Act of that nature decriminalising drunkenness in public, but the Act not having been proclaimed, can the Minister give the Committee any information indicating the Police Department's attitude to this offence? I must call drunkenness an offence because, according to the Statute Book, it remains one. Has there been any change in the department's attitude towards people who are suffering from a little too much alcohol?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: To be practical, I do not think we would have any objection to it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What: to alcohol?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: No, to the results of alcohol in the form of drunkenness. I was asked why the Act had not been proclaimed. I do not think that the Police Department would have any objections to its being proclaimed. However, I understand that the matter comes under the aegis of the Minister of Health, and I would not want to pre-empt another Minister. The matter having been raised in this Committee, I will take it on board.

Mr KENEALLY: I am not sure whether I completely understand that. In fact, the Act, which is an amendment to the Police Offences Act, 1953-1976, comes within the responsibility of the Chief Secretary. Is the Minister telling the Committee that, for reasons of which he has not made the Committee aware, it is the responsibility of the Minister of Health to have the Act proclaimed? I should be interested to hear the technical details involved, as to all intents and purposes, this Act comes within the Chief Secretary's responsibility.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not aware that it does. To which Act is the honourable member referring?

Mr KENEALLY: I am referring to Act No. 106 of 1976 to amend the Police Offences Act, 1953-1976.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: With regard to drunkenness?

Mr KENEALLY: It is in regard to the decriminalising of the offence of drunkenness in public.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask the Commissioner to comment on this matter. The honourable member has referred to the technical aspect, and the Commissioner may be able to throw some light on it. The matter has not been raised with me or, as far as I am aware, in Cabinet. I would be grateful if the Commissioner would comment on it.

Mr Draper: As far as I am aware, the amendment to the Police Offences Act to which the honourable member refers is purely a side issue to the main legislation, which relates to treatment of alcoholics and people who are found in public places in a state of drunkenness and to their transfer to drying-out places. I am not sure of the name of the Act, but I understand that it has something to do with alcoholics and drug users. It is called the Drug Abuse Act or something of that nature. Certainly, this Act was not initiated by the Police Department. On the other hand, we have never had any objection to its implementation.

Mr KENEALLY: In the meantime, because the Act has not been proclaimed, I take it that the section in the Police Offences Act which provides that 'any person who is drunk in a public place shall be guilty of an offence' still applies.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Yes.

Mr KENEALLY: My next question is a serious one. It refers to police investigations of its own force. I am sure that the South Australian public has been concerned that so much bad publicity has befallen the Police Department in recent months because of the activities of some of its officers. I understand that the normal procedure when complaints are lodged against members of the Police Force is that the force itself investigates the complaints and determines whether or not they are valid.

Is the Government content with the present system, or does it consider that the principle that justice must not only be done but must also be seen to be done should apply, and that a person, other than a member of the Police Department itself, ought to be charged with the responsibility of the investigation, or at least should be a part of the investigation into serious complaints, or indeed any complaints, against the Police Department?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not understand completely the honourable member's question. Is he referring to complaints that are made against police officers?

The CHAIRMAN: Will the member for Stuart please clarify his question?

Mr KENEALLY: I am referring to all sorts of complaints, be they of a criminal nature or a civil nature, by people who have problems with the Police Force. The whole nature of inquiry into the Police Force is the subject of much publicity and controversy at present. I ask this question so that the Government can state clearly its policy in relation to inquiries of a criminal, civil or complaint nature against police officers.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: No thought has been given to this matter. The Police Force has discharged its duty very well in this area, and the Commissioner has in recent times shown that he is concerned when there have been aberrations in relation to the Police Force. The Government supports that concern. I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that there should be another authority.

Mr KENEALLY: I am asking what the Government's policy is; I am not—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Its policy is support of the *status quo*.

Mr KENEALLY: That Caesar investigates Caesar?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: If you want to put it that way, yes. The South Australian Police Force can stand on its own record. If there are cases where there has been

improper conduct, it has been dealt with, and dealt with satisfactorily.

Mr KENEALLY: How do you know that?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: By the record that I have come across.

The CHAIRMAN: Although the member for Stuart has the call, because of the matter he is questioning, I feel we can go only so far as the circumstances arranged. I am sure it would be inappropriate to go into real detail on this matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Why would that be the case?

The CHAIRMAN: Because a committee has been set up. It depends on the question that is asked. I merely ask the Committee to consider the matter. Each question asked will be considered on the basis of the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Chairman is entitled to his feelings in the same way as anyone else but, unless the matter is *sub judice*, it is a fair and proper matter for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not *sub judice* in the strict sense, but I just wanted to point that out to the Committee.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I was not clear whether the member for Stuart was referring to a specific issue. I thought the honourable member was talking about general investigations made by the Commissioner into alleged misdemeanours in the Police Force.

The CHAIRMAN: I previously indicated that I would give another honourable member the call at this stage. I will come back to the honourable member for Stuart.

Mr OSWALD: Perhaps the Commissioner can correct me if I am wrong, but I think that about nine months ago a survey was conducted through the Police Force concerning stress related to the nature of police work and the difficulties encountered by officers generally. What were the major findings of that inquiry and how were they implemented? Were there pay rises which have revealed themselves in this Budget? What advantages have accrued to members of the force as a result of that inquiry?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I understand that the survey and investigation has been made, and I am told that the report is in the process of being made, but it is not yet to hand. I know that police officers undergo much stress in their job. One can see from the questioning here today that they are in a sensitive area. They deal with all sorts of people in many circumstances. We are living in a sophisticated society, and so the survey was made. The report is not yet to hand but it is expected to be available soon, and the Commissioner informs that it will be available to members of Parliament and the public when it is produced.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to a Victorian press cutting giving the number of policemen forced to retire from the Victorian Police Force as a result of stress. Have we in South Australia any figures on the number of officers forced to retire through ill health, stress-related problems or marriage problems caused through such stress-related work?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Information is available on that and we will procure it for the honourable member and the Committee.

Mr OSWALD: I hope that, if there is a recognition that the South Australian Police Force officers are working in a stress-related environment, compensation in relation to pay or improved conditions will be passed on by the Government.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That was one of the criteria for the recent pay adjustments. It has also been one of the strong points in the appointment of a full-time medical officer, so that he can deal with such problems as they arise.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I refer to the police mounted services and the reference at page 3 of book 6. What is the current cost of operating the police mounted services?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Apart from my comment, the Commissioner will probably want to comment as well. The facilities used by the mounted cadre are shared by other units of the department. It is not possible to provide an accurate cost of operations of the cadre, except for salaries, wages and fodder costs. At present, the cadre is comprised of one commissioned officer, 33 non-commissioned officers in other ranks, and six weekly-paid employees. The salaries and wages paid to cadre personnel in 1980-81 amounted to \$793 105, and the cost of fodder for that period was \$23 580.

I should point out that the mounted police are also involved in general policing, in addition to the processions and other searches in which they are involved. The Government is committed to the maintenance of the mounted cadre. Since I have been Chief Secretary, I have found that a large group of citizens have a strong appreciation of the police greys, who enjoy a special place in the hearts of South Australians.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: How many country shows and similar activities has the police mounted squad attended in the past 12 months?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is a specific question concerning an internal matter. The Commissioner advises me that he will get that information.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can he also get information about the dates and the venues involved?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Yes.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I note that the department owns six horse floats, which I presume are part of the mounted services section? Have any of those floats been out of the State in the last 12 months and, if so, for what purpose?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The fixed asset information indicates that the mounted section contains 71 horses. Is the breeding programme carried on solely at the Echunga reserve or are mares sent elsewhere as well?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: Some mares are serviced at Echunga and some are sent out for servicing.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Have Police Department horse floats ever been used for the transportation of horses other than those attached to the police mounted services section?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As far as I know they are used exclusively for police horses.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Would the Minister like to refer that question to the Commissioner for comment?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is up to the Minister to make that decision.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Have any horses been donated to the mounted services section of the Police Department in the last 12 months or in the preceding 12 months?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that matter to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I am not sure what has occurred in that period. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the Minister finds that such donated stock do exist, will he also find out where they are paddocked at the present time?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will obtain that information for the honourable member. The Commissioner would also like to comment.

Mr Draper: As far as I am aware, there is only one place, and that is Echunga.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would like that checked.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That will be done.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Minister provided me with costs in relation to the police mounted services section, and I note that the total cost is \$816 603.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I point out that those facilities are shared by other units of the department. It is not possible to provide an accurate cost, other than in relation to salaries and wages.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Which particular services are shared? I do not expect that, for example, horse floats are used by the water police.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: To clear up the matter I refer the question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I am not quite sure whether I can answer the question clearly, because I am not quite sure that I understand it. It is not so much a question of the facilities that are shared, but that the services of the mounted police are spread across different functions.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That clarifies the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: This line of questioning quite possibly interests only the member for Elizabeth. I point out that I have given him quite a number of opportunities to ask questions, because the questions and replies have been short. It is for that reason I am continuing to call the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The figure of \$816 603 is far in excess of the amount of money made available by the Government of this State to, for example, legal aid. Is the Minister satisfied that that expenditure is appropriate in view of the fact that the Government's allocation to legal aid is about half that amount?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: An amount of \$23 000 is spent on fodder, and the rest is to provide officers' salaries. If those officers were not engaged in the mounted cadre they would still be an expense to the department because they would be performing other duties and that expenditure would show up in another section of the department. I do not know how that equates to legal aid. If that were cut out we would largely deplete the Police Force. I point out that police horses have been valuable in search situations and in relation to crowd control. As the Commissioner said a moment ago, it is difficult to quantify the amount of work they do. They are not used solely for ceremonial work. They do a lot of other valuable work in the performance of police duties.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does the Police Force, the mounted services section or any member of that section constitute a polo team and have police horses ever been used for polo?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not aware of it. I refer the question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: There is no police polo team. I do not know whether individual members play polo. I am quite satisfied that police horses are not used for polo by any member of the force who is a member of any polo team if, in fact, they are members.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Are any horses not the property of the Police Force on the Echunga reserve?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: Yes.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: For what purpose?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: There is one horse at Echunga and it belongs to me. It is being loaned to the department. It is a stallion and it is being used to service and tease police mares.

Mr EVANS: Mr Chairman, I wish to ask the Minister whether he would accept that my evaluation of the mounted unit's role is an accurate one, and I refer not only to its role but also to its place and acceptance within the community. I have always believed that our mounted police squad was part of the culture of this State. This State spends a lot of money in other areas of ethnic culture to promote and continue those cultures and that our police mounted squad is known not only within South Australia and within Australia, but also in other parts of the world as being part of our culture.

I ask whether our mounted squad is used, whether for agricultural shows or other community activities such as displays and exhibitions or even sometimes in competitions, that provide training for the personnel, but more particularly as a method of fund-raising for many charitable organisations and community groups. Also, I ask whether it is not a fact that the facilities, especially those at Thebarton, are used at times to help in training other persons to become qualified as instructors so that they may be able to create safer riding conditions for people who belong to pony clubs or who work in pony clubs and so there is a reduction or a potential for reduction in that area where there could be quite severe accidents for people not knowing how to handle horses or ride them currently. Therefore, there is an offsetting balance as a benefit to the community there.

I ask whether it is not a fact that the exhibition with the police band, the men, and the horses that has been developed by the mounted squad could be shown anywhere in the world and could become a tourist attraction to this State that would be of great benefit to us in that area. I have mentioned only those areas where I see a tourist attraction, or a community benefit and charitable fund-raising, but other areas have been mentioned by the Minister, such as crowd control, where the mounted squad plays a very important role.

Would the Minister agree with me it would be a sad day for South Australia if we lost this particular section of the Police Force, which is now part of our culture and one of the facets of our life that a large section of our community supports and sees as a benefit to the community in fund-raising as well as in tourism, apart from the active work it does for the Police Force?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do concur, Mr Chairman, as a horse lover and one who has been associated with horses all my life, and I do not think I am being biased. The honourable member referred to tourism. I think very soon after the Government changed there was a police exhibition associated with Count Potocki and there was a display by members of the Police Force that was ceremonial and I know it drew wide acclamation not only in this State but beyond this State. There were some specific details to which the honourable member referred in his question and his remarks; I think it is best that I ask the Commissioner to comment on the general thrust of the honourable member's question.

Mr Draper: I agree with those activities mentioned by the honourable member as being those that are to some degree carried out by the mounted police.

Mr KENEALLY: I would like to ask the Minister a question that deals with the accuracy or otherwise of Budget details that have been presented to us. Tonight the Premier will be making a speech to the Financial Executives Institute of Australia and the subject of his speech will be new

State taxes and further pruning of the public sector. At least, that will be a significant part of his speech which he is going to make. My question is: in the further pruning of the public sector will there be a reduction in the police vote and, if there is, how accurate are the figures and how accurate is the Budget that we have been given to discuss today?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This is the vote that we have received and it has run the gamut of very strict and stringent examination. I do not propose or expect that there will be any cuts in this. What the Premier is going to say tonight is not something I have been privy to. We are here in the Committee dealing with a vote that has been introduced in the Parliament and I can only say that this is the amount of money for the police and any other departments that are under my jurisdiction, or my colleagues' jurisdiction, that will be appropriated for this 1981-82 year.

Mr KENEALLY: Mr Chairman, to say that I am amazed with that response is an understatement. Am I to believe the Premier is going to make a speech tonight about major cuts in State services and major new taxes and he has not discussed this with the Chief Secretary, a senior member of his Cabinet? Is that what the Chief Secretary is telling us, because the Chief Secretary has said he is not privy to any financial statements in relation to cuts and new taxes that the Premier may be making tonight? I would like a clear explanation of that from the Chief Secretary, because it reflects very gravely not only on his position in the Cabinet is the matter under discussion here, but also on the vote we have to discuss.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order. I can understand the member for Stuart asking a question in relation to the lines that are before us now. I cannot understand how he can expect to ask a question in general terms about the Budget that may relate to many other lines that have already been discussed by the other Committees or this Committee. In a way, he has asked a hypothetical question, because he has not told this Committee of any particular statement the Premier or any other person is likely to make tonight. He only believes he is going to make a speech in relation to certain matters. Whether that speech is made or whether anything relates to that is another thing. The member is accusing the Chief Secretary of not knowing of certain matters that may not even exist. I just pose the question. The member has asked a general question about all the lines related to this portfolio and others, and I think that has no relevance to this particular line.

The CHAIRMAN: I would uphold the point of order to the degree that if the honourable Premier is to make a speech tonight, that is in the future and the Chief Secretary is correct. This Committee can deal only with the papers that are before it and the lines in this Budget. If the honourable member wished to raise this particular subject, the Chair would consider that perhaps another forum would be the place for that, not in a Committee such as this, where we are considering specific sums of money in a document that has been presented to Parliament.

Mr KENEALLY: I do not argue with your ruling, Sir, except to ask a question. Am I understanding the ruling to be that, even though it is almost certain, that the Budget that we are now discussing is not going to be the Budget that is going to be effective in this State for the forthcoming financial year, that matter is not the subject of the Estimates Committees? If that is the ruling and that is the fact, it seems to be of very little relevance for us to continue what might otherwise be a farce, because, unless we have the figures to discuss, all the time that we have put into these Estimates is wasted. I accept your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: In answer to the honourable member, the Chair is viewing it in the light that it is supposition as

to what the Premier is likely to say but what we have before us is fact. These are the only figures and documents which the Committee is considering.

Mr KENEALLY: I ask the Chief Secretary whether he would inform the Committee as to the procedures which take place when the police investigate complaints against police and when there are criminal investigations pending against police. Could he tell the Committee exactly what the procedures are in the areas of complaint that the police receive? I pointed out earlier this afternoon the three types of complaint—criminal, civil and normal—that the Police Department receives about its own activities.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I thought the honourable member covered that ground earlier. I find that a difficult question to answer as a layman. The honourable member made three points in regard to criminal, civil and other charges.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Stuart to repeat the question and the information required.

Mr KENEALLY: I point out to the gentleman that he is not a layman; he is the Minister in charge of police. I have asked him a simple question. What are the procedures that apply when the police investigate complaints against their own officers and when there are civil and criminal investigations against members of the Police Force? I point out to the Committee that we are well aware that these are not frequent complaints but, in the Commissioner's own words, they have been much higher: there have been many more charges placed against the police of a criminal nature in the last 12 months than previously, in the Commissioner's memory of the Police Force. I made the point earlier that we accept that we have the best Police Force in Australia. Nevertheless, it is important for the people who read newspapers and who listen to the various news media to be assured of the procedures which take place to ensure that the Police Force of South Australia maintains that high level of professional conduct.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member has communicated to me what he is seeking. The Government is quite happy with the present procedure. It is an internal matter and I am going to ask the Commissioner to give an answer to the honourable member.

Mr Draper: The procedure in criminal matters is the same as that which would apply in any criminal investigation; that is, to obtain information from an informant or complainant as to what the complaint is about and make such inquiries as are necessary before interviewing the police officer who is alleged to have committed a criminal offence. The action then taken depends upon the strength of the evidence which is available. I cannot for the moment see that there is any application in the civil area because any civil matter would really be dealt with as a police complaint. The procedure is that the complaint is received, and it is reduced to writing by the officer who receives a complaint. Copies are prepared and sent to the section called the Inspectorate which records relevant details of the complaint, and the officer in charge of that section allocates a commissioned officer to investigate. In due course, that officer reports to the officer in charge of the Inspectorate and in turn reports to the Deputy Commissioner, one of whose functions is the supervision of disciplinary matters. It is at that level that a decision is made as to what action should be taken.

Mr KENEALLY: I take it from that that the community in South Australia can be assured that the police are concerned about misconduct of members of their force by the very fact that when there are offenders the police do take action (and we have seen examples of that within the last few months). That is a factor that the community ought to be aware of. We have examples in South Australia where

the police, once they understand that charges ought to be laid, do lay them. That was the point I was trying to get the Minister to make so that he could point out to those people who read *Hansard* or point out through some public statement that the Police Department of South Australia is prepared to prosecute its own officers where circumstances prevail that such action should take place. It was not a criticism of the police. I was trying to get that point through and I would have hoped that the Chief Secretary would be alert enough to make it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What specific steps does the Police Department take to endeavour to ensure that corruption does not occur within the ranks?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am going to ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: By following the procedures that I have outlined. When a matter comes to our attention it is investigated by a senior officer and reported to the Deputy Commissioner of Police in the first instance. In those cases where there is evidence of a criminal offence a prosecution is launched. In the past 12 months it is on that basis that people have been prosecuted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Do I take it that the Police Department has no institutionalised methods of seeking to limit the opportunity for police officers to become involved in corruption by shifting them around and requiring them to disclose details of their pecuniary interests outside the Police Force to someone within the force?

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

Mr Draper: From time to time officers are transferred from one section to another. The period that they service in any one section depends upon the extent of training necessary and the degree of value that they derive from the experience that they gain by remaining in a section. There is no requirement in police regulations for any police officer to disclose any pecuniary interest that he has.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does the Minister consider that that would be a desirable reform?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Apart from the instances that occurred in the past 12 months, the South Australian Police Force has an enviable record of law enforcement. I do not see any need to alter the arrangements that exist at present.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In giving consideration to moving officers from particular squads, does the Commissioner or whoever makes such decisions take into account the degree of likelihood of the possibility of graft and corruption in those areas?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is a question of internal arrangement and I ask the Commissioner to answer.

Mr Draper: The short answer is 'Yes'.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my intention to continue calling the honourable member for Elizabeth as I have had no other indication on this vote from any other member wanting to ask a question or seek information. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In the *Adelaide News* of Wednesday 9 September there were some brief details of previous incidents described in relation to the personnel of the Police Force during this year and it briefly detailed a number of resignations. Can the Minister say why a Darlington police officer resigned following an inquiry into allegations that he ran a cabaret called 'Sexual Fantasies'? Why was it necessary, given the answers the Commissioner has just made, for this person to resign from the Police Force in light of the fact that the Police Department does not involve itself generally in the pecuniary interests of members outside their role as police officers?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is a matter of internal administration. I will ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: I remember the case but I am not sufficiently acquainted with it to answer the question. I will have to obtain that information.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to these resignations, which we might describe as clouded resignations, I make it clear I am not criticising the policy of encouraging resignations in the circumstances; it is important that our Police Force should endeavour to be as clean as possible and obviously some officers from time to time will be in the situation where they may not have committed criminal offences but their conduct may be sufficiently serious or of sufficient concern that it is desirable to have them resign from the force. I would like to know under what conditions these resignations take place because, by simply requiring a resignation from a police officer, the Police Force is to some extent advantaging the person concerned in that he is not being sacked. In these circumstances in the past 12 months, where officers have resigned in clouded circumstances, have they received the normal terminal leave payments and normal emoluments one would expect to receive on leaving the force if one was not under a cloud?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will refer this matter to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I cannot answer with an absolute knowledge of each individual case, but my view is that they have received the normal payments.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not anxious to have a list of names, but could we have a list of the number of persons who have resigned and in each case, without naming them necessarily, the total amount of money that has been paid out as leave payments?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I notice under the line 'Police Commissioner's Office' (which does not involve the Commissioner, but medical officers, administrative, accounting, and supply) there is a figure for terminal leave payments of \$1 104 000 which basically equates the amount paid during the last year. I do not believe that that figure relates to the sort of resignations we are talking about. In relation to the lines detailing the Police Force itself, however, there is no figure for terminal leave payments. Can the Minister explain where these payments come in the lines?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am advised that under line 3, 'Police Commissioner's Office', there is an amount of \$1 104 000 for terminal leave payments which applies to everybody in the force.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Since the compilation of the Estimates, which would have been early in the year, does the Minister believe that that figure will be adequate to meet the present estimates of resignation payments and terminal leave payments for the force?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: We believe that this amount of money is sufficient, because we believe that retirements will be down and consequently the leave payments will be down.

The CHAIRMAN: Since I made the last statement I have received indications from other members wanting information. After this last call I will move to another member. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Minister say how many police officers (and I appreciate that this is detailed information) and under which ranks, have applied to terminate their service with the Police Department or applied for leave of absence during the past three months, in other words, since June?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We will obtain this information and supply it to the honourable member.

Mr EVANS: Can the Minister say whether it is a general policy of the Police Department that, where an employee of the force wishes to take another job whilst serving in the force, or more particularly operate a business (and I know there are ways of getting around that by operating a business in the name of a spouse or relative), before any officer moves into these areas he has to obtain permission from his superiors?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is not permissible for an officer to have another job without the permission of the Chief Secretary. During the two years since I have been in office I have not given anyone permission.

Mr EVANS: The present Minister may not have given permission, but do I correctly assume that, if permission was given by a previous Minister or Administration there is no need for a reaffirmation of that permission? Does the permission automatically carry on on a continuing basis without it having to be referred to a new Minister or new Administration?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That would be right.

Mr EVANS: Since the Minister has been in the position he holds now, has he ever asked for details of the number of persons that have been given permission to have other jobs or operate businesses?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have had no occasion to, nor have I asked.

Mr EVANS: I do not wish to know names. Will the Minister get information, and make it available, later, regarding the number of persons who have been given permission to operate in those fields? I am aware, in saying that, that the same should apply to other departments, particularly when a lot of people are unemployed.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr EVANS: The Minister may wish to refer this question to the Commissioner. There has been some change in the regionalisation of the Police Force, and new centres have been established. I do not know whether more regions have been established or whether it has involved a realignment of boundaries. Is that system fully operational and, if it is, can the Commissioner say whether it is working satisfactorily, or whether some amendments to the regionalisation still need to be made?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As this involves a matter of detail, I ask the Commissioner to answer.

Mr Draper: There have been some changes not so much in the regional areas as in the divisional areas. I expect that one or two changes which are still pending will be put into operation some time in the next 12 months. Apart from that, I cannot recollect any significant changes in the regional areas.

Mr EVANS: Likewise, the Minister may wish to refer this matter to the Commissioner. Do we have any interchange of personnel between the South Australian Police Force and Federal Police Force on an exchange basis, for short terms, such as two or three months, or even longer, just for experience, or is that practice not carried out?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask the Commissioner to comment on that question.

Mr Draper: There is interchange between State forces but, to the best of my recollection, we have not interchanged with the Australian Federal Police.

Mr EVANS: I refer to page 137 of the Auditor-General's Report. In relation to the utilisation of motor vehicles, the following is stated:

During an examination in December 1980 of the department's vehicle purchases and motor vehicle utilisation, it became apparent that 24 vehicles (Toyota Land Cruisers and Ford F100s) purchased between July and December 1979 at a cost of \$232 000 were surplus to the department's immediate needs.

The matter was raised with the department, which indicated:

Low resale values during 1979-80 resulted in a shortfall in funds needed to fit bodies to 19 of these vehicles.

Greater use of departmental aircraft to transport prisoners and lower motor vehicle usage to conserve fuel resulted in vehicles in the field having an extended life. This created a surplus of replacement vehicles.

Eight Toyota Land Cruisers were over ordered.

An eight month delay in preparation of body specifications and tender calling further compounded the situation.

All vehicles were commissioned by June 30 this year.

Does that matter still remain the same, or is the department at present holding vehicles that it is not using, thereby tying up money that should not be tied up?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As this is a matter of specific detail, I ask the Commissioner to comment on it.

Mr Draper: All vehicles which we now have but which are not being used have been received within the past 30 days only. They will be put into commission virtually immediately.

Mr Millhouse: I am sorry that I was not here for the first hour today, but I had to take some people to see the Premier. When I first came in, it sounded as though we were pretty close to the topic that I want to raise, but the Committee has slid off it a bit now. So, this is really something new.

The CHAIRMAN: Does it relate to the Budget?

Mr Millhouse: My word it does. It is about the police.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to proceed with the matter, and I can ascertain from his question what it is about.

Mr Millhouse: The question concerns last week's announcement about an inquiry into the police and the suggestion of corruption, links with drug pedlars, and so on. That is the general topic that I wish to introduce.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the member for Mitcham proceeds, I ask the member for Elizabeth whether he wished to follow the other line of questioning which was being pursued by the member for Fisher, or does he intend to raise a new topic?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Certainly not. I did not wish to pursue the eulogistic line that the honourable member was following. I wish to refer to a new line.

The CHAIRMAN: While the member for Mitcham is here, I might refer to the report brought down by the Standing Orders Committee, which considered the proceedings of the Estimates Committees. It is at the discretion of the Chairman to call any other member. I will read the following part of the report, as I want the member for Mitcham to choose the important matters that he wishes to address to the Committee. The Standing Orders Committee Report states:

One approach which the Committee suggests is to consider appropriate time allocations for members. After allowing for the non-participation of Ministers, the Speaker and the Chairmen, an average time for participation by all other members each day is 15 minutes per Committee. Your Committee recommends that the Chairmen use this time as a yardstick for participation.

I should like the honourable member to keep that in mind. He has already asked some questions earlier today and, therefore, is capable, I am sure, of condensing his questions so that he will be able to use the time that is available.

Mr Millhouse: I am sure that I can condense the questions, but whether the answers can be condensed is another matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is taking this report as a yardstick, and consideration will be given. However, I also want the honourable member to understand that he has already had a fair time in which to ask questions today.

Mr Millhouse: That was on an entirely different matter. However, I certainly defer to you, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that the suggestion in the report relates to participation by other members per day and not per consideration of any matter.

Mr Millhouse: I will get as far as I can and see how we go. I have referred to the subject that I wish to raise. In my respectful opinion, it is perhaps the most important matter that could be raised during consideration of the Chief Secretary's lines and in the presence of the Police Commissioner. May I say, by way of a quick, short preface, that from time to time I have been very perturbed about complaints that have been made to me concerning the conduct of certain police officers. This has occurred over a number of years, but increasingly in recent years. However, I have never been able to pin them down sufficiently or get any corroboration so as to justify my making a public complaint about them. The member for Elizabeth has not been in that position. He has made public complaints and he has had corroboration. However, I have not been able to do that.

I should like to mention the sort of complaints that I have received or heard about. I have had a number of complaints about the Duncan case: the tragedy that occurred in the early 1970s. A member of the legal profession who is a friend of mine has told me (and I notice that this is one of the things suggested in the Extra report by Ball and English) that a client had been picked up for trafficking in drugs. The police had gone into his house and found a sum of money there which the client told my friend (his counsel) was \$15 000 but, when the police came to court, there was only \$10 000. Of course, it was not in his interests or those of anyone else to raise that matter. It would not have done him any kind of good. Whether it happened or not, it is the sort of thing that can so easily happen, and no-one has any redress or any way of proving to the contrary. It is a very worrying thing.

The other matter is not so much a complaint as an observation in regard to brothels around town. Perhaps the Commissioner will comment on this area if the Minister will allow him to do so. In the past few months the police have adopted a new form of harassment to try to close these places down by having police officers stand outside to speak to those people who looked as though they were going inside, presumably to warn them of the immorality that they might find.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Inside the premises, you mean.

Mr Millhouse: Inside the premises.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham is quite capable of proceeding without assistance from the member for Elizabeth.

Mr Millhouse: That tactic was successful in the case of a number of massage parlours, cum brothels, which closed down and moved elsewhere, which is what normally happens, but there are some against which this tactic has not been used, and the reason cannot be that they are so well protected that the police cannot enter them because, to use that tactic, the police do not have to enter them. I took up the matter with the Chief Secretary by letter and got no satisfactory reply why in the case of such places as Bluebeards and Caesars it has not been used. I would like to know. It is one of the things that has caused me increasing suspicion in this area. This is one matter on which the Chief Secretary or the Commissioner could speak.

I now refer to the inquiry that was announced curiously enough not by the Chief Secretary but by his colleague the Attorney-General. I noticed, in regard to the random breath tests, that it was not the Chief Secretary but the Minister of Transport who made the announcement.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That was his legislation.

Mr Millhouse: The Police Force is the Minister's responsibility, yet it was the Attorney-General who made the running on that matter and who made the announcement following the grave allegations made. Specifically, what I

would like to know are the precise terms of reference of this inquiry. Has any police officer been suspended as a result of the allegations made? If not, why not? When is it expected that the inquiry will be completed? What action is contemplated when it has been completed?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Let me say to the member for Mitcham and the Committee that these allegations were made to the Attorney-General—they were not made to me. Let the Committee consider that: they were not made to me. These two young journalists who have been working on this matter for six months and who have apprised South Australia of their view of things (and some of it is as old as Methuselah's goat) have made their comments, but they have not been near me. I was a bit jaundiced to hear a reported comment of the member for Elizabeth—although I do not know whether he said it or not—that he made a remark to me, and I smote my brow and wiped him off. This was in a newspaper, but it may not be correct. I have no documented evidence from the member for Elizabeth.

The portfolio of the Attorney-General does overlap with my portfolio, and we work along those lines. The accusations that came to the Attorney covered more than the Police Force—other people, lawyers, were named, so I have learned, as a matter of hearsay. As far as the police are concerned, two high-ranking and honourable officers are investigating this matter. Investigations are under way, and it is my understanding that they will report to the Attorney in the near future. That is as far as I can take it. One cannot say what one does not know. Those two journalists never paid me the courtesy of showing me what they had close to or in their hot little breasts.

Mr Millhouse: I am flabbergasted. The Chief Secretary is the Minister of the Crown responsible for the police and, to hear from him this afternoon that he just does not know anything about something which goes to the core of the Police Force, its effectiveness, its honesty and its morality, and that he apparently has not even been associated in the decision to have an inquiry is most extraordinary. I was going to say outrageous—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The matters have been referred to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the Minister an opportunity to answer.

Mr Millhouse: Does the Minister really mean that he does not know what are the terms of reference and whether anyone has been suspended or not, or when the inquiry will be finished? Yet he is the responsible Minister. Is this the confidence that his colleagues have in him?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member goes on. I do not know whether there have been any names. There have been allegations. As far as I am concerned, people have not been named.

Mr Millhouse: Will the Chief Secretary allow the Commissioner to answer some of my specific questions about what are the terms of reference? After all, two of his officers are in it, and I suppose he knows what the terms of reference may be, even if his Minister does not.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is not fair to ask the Commissioner to answer those questions. The terms of reference have not been relayed to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members are permitted to ask questions, and the Minister at the table has the right to reply as he sees the situation. The honourable member has asked his question and the Minister has replied. The member for Mitcham has had another 10 minutes, and I intend calling another member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was equally as flabbergasted as the member for Mitcham to hear the Minister say that he did not know the terms of reference of the inquiry, and that he was not going to allow the Commis-

sioner to answer such technical questions as, 'What are the terms of reference?' because he was not going to put him under such pressure from the member for Mitcham. I would like to ask the Chief Secretary what are the terms of reference of the inquiry. That is not a technical question, and it is a perfectly proper question for this Committee. Because police officers are involved, it clearly becomes a matter subject to the work of this Committee. Can the Minister say what are the terms of reference of the committee of inquiry? I understand the committee comprises two police officers and Jim Cramond from the Attorney's office.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not able to supply the terms of reference to the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already referred to repetitious questions. I have explained that a member of the Committee can ask a question and the Minister has the right to decide about the answer. That question has been asked twice—by the honourable member and by another member. If that question is asked again, it will be ruled a repetitious question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Which department is meeting the incidental expenses of this inquiry? Is it the Attorney-General's Department?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: What does the honourable member mean by 'incidental expenses'? I point out that the officers are being paid.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That would come under salaries and wages costs. Incidental expenses would relate to the provision of air fares, if that was necessary, and the provision of back-up facilities for persons working on the report, including typing and secretarial work for the committee and so on. Who is providing the administration and back-up for the committee?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I assume that would be done within the Police Department. Mr Cramond is with the Attorney-General's Department, so I presume those two areas are involved.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Have any police officers been suspended, resigned or otherwise indicated their intention to leave the Police Force as a result of this inquiry?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I cannot answer that question. I understand that no names have been mentioned, only a spate of allegations. That is one of the sad things about this matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is the Minister inviting members of this Committee to sit here and name a whole series of police officers who are only the subject of allegations?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is asking me a question about which I have no knowledge. As far as I know, there have been no suspensions.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is the Minister prepared to refer that question to the Commissioner to see whether he has any further information?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I believe these questions are unfair to the Commissioner. An inquiry is being held, and I think it is despicable that we should have to put up with this line of questioning. I will not ask the Commissioner to comment on this matter, which is in his department. The matter has been referred to two highly competent officers, and a member of the Attorney-General's Department.

The CHAIRMAN: I will call on the member for Elizabeth once more, before calling on another honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, it is difficult if you will allow me only one more question. However, I will endeavour to start my line of questioning. I do not see in the Estimates any provision for matters such as the payment of police informants or other matters which could

be described as special purpose funds for the use of the Police Department. I understand that such funds are available from time to time and that they are used. Under which line does that provision appear?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I think the honourable member is referring to the 'Miscellaneous' vote, which appears on page 62, and specifically to the line 'Payment of rewards for information in respect of various offences'.

The CHAIRMAN: That line is outside the present vote. I suggest that the member for Elizabeth rephrase his question or ask it again when we reach that vote. It has been customary for the Committee to have a break in proceedings in the afternoon. It is up to the Committee whether it follows that procedure.

Mr KENEALLY: I give notice that I intend to move a vote of no confidence in the Chief Secretary because of his refusal to answer legitimate questions. That can be done before the break, or we can break now, and I will move my motion immediately we return.

Mr EVANS: In relation to that matter, no question has been asked by members on this side of the Committee. I wish to ask the Chief Secretary a question on this subject, and I hope I can do that before we break so that the matter can be resolved. I wish to ask my question before the member for Stuart moves his motion, and I believe the call is with this side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham and the member for Elizabeth have both asked questions, so the call is to the other side.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, you called me to ask a question and then asked me to rephrase it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have not called the other side yet. At the moment, we are discussing whether the Committee wishes to take a break and when. The member for Fisher has suggested that we have a break after he has asked his question.

Mr Millhouse: Mr Chairman, am I permitted to raise a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr Millhouse: Do I understand that you will not be giving me the call again this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: I did not say that, but it is reaching the borderline because of the conditions that I read to the honourable member. I assure the honourable member that he will not be receiving a call until members of the Committee have had their opportunity.

Mr Millhouse: Am I permitted to participate in the foreshadowed no-confidence motion?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can participate but he cannot have a vote. The consensus is that I will call on the member for Elizabeth and then the member for Fisher, and we will then break for 15 minutes.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, I am not quite clear. You ruled me out of order on the basis that the subject I raised could relate to the 'Miscellaneous' vote, and I accept that, if that is the case. I am not completely sure that the matter I raised is dealt with under the 'Miscellaneous' vote. I would not like to pass over the 'Salaries and wages and related payments' lines if this particular matter is covered there. The payments that I am referring to are not of the nature of formal rewards announced publicly for information leading to a conviction, etc. I am referring to payments made to people who are known in the trade as 'pimps' and other people who provide police officers with information in the course of their duties.

To my knowledge, these payments are not usually particularly large. They are more likely to be regular payments or payments of a smaller nature than payments of rewards. If such payments are covered under the line 'Payment of rewards for information in respect of various offences', I

will be satisfied with that. If they are not, I would like to know under which line they appear. It has also been suggested to me that certain funds from the Police Department are from time to time made available for police under cover work, such as setting-up drug dealers and so on. Under which line do those payments appear?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The only line I know of is what appears in 'Miscellaneous'. That is the only line I know of and there is nothing hidden in these other lines that I know of.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What moneys have the Police Department used during the past 12 months for activities associated with the buying and selling of drugs, or associated matters, connected with the intention of catching out drug dealers and the like?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Could the honourable member repeat that for me?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Sir, it has been reported to me that from time to time police officers have been involved in setting up various drug dealers to undertake drug transactions and that the police officers concerned have been able to provide for the purpose of the set up large sums of money, which must surely have come from somewhere, Sir. I would have assumed they would have been public moneys; I would be gravely concerned if I found out that the Police Department had some sort of private slush fund that was used for such purposes. I assume that these amounts would have been covered in the public statements of Estimates for South Australia. Where do these amounts appear in our Budget?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not know of any private slush funds, to the use the phraseology of the honourable member, other than the amounts that are shown in the line 'Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous'. That is the only answer I can give to the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Having got the Minister on record about that matter, I am not wishing to pursue it further.

Mr EVANS: I wish to know from the Chief Secretary whether my assessment of the inquiry and its operations is correct. I am of the belief (and I believe most members of Parliament here would know, including the Attorney-General of the 1968-70 era) that where there is an inquiry which is purely departmental, on allegations against individuals and an inquiry such as the one in the Police Department at the moment, it is in fact a straight inquiry in relation to all allegations made against individuals or any other related matter, and there never are or have been any terms of reference and there are no such things as terms of reference for such an inquiry. Is that not the fact?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I think that is the situation. I would be very surprised if there are terms of reference.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fisher has asked a question and the honourable Chief Secretary is answering it. There are interjections from members other than those on the Committee and interjections are out of order in any way.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: In response to the honourable member, I have given my understanding. I was asked the terms of reference. I was not aware that there were any. I have since been informed there are not any. It is an investigation being conducted by the officers of the Police Department and the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr EVANS: I am satisfied there are no terms of reference and there is none to be disclosed.

[Sitting suspended from 3.55 to 4.10 p.m.]

Mr KENEALLY: Prior to the break I had indicated that it was my intention to move a motion of no confidence in the Minister. Therefore, I move:

In view of the Chief Secretary's refusal to provide to the Parliament answers to legitimate questions, this Committee expresses a vote of no confidence in him.

The motion is simple and direct. We do not dispute here in this motion any matter to do with the Minister's wider responsibility as a Minister. We are discussing the refusal by a Minister of the Crown to provide to the Parliament of the State answers to legitimate questions. After all, the Minister is responsible to this Parliament for the areas of his portfolio responsibility, which includes that of the police. He has told this Committee that he will not provide to it information that it has a right to know—information that the public at large has a right to know and information that was available to him if he was to simply take the opportunity to speak to officers at the table with him.

However, the Minister decided that he would treat this Parliament with contempt. That is what we are—the Parliament of South Australia. We are not a Committee simply here to ask questions and listen to answers about the Budget. We are the Parliament of South Australia, and we have a Minister who treats the Parliament with contempt. When asked to provide information, he decides that he is not going to provide it. I am not going to speculate as to the result of this motion. I full well know the system that applies. Nevertheless, the only opportunity that the Opposition and members of Parliament have to express their concern that a Minister of the Crown would treat Parliament in such a way is through a no-confidence motion. That is what we are doing now.

It is no good whatever for the Minister or anyone else to say, subsequent to the denial of legitimate information, that the Minister was able to provide information that he ought to have had at the time of the original request. To my colleagues and to me, quite clearly the Chief Secretary has fallen short of the responsibility that this Parliament and this State places in him. He has contemptuously disregarded the rights of members of Parliament. If this is going to be the level of the Minister's performance for the rest of today's sitting then quite clearly the Parliament, as expressed in this Committee, can have absolutely no confidence in him. It is quite clear that the Minister, when asked to give terms of reference of an inquiry into the Police Force, refused to do so because he said it was not fair to the Commissioner of Police. How fair is it to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia who have every right to expect that the Parliament of South Australia should have provided to it information of this kind? The Minister has denied Parliament that opportunity.

It was well within the Minister's ability to ask the Commissioner what the terms of reference were if the Minister himself did not know. It is quite obvious that the Minister did not know. It is quite obvious that his colleagues and the Cabinet do not confide in the Chief Secretary decisions that are to be made in the areas of the Chief Secretary's portfolio responsibility. The fact that his colleagues and the Cabinet treat him with contempt is no reason why he should treat the Parliament with contempt. He ought to realise, if his colleagues treat him in such a way, how the Parliament would respond if he was to treat us in such a way.

Last week the Attorney-General (and we do not know why it was the Attorney-General and not the Chief Secretary) stated that there would be an inquiry into the Police Department. The inquiry would take into account allegations about police behaviour and drug rackets. That may well be the terms of reference. If they are the terms of reference, they are very simple indeed. Why is it that the Minister decided that those terms of reference, which have been widely canvassed in the news media in South Australia, are not proper to be told to the Parliament? My motion of no confidence is simple indeed: it relies completely on the importance of Parliament and the way Cabinet treats Parliament. I move:

That the Committee has no confidence in the Chief Secretary because of his failure to treat the Committee with the respect that it deserves as the Parliament of South Australia.

Mr EVANS: I do not support the motion. If one went through the transcript, one would find that the Minister has gone out of his way to answer the vast majority of all questions in full detail if the information was available to him. There have been numerous questions. The member for Elizabeth asked many short question in one bracket, and to the vast majority he received full answers. I believe that the Minister has endeavoured in every way to co-operate with the Committee. You, Mr Chairman, said at the beginning of the sittings, and you emphasised to Committee members in your general explanation, that a Minister, if he so wished, need not answer questions, as is the case within Parliament; the same procedure prevails. There are persons on this Committee or in attendance who have served in portfolios in Parliament who also refused to answer questions if they believed it was better to do so, not just for the sake of what people might accuse a Minister or an individual of doing (for the sake of some party political reason) but because of the wider implications within a department. When we talk about the police force, that situation is likely to arise.

I believe that the Minister has co-operated to the best of his endeavours in every way with this Committee, and I ask the Committee to think seriously about that. The honourable member who moved the motion did not state any particular question that the Minister refused to answer. Why did he refuse to state any question that the Minister refused to answer? Is it because the honourable member himself was incapable of remembering an unanswered question, or did not know whether a question was answered (because the honourable member was not listening), or is the member flying a kite? Why did the honourable member not state the questions that the Minister refused to answer? There was an occasion when the Minister said he knew of no terms of reference for an inquiry into his particular department. That is accurate: there were no terms of reference. That is fact, so that is not a refusal to answer.

I am quite satisfied that the Minister has co-operated and has acted quite rightly in the way that Parliamentary practice takes place, as well as in these Committees. He has the rights of a Minister. If he believes in his discretion that it is unwise to disclose certain information or he does not have the full details, then he has the right to refuse. If that occurs at any time, that is his right. In the case of the terms of reference, the Minister did not mislead anyone in any way. He stated a fact: he had no terms of reference—there were none. I ask the Committee to reject the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am amazed to hear the comments of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat; either there are terms of reference for an inquiry or there are not. The article that appeared in the *Advertiser* said:

Wider inquiry on South Australian police. South Australian Government will probe into police drug racket allegations and would examine alleged improper as well as illegal police behaviour, the Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, said last night.

If that does not indicate the types of matter that are to be investigated by this particular inquiry, then I do not know what does. This clearly indicates that there are some terms of reference. It may be only one term of reference, the term of reference being simply to inquire into general allegations, wherever they might come from. If that is the term of reference, so be it. For the Minister to get up and say, first, that he would not tell us what the terms of reference were and, secondly, to deny there were any terms of reference, is the height of stupidity.

The member for Fisher said that the member for Stuart did not refer to any questions that were not answered. I can tell him a question that was not answered. I asked whether or not any police officers had as yet been suspended or left the force as a result of this inquiry. As I recall it (my memory might be slightly faulty regarding the exact words), the Chief Secretary said that he was not prepared to answer that and that he was not going to refer it to the—

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: He said that he was not aware.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Minister said that he was not aware, and then I asked whether he would refer it to the Commissioner. The Minister then said that he thought that it was a technical matter, and that he would not refer it to his Commissioner, or something extraordinary like that. I believe that, if Ministers are to come before these Estimates Committees, they must be prepared to come here in a state in which they can reasonably answer questions put to them by Committee members. I have no doubt that a considerable amount of Cabinet time in the past couple of weeks was taken up with coaching the Chief Secretary on how to handle this Committee.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is a fabrication, and I object to it. That is a complete fabrication.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will have a right of reply.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Apparently it was not a considerable amount of time; it was only a lot of time. Obviously that was to some extent the reason why initially, before he started to lose his cool, the Minister was trying to co-operate to a limited extent with the Committee. The fundamental thing is that this motion is not the traditional sort of motion of no confidence that is moved in these Committees. It is not the sort of motion that one normally moves condemning a Minister's behaviour or the administration of his portfolios. It is not that sort of resolution at all.

It was not the Opposition's intention to move any sort of motion of no confidence in these proceedings today. We believe that getting on with asking questions and hoping to receive answers thereto was the Committee's duty, and that is what we wanted to get into. Unfortunately, we have been thwarted by the stone-walling of the Chief Secretary over this matter. I do not think that that sort of thing is good enough, and this Committee ought to stand up for itself, show a little guts, and show its expression of concern, which I know is shared not just by Opposition members but by all members when they are being more frank.

For those reasons, I think that the Committee ought to have the guts to vote to tell the Chief Secretary in no uncertain terms what we think of the performance that he has put on today, so that, in the remaining few hours of the consideration of his lines, we can possibly get a little more co-operation than we have seen in the past half hour or so.

The CHAIRMAN: In calling the member for Mitcham, I should like to point out that there has been brevity in this debate, and I ask the honourable member to conform to that.

Mr Millhouse: Of course, Sir. May I say that, if I was able to vote as a member of this Committee, I would be supporting this motion? In giving briefly my reasons for the support that I would have given if I had been a member of the Committee, might I remind the Committee of how this all came about? I raised this matter as a new topic. I said (and I stick to this) that this was perhaps the most important matter that the Committee could inquire into while the Chief Secretary and the Police Commissioner were here. The allegations that have been made against the Police Force and the inquiry that has been ordered are of

crucial importance not only to us but also to the whole community.

That was my preamble. I asked a number of specific questions, not one of which has been answered. I asked a question about massage parlours and the police methods of harassment, and why they were not being used against every massage parlour. That matter dropped by the by. No doubt, the Commissioner, who has had long years of experience giving evidence in court, will be delighted to know that the tactic of diversion succeeded on that occasion. Perhaps we will return to that matter on another day. Obviously, we will not get an answer on it now.

On the question of the inquiry, I asked three specific questions: what are the terms of reference; has anyone been suspended; and, when is it expected that it will be completed? Another member followed up that matter afterwards. It was obvious when the Chief Secretary went to answer me (and here I am not prepared to be as charitable as were the members for Stuart and Elizabeth in giving the Minister the benefit of the doubt) that he did not know the answers. It was not that he was refusing to give the information; he either genuinely did not know, or was pretending not to know, what the terms of reference were and whether anyone had been suspended.

The last thing that the Minister was going to do (and here we do get to a refusal!) was to refer the matter to the Police Commissioner, who must know the answer to those questions. Right at the end of the discussion, before the Committee adjourned, the Chief Secretary grabbed at the plank that the member for Fisher threw to him when he asked whether there were any terms of reference, and he said that there were not any. That was no more than grabbing at a plank. He did not know, according to what he said and the way in which he answered my question, whether or not there were any terms of reference.

There are only two alternatives: either this is a Machiavellian plot by Cabinet to deprive the Chief Secretary of the knowledge so that he cannot give it here in this Parliamentary Committee, and keep him absolutely in the dark, so that he can say afterwards, 'These are questions that should have been asked of the Attorney-General'. Of course, when the Attorney-General was here, no-one would have known to ask him, nor would it have been proper to ask.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We did ask, and we were told that it was the Chief Secretary.

Mr Millhouse: I see. There you are. Both Ministers are apparently trying to buck it. Either the Chief Secretary was left in the dark deliberately so that he could not answer these questions, and thus put himself in a position of ridicule as he has this afternoon, or his colleagues in Cabinet think so little of him that they did not bother to consult with him on a matter concerning his own department. There cannot be any other alternatives than those two. Either he was deliberately left in the dark so he could not answer, or his colleagues think so little of him that they will not tell him what is going on in his own bailiwick.

Let me finally remind the Committee and the Chief Secretary that Parliament gets very little occasion or opportunity to question Ministers directly or senior public servants or holders of offices, such as the Commissioner of Police. This is the only day in the year when Parliament gets the opportunity to question the Commissioner of Police, and here we have the situation that, on the most crucial and vital matter of the lot, information is denied to us.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want to correct the honourable member on one matter. The member for Mitcham said that the Committee has the right to question the Commissioner of Police. That is not exactly right.

Mr Millhouse: I thought I used the word 'opportunity'.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not correct. The position is that questions are asked by Committee members and are addressed to the Minister. If the Minister seeks advice, he calls on one of his advisers. That is the situation. It is not a matter of questioning any of the advisers: it is a matter of asking the Minister, who can then seek advice.

Mr Millhouse: Come on, Mr Chairman, you know as well as I do that the facts are that these people come down to assist their Ministers, and it is an opportunity to question them through the Minister. It has happened: this is the sixth day involving the twelfth Committee. Let there be no misunderstanding about that. This is the only opportunity we get publicly to question the Commissioner of Police and anyone else. It is done through the Minister but it is done nevertheless. So it should be. Parliament ought to know what is going on, and on such a vital matter such as this. I will not say anything more. If I could vote on this motion I certainly would and, as I cannot do so here, I may have another opportunity in the whole House later.

Mr OSWALD: Even in its wording the motion obviously fails. It claims that the Chief Secretary has refused to provide answers to legitimate questions. There is not one semblance of evidence that has been presented before the Committee that could give any weight to this motion. The motion must fail. The Chief Secretary has provided information all the afternoon. It was interesting this morning that time was set aside to debate the Chief Secretary's lines. Some debate ensued so that the Chief Secretary could be examined on his lines to 6 p.m. I wondered why that debate ensued, because it was obvious from Saturday's *Advertiser* that the Opposition was going to wait. We already have on record that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Democrats were waiting to confront the Minister on this subject. The situation has been set up, but it has failed.

When announcing the inquiry, the Attorney-General specified the areas of the inquiry which was to probe into the police drug racket allegations as well as illegal police behaviour. I suppose that that would be an instruction coming from the Attorney-General's office. By no stretch of the imagination can that be understood as a term of reference. It is not a formal term of reference or an unofficial term of reference: it is purely an instruction that has come from the Attorney-General's office. All members have knowledge of that particular instruction.

Further, the Chief Secretary is under no obligation in the eyes of this Committee or in any other judgment to divulge to this place the names of officers whose reputations are to be investigated by the competent senior officers of the Police Department. There is no obligation whatever, nor is there any requirement by this Committee to draw from the Chief Secretary that type of information. It is immoral for a Committee of Parliament to try to draw out the names of police officers who at this time are totally innocent until proven guilty. Certainly, I would not want to be part of any no-confidence motion from which the inference could logically be drawn that we wanted various parts of the inquiry divulged to us.

I am happy in my mind that the officers nominated within the Police Department to investigate these matters are competent to undertake such an inquiry. It is obviously an internal inquiry. I accept what the Chief Secretary says when he says that there are no formal terms of reference in existence. Also, from my reading of the press, I have no doubt that no formal terms of reference exist. The Chief Secretary was accurate in saying to the Committee that to his knowledge there were no terms of reference.

In fact, such terms of reference do not exist. The Chief Secretary has not undermined his office in the eyes of this Committee—he stands head high. He has not deceived us.

He has not hidden information. In fact, today he has been frank in providing information to this Committee. I totally reject the whole concept behind this motion, and I do not support it.

Mr LANGLEY: I have listened intently to the member for Morphett, who has been in Parliament for a certain time, anyhow. He must know that at all times politics is a numbers game. He spoke as if he did not understand that. I have nothing personal against the Minister. However, as everyone knows, during Question Time in the House the Minister is always advised by the Minister of Agriculture. It is also a fact that it was a decision of the Liberal Party to make the Chief Secretary a Minister. The Party must then stand behind that decision. Surely the Opposition must have the opportunity, if it so desires, to move a no-confidence motion; that is its privilege. The same situation would apply if members opposite were in Opposition. There is nothing the matter with that.

These Committees were the idea of the Liberal Party and the Premier. They provide an opportunity for members to ask questions and for the Minister to answer questions, with the help of advisers. That is exactly what we are trying to do. We have not received answers, and I could name several instances when this has occurred. The Minister on many occasions has not answered the questions, and that is why I support the motion.

Mr OLSEN: I concede the point raised by the member for Unley that it is the right of the Opposition to move such a motion, but it was only a privilege that it took up after being embarrassed by the late arrival, of which we are accustomed in Parliamentary sittings, of the member for Mitcham. The Opposition would not have taken that action had the member for Mitcham not embarrassed it by taking action for fear of once again having the official Opposition being put on the shoulders of the member for Mitcham. That is why the mover, when speaking to the motion, did not quote the specific questions to which the Minister had not responded. The sessional orders of the Estimates Committees were accepted by the House. Sessional orders provide:

A Committee may ask for explanation from Ministers of the Crown assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information relating to items of proposed expenditure.

The purposes of such Committees are clear and concise. What we have seen here today, as we have seen a number of times during this Committee's sittings over the past six days, is a total abdication of responsibility by the Opposition for using Estimates Committees for the detailed examination of Government expenditure line by line. An enormous amount of time is spent by the Public Service in the preparation of documents and information which the Opposition can seek in relation to Government expenditure. *Ad hoc* motions brought on at short notice, as we have seen today, do nothing to cover the Opposition's lack of penetrating questions in relation to finance. Questions such as those raised by the member for Mitcham and the member for Elizabeth have a place within the Parliamentary process in the form of Questions on Notice and questions in the House. But how irrelevant to a committee looking at expenditure lines under the Chief Secretary's vote is a question in relation to policy decisions, such as 'How long did Cabinet discuss such a matter?'

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think the member for Unley hit the nail on the head when he pointed out that this whole system of Budget Estimates Committees is a creation of the Tonkin Government. Therefore, it is incumbent on that Government, particularly its Ministers, to endeavour to make this system work as effectively as it possibly can. Ministers cannot argue that they have lacked time to prepare themselves for these debates. Other mem-

bers serve on these committees for six sitting days in a fortnight. The hardest working members are the Government back-benchers. Given that Ministers cannot serve on committees and that the presiding officers are provided from the ranks of Government back-benchers, their ranks are so depleted that they have to serve on practically every Committee. The least hard-working members are the Ministers. They face one day of hell or heaven, depending on how it turns out. The rest of the time they can put their heads into their Budget papers and ensure that they are properly prepared.

From what I have seen of this Committee, it is clear that the Chief Secretary is not properly prepared. It is clear that when this matter was raised the Minister did not know whether there were terms of reference. I believe that in itself is an indictment. We are not discussing some obscure corner of the Minister's portfolio which was a matter of press and public speculation six or nine months ago. We are not discussing some theoretical matter which may arise in the future. We are discussing something which is in the centre of the Minister's portfolio and which is the centre of press and public speculation at the moment. I do not think I need say anything further. There are plenty of reasons why this Committee should support this motion.

Mr LEWIS: This is another attempt, just as we saw yesterday, by Opposition members to obscure the fact that they have absolutely no idea about their responsibilities in obtaining information about the operation of various departments that are to be scrutinised by this Committee. They have no idea how to formulate questions which would give them the sort of information that would enable them to present better and more informed debate before the full House, during the subsequent debate and in other debates throughout the year.

Quite clearly, we were aware that this motion was coming, as was pointed out by the member for Morphett. After all, it was publicised in Saturday's *Advertiser*. It is a set-up. The Opposition deliberately set about attempting to find an area of inquiry quite unrelated to proposed expenditure, about which they could claim that they could not obtain information, so that they could then justify introducing this motion. How peurile, how spurious, how ridiculous, how childish, and how churlish! What a waste of time it has been, and I point out that it is their time they are wasting. Members of the Opposition have complained that they do not have sufficient time to obtain the information they need, yet the inane approach they have adopted, assisted in that inanity by the member for Mitcham, is an indication of their incompetence.

The member for Unley quite clearly had a grasp of what it was all about, but he did not interpret that grasp very accurately. Indeed, it is a numbers game. Therefore, how ridiculous and how stupid it is even to propose such a motion knowing that they do not have the numbers. It achieves nothing. It is no accident that the remarks made by the member for Unley indicate the way he would vote given the same circumstances if he ever found himself back on the Government benches.

Mr Langley: You know I'm retiring undefeated.

Mr LEWIS: It is acknowledged that most Parliamentary members who retire do so without being defeated. By definition, were they to be defeated they would not be retiring. That is an indication of the level of debate being conducted by the Opposition throughout this hearing today and in previous Committee hearings. The member for Rocky River pointed out that the purpose of this Committee is to provide information relating to proposed expenditure, not to provide information about other matters. Members of the Opposition have sought information about matters which are not

related to the expenditure which the Government seeks to appropriate.

With due respect to the Committee's proceedings and a desire to spend as much time as possible obtaining information about the proposed expenditure, it was my intention, without engaging in political exercises, to move an amendment to the motion. However, I will not do that. My amendment would have read:

That this Committee expresses its confidence in the Hon. Allan Rodda as Chief Secretary and that in view of the inquiries he has instigated in those areas of his portfolio responsibilities, which have and will facilitate the much improved operation of those public functions within the ambit of the responsibilities, commends him for the improvements effected thereby and thanks the officers who have assisted the Committee in any way whatsoever in providing it with a full and frank disclosure of the factual information supporting the proposed expenditure.

I oppose the motion.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not wish to say a lot. I am not unaccustomed to this heat, because it has been on for the past two years. In some instances, although not on this occasion, it related to some of the shortcomings of members opposite who had perhaps not toed the line in areas where they should have. I wish to reply to some of the comments that have been made. The member for Elizabeth referred to coaching. That is a complete fabrication. The honourable member will say anything, as he said last week in relation to discussions we had in passing. The member for Elizabeth and I have had many discussions in passing in the corridors of this House. I do not recall the particular incident which reared its ugly head on the front page of the *News* last week.

If the honourable member was so concerned about the things occurring in the Police Force perhaps he could have given me some documentation, but he did not. I was surprised to learn some six weeks ago that this matter was abroad and that it had been flagged to the Attorney-General on a broad base. The honourable member also said something about putting words into the mouths of his colleagues. I do not know what he meant by that. My old friend, the member for Unley, referred to the Minister of Agriculture coaching me. Although this is irrelevant, I point out that the Minister of Agriculture never receives a question in the House. That is an indication of what members opposite think of agriculture. During the break I did check with the Attorney-General and there are no formal terms of reference. They are not required for this type of investigation. In checking on the question of the moneys, the wages and salaries of police officers come from the Police Department and any incidental costs all come from the Attorney-General's Department. The matter is in hand and the investigation is proceeding. That is all I want to say.

Mr KENEALLY: Just to enlighten the members of the Committee on what took place, the member for Mitcham asked the Chief Secretary what were the terms of reference of the inquiry into the Police Department. The Chief Secretary said he would not give the information and one of the grounds for that was that it would be an embarrassment to the Police Commissioner. The Chief Secretary refused to give information to the people of South Australia, through the agency of Parliament. That is a simple fact. The no-confidence motion is simple and direct. It does not canvass any of the blind issues that the Government raised in opposing this motion.

The motion before the Committee is as to whether or not this Committee ought to express lack of confidence in the Chief Secretary because he refuses to provide information to the Committee and to Parliament. That information was available to him. It is not a matter of questions that we are concerned about: it was a simple question and it had a simple answer. In fact, each speaker, including the Chief

Secretary, has proffered the information to the Committee. It could have been given to the Committee, I suggest, when it was asked for. It was the action of the Chief Secretary that this Opposition condemns and so we ask the Committee to support this motion of no-confidence in the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: On a point of order, I—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Minister is not a member of the Committee. How can he take a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: I want to explain that we are conducting these Committees in accord with the Standing Orders of the Committee of the Whole. The no-confidence debate has been conducted under the normal rules of debate and is to be kept as concise and orderly as possible, but it is possible for a member to have a second call. This happened yesterday in a motion when the Health lines were being heard, so therefore I take this opportunity of calling the honourable Minister.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The member for Stuart said, or I understand him to say, that I said it would embarrass the Commissioner of Police. I did not say that. I said it was unfair to ask the Commissioner of Police.

The Committee voted on the motion:

Ayes (4)—Messrs Duncan, Hoppgood, Keneally, and Langley.

Noes (4)—Messrs Evans, Lewis, Olsen, and Oswald.

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

Motion thus negatived.

Mr KENEALLY: I understand that it is the policy of the Police Department to regionalise its operations and there were going to be regional centres established at central places. I cannot be certain of that, but I think they were Port Adelaide, Elizabeth, Holden Hill, Marion, and Noarlunga. They may not strictly be the locations but I understand that, if they are not, they are very close to it. I understand that the estimated cost of each of the buildings is \$6 000 000 to \$7 000 000. Can the Chief Secretary tell the Committee what is the current status of the move to regionalise the Police Department and can he say whether the Government proposes to go ahead with this? If it does, can he say when?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The regionalisation is proceeding and plans are in hand for a new headquarters at Holden Hill. I will ask the Commissioner to give us some details on the regionalisation that has been requested.

Mr Draper: Mr Chairman, there are regional headquarters situated at Para Hills, Port Adelaide and Adelaide. Within those three regions each of them has two divisions, with divisional headquarters also at Para Hills, Holden Hill, Adelaide, Port Adelaide and Darlington. The regionalisation was established in 1974 and has been maintained since that time. It is not anticipated that within the next 12 months there will be any extension of the regionalisation in the metropolitan area.

Mr KENEALLY: I understand that there was provision for expenditure of many millions of dollars and a failure to spend that may well be a budgetary matter, so we have the current account benefiting from the capital cost not being incurred. I ask the Minister whether the effectiveness and the efficiency of the Police Force in these regions has been affected by the Government's failure to construct adequate facilities for the regions.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The effectiveness of the Police Force has not been impeded. I think the matter of the regional headquarters at Holden Hill is with the Public Works Committee at present. If the Commissioner would like to comment on the deployment of his staff, I am sure

he can bear me out and perhaps provide some further information that the honourable member may require.

Mr Draper: The Holden Hill building is in the process of planning. I anticipate and hope that it will be followed by others at various other locations in the metropolitan area. I am sorry that I missed the point in commenting on the Holden Hill building, but there is provision for it to proceed in this financial year. I have no reason to believe that it will not proceed.

Mr KENEALLY: The question that I directed to the Minister was whether or not the failure to construct the regional facilities at the time the decision was first made has impeded police efficiency at all within those regions. The reason for the question is the current Government's stated policy to upgrade police resources. I was asking whether failure to contract these facilities is consistent with that policy.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am sorry if I missed that part of the question. The policing has not suffered. It has been regionalised. There are patrols and police services deployed throughout the city area. This is a long-term plan. The Government has been in office for two years. We are in times of financial stringency. If the previous Government had been able to go ahead with its programme two years ago (and I know it is a sore point with the honourable member), it would not be in any better circumstances than the present Government in regard to budgetary restrictions. The police are doing a wonderful job. They have my complete support and loyalty in what they are doing in the metropolitan area.

Mr KENEALLY: The police are doing a wonderful job—the Treasurer is doing a terrible job. I now refer to the purchase of motor vehicles. Could the Minister explain for the benefit of the Committee the variation in the line for additions to the fleet, where the amount voted for 1980-81 was \$30 000, actual payments were \$27 986, and this year the proposed expenditure is \$204 000. I also refer to the net cost of the fleet replacement. Last year the voted amount was \$1 913 000, but only \$1 612 735 was expended. I am sure that the vehicles were available to be purchased. One wonders why they were not. This year the proposed expenditure is \$1 931 000. The same question applies in regard to the purchase of technical and other equipment. Last year, the amount voted was \$627 000 and the amount expended was \$377 257. The amount proposed for 1981-82 is \$747 000. I am happy for the information to be given at a later date.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will give that information to the Committee and the Commissioner may comment on it. In regard to the purchase of motor vehicles, additions to fleet, in 1980-81 the amount voted was \$30 000 and the amount expended was \$27 986. The amount unspent was \$2 014. A total of six vehicles were purchased at a cost of \$27 986. 1981-82, an increase of \$176 000 or 62.9 per cent is proposed as the sum to be spent on motor vehicles. That amount for 1981-82 of \$204 000 will allow for the purchase of 18 patrol vehicles, six unmarked vehicles, four vehicles comprising two breath analysis vans and two breath analysis patrol vehicles for use in connection with random breath testing, and two coroner vans for the transport of deceased persons.

For the net cost of fleet replacements, the amount voted in 1980-81 was \$1 913 000. Actual payments for that year were \$1 612 735. An amount of 16 per cent remained unspent—a figure of \$300 265. The under-expenditure in 1980-81 was due to the action taken by the Government to reduce spending (that was the issue of instructions by the Premier that no further commitments were to be made without Cabinet approval), the late delivery of vehicles, and improvement in the resale price of vehicles. This year we

are supposed to spend \$1 931 000, a 20 per cent increase on actual payments last year. The provision of \$1 931 000 provides for fleet replacements in accordance with revised Government policy of 50 000 km after 2½ years service.

Mr KENEALLY: If the Minister is going to give the information, he might as well give it in regard to office machines and equipment and technical and other equipment, so that there will be no need for him to supply the information at a later date.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: For the purchase of office machines and equipment, the vote for 1980-81 was \$38 000 and payments were \$32 616, which left an amount unspent of \$5 384. The under-expenditure of \$5 384 was due to the late delivery of items, which were not received in time to be paid for by 30 June 1981. It is proposed this year to spend \$292 000, an increase of \$259 384 on actual expenditure last year. The major items included in the 1981-82 provision of \$292 000 are as follows: \$46 000 for the purchase of an additional disc drive for the Firearms Dec PDP 11/70 computer to satisfy firearm control system requirements; and \$209 000 for the upgrading of the Dec PDP 11/70 computer to handle traffic infringement notice system requirements and the purchase of associated computer hardware and software, and cash receipting machines, etc. for that system.

Mr KENEALLY: Can the Minister answer my question in regard to the last line?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer to the purchase of technical and other equipment for which an amount of \$627 000 was voted last year and payments were \$377 257, leaving an amount of \$249 743, or 40 per cent, underspent. The under-expenditure is attributed to the late delivery of equipment which was not received in time to be paid for by 30 June 1981, and the deferment of equipment purchases in accordance with actions taken by the Government to curtail spending.

In the 1981-82 provision of \$747 000, \$272 000 is allowed for completion of the 1980-81 equipment purchase programme, which includes purchase of the following items: revolvers, \$95 000; radio, \$71 000; launch, \$34 000; radio-miniature transceivers, \$19 000; motor cycle helmets, \$12 000; handcuffs, \$9 000; shotguns, \$15 000; camera kits, \$4 000; multi-channel recorder head, \$10 000; and cross band radio transceivers, \$3 000.

An amount of \$475 000 was for the purchase of the following essential replacement and additional equipment items: communications equipment, \$223 000; traffic and breath analysis, \$24 000; state security and tear gas, \$66 000; rescue and diving equipment, \$53 000; cameras, \$51 000; laboratory equipment, \$13 000; special video equipment, \$10 000; coroner's body handling equipment, \$14 000; training equipment, \$4 000; and workshop equipment, \$17 000.

Mr EVANS: Is the same practice carried out in the Police Department as in some of the other departments in relation to motor vehicles? Is it a fact that the revenue from motor vehicles that are traded in or sold at auction is allocated to general revenue, and that the replacement vehicles are paid for in total out of the years allocation of funds?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: There are specific details with this and I ask the Commissioner to give them.

Mr Draper: No, the Police Department does not operate in that fashion. Used vehicles are disposed of at auction and the money received is paid back into the department to offset replacement costs.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to other equipment in the department, how does the department dispose of items surplus to its requirements?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Such as sundry items?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask the Commissioner whether he can tell the Committee how these matters are dealt with.

Mr Draper: They are sold either through the State Supply Department or the Public Buildings Department.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If such items were not sold and were being used by persons for their own purposes, is that possible within the audit regulations? Would the Chief Secretary know about it if that was happening, and would he have to give his approval?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I take it you are referring to officers of the force? I require some clarification from the honourable member.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will ask Mr Draper to reply.

Mr Draper: The only equipment that is sold other than as I have said is minor equipment, and a return is made to the State Supply Department of the equipment which is sold.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Would it be sold to officers of the Police Department?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I cannot answer that question. I will ask the Commissioner to answer it.

Mr Draper: Yes.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: How are such sales arranged—internally within the Police Department or through another Government department or agency?

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

Mr Draper: If it is of a minor amount, then it is on offer from the individual who makes the purchase. That is done direct to the Building and Supply Section. If it is over an amount of \$50 then it is referred to the State Supply Department.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Do senior officers of the department enjoy this benefit, the same as the ranks?

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

Mr Draper: Yes.

Mr Mathwin: What action, if any, is the Police Department taking in an attempt to counteract the moribund gangs operating, as has been the case recently in Hindley Street and in the country, where we have had a concentration of this type of person. These groups are very mobile and are in large numbers? Does the department have any plans to have a certain section of the Police Department to counteract this type of person or keep them under some control? At present they appear to be enjoying a fair sort of life where they can spread their wings wherever they want and move about very quickly. The gangs concerned are well known to the police. Is there any particular squad set up to handle these people and, if there is not, is it intended that there will be such a squad to counteract this nuisance?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The policy of the police is to assess all the needs. As I have mentioned this morning, we are recruiting an extra 33 cadets and 16 adults this year. This is a recruitment of an additional 49 members in 1981-82. I will ask the Commissioner whether he can elaborate on the matter of policing and dealing with these moribund gangs.

Mr Draper: When information comes to the attention of senior officers in the uniform section a decision is made to deploy the special task and rescue force in particular areas to combat those sorts of problems which the honourable member spoke about. This is in addition to and in co-operation with the police who are responsible for policing the specific area involved.

Mr Mathwin: I take it then that no action is taken until some trouble arises? Even if it looks as though trouble will

occur, I take it no action is taken to counteract the trouble before it actually starts? At one stage there were personnel who were closely linked with people who rode motor bikes around the place. I went to an annual general meeting some years ago and one of your officers was present (I think his name was Begg) and he seemed to be operating with some success. As the situation has not improved and, from what I gleaned, there has been a bigger concentration of this type of gang, it does not leave much to the imagination to see what can occur and has occurred. When do the police take action? Do they take action when they think something will happen or when it happens, because then it may be a little late?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This is a matter of general policing and I ask the Commissioner whether he will reply.

Mr Draper: We take action in both cases, depending on the information which is available to us of what things are likely to happen.

Mr Mathwin: Is it the intention of the department to have a section of the police to deal specifically with juveniles, and to include policewomen who can handle this situation well? The Minister read my report recently and he would be aware of what happens in many countries with great success such as in Canada, Germany and some States of America. We have a problem with juvenile crime which certainly will not get better. The problem is the same as in most countries of the world. It seems to me to make good sense to do something about it now because of the great success rate, particularly in Manitoba, where they have a section of the Police Force which deals specifically with, and gets the confidence of, young people in the State. It is a two-way job: it is a good public relations exercise and it helps the situation immensely in that particular Province.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I think that the honourable member's report broke new ground in this area. I ask the Commissioner to comment on what deployment, if any, there is in the Police Force to deal with young people.

Mr Draper: There is no specific section in the Police Force dealing with juveniles, except in the prosecution area. At present, no suggestions are being considered in relation to deploying people into that area of work.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I want to ask a question regarding the fight against organised crime in South Australia. I am particularly interested in the attempt that organised crime is constantly making to infiltrate Police Forces, not only here but everywhere else, as well as in their *modus operandi*. I am particularly concerned about reports that I have received recently regarding the well-known Sydney group run by Mr Saffron and his associates gaining further licensed premises in South Australia. Can the Chief Secretary give the Committee any information on that matter, on which, during my time as Attorney-General, I know the Police Department kept a close scrutiny?

I understand that recently Mr Saffron's associates have obtained control of the licences of four leading restaurants in Adelaide. I would be interested to know what has happened to the campaign to try to keep these influences out of South Australia.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member has asked questions on a matter on which we would have to obtain information. However, I ask the Commissioner to comment on the ambit of the information that we will have to obtain for the Committee.

Mr Draper: Personally, I do not have the knowledge to enable me to answer the question. I would have to seek information in order to do so.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I appreciate that. Has there been any change in the general direction of policy in

relation to organised crime since the change of Government?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not think that there has been any. I would like to refer that matter to the Commissioner for a professional comment.

Mr Draper: No, there has not been, as far as the Police Department is concerned. About two years or so ago (it is probably three years ago now), I set up a committee to report on organised crime in South Australia and, as a result, put greater emphasis on the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. In that area reposes the main responsibility for bringing to our notice those operations that can be attributed to organised crime. There is no relenting, as far as the department is concerned, in following up the matters that fall into that category.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It has also been reported to me that recently pressure has been put on some massage parlours to sell out or close down. This pressure has come from interstate interests who apparently seem to be taking over and consolidating control of massage parlours (or, if you like, brothels) in South Australia. This seems to be a matter that is of grave concern to the people of this State. Can the Minister or the Commissioner throw any light on that matter?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Massage parlours and what attaches to them are of great interest to the people of South Australia. I ask the Commissioner to comment.

Mr Draper: I understand that, at the time when legislation relating to the licensing of massage parlours was being considered by Parliament or being discussed in Parliamentary circles, information from our Vice Squad indicated that there was a movement of interstate interests to endeavour to get control of more massage parlours in Adelaide. Since the cessation of consideration of the question of licensing massage parlours, that degree of interest has dropped off.

Mr EVANS: I should like to take a little further the point raised by the member for Elizabeth. I realise that it may be impossible for the Minister or any of his advisers to give any detailed information on this. However, I was led to believe that perhaps two years or 2½ years ago (it could be longer), when a particular type of nightclub operation started in Adelaide (I do not wish to name the club or to give any information that would identify it) and began a certain form of strip act, it was approached by another Hindley Street operation that had a direct connection with Mr Saffron from Sydney and told that, if it employed a stripper from the Hindley Street operation, it would not have any bother with customers' cars being dented, fights started, or drinks spilt on the floor, or any trouble on the scene.

When that operation found a way of getting around this matter by having another form of strip that could even have involved volunteers, it was told that, if it ensured that the Saffron organisation was to win each night or at least on the majority of nights when it provided a person to enter the volunteer strip, no problems would be experienced. Those involved went even further and said that the compere could be more readily provided by the Saffron operation and that a certain fee would be set on him.

Has the Minister, or any of his officers, knowledge of any such practice actually occurring, or is it merely a rumour that has been spread to discredit Mr Saffron, any more than he has already been discredited? It concerns me with people trying to start a business within the law (even though it is just within the law) and they are successful in attracting large attendances and making good profits, when a form of organised crime (and that is all that it can be called) can move in under this black-veiled type of operation and make it very difficult for our law-enforcement agencies

to stamp out the practice, mainly because of the fear of the business operation being offended against coming out in the open as the ultimate result might be something worse than its having to pay \$500, \$700, \$800 or \$1 000 a week protection money, which is really what appears to occur. Does the Minister or any of his officers have any knowledge of that sort of thing occurring here and has he any thoughts on how it can be counteracted?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer this question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I do not personally know of anything of that nature. However, I will have inquiries made and endeavour to supply an answer.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Oswald): The member for Fisher.

Mr EVANS: My question is not on the same line. The member for Elizabeth might have a follow-up question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mine is not on the same line, either, but I suspect it is my turn.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If the member for Fisher is going on to a new line—

Mr EVANS: I am dealing with the general Police Department line.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: All day, when a member has wanted to go through a new topic, we have given other members the opportunity of raising—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The practice this afternoon is that, when a member goes to a new topic, we do give a new call. I will come back to the member for Fisher.

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, Sir, I earlier raised a point of order concerning the fact that we had been talking about breathalyser tests. It was ruled that that was a specific topic. When we left that topic, I was informed that we were on the general Police Department line and there were no more specific topics, and we could deal with that whole line. Did I misunderstand the ruling? That is what I understood.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am advised that the Chairman reversed that ruling, and admitted that he perhaps erred in that ruling. The practice is that after we go to a new topic we give a new call. I call the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What procedures are followed and what checks are made in relation to drugs and other items, including cash, which are confiscated by police officers, and what procedures are followed to ensure that those items are kept in safe custody, do not go astray, and are available for subsequent proceedings, or are alternatively returned to the person from whom they have been confiscated?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As it is a procedural matter, I will refer the question to the Commissioner.

Mr Draper: I cannot do justice to that question from memory. There are procedures for the weighing of drugs which are seized, for the recording of drugs and their placement in a strong room. The same applies with cash, which is counted, recorded and placed in safe keeping. I think it goes to the general property area and is held there. However, to do justice to the question I will have to get details of the systems which apply.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We will get details for the honourable member.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to the computer that was purchased by the Police Department in order to facilitate and expedite the collection and retrieval of information in regard to firearms registration. I refer to 'Assistant Commissioner, Services' on page 180 in regard to firearms control. What did the computer ultimately cost in terms of hardware and

software? What proportion of the cost was spent on hardware? Is it functional at present?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As this is specific information, we will have to obtain it for the honourable member.

Mr LEWIS: I thought it was about \$1 000 000. I would like to know whether the introduction of the new firearms regulations during the past year, when they have been operating, has resulted in making any reduction in the number of crimes that have been committed using or involving firearms.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That involves statistical information on the results and we will have to obtain that for the honourable member as well.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to bring to the Committee's attention the fact that there are nine votes still to be considered.

Mr KENEALLY: We have finished.

Mr EVANS: My last question relates to the important topic of emergency services, about which the Opposition has not asked a question. Is the amount allowed for under the Police Department the total amount made available for State Emergency Services? Is there any consideration by the Government in an attempt to put all the emergency services, or more of them, under one Minister? I refer particularly to the ambulance, Fire Brigade, State Emergency Services, Country Fire Services, and the Police Department.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The note I have is as follows:

State Emergency Services—Operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries:

	\$
Voted—1980-81	44 000
Payments 1980-81	43 145
	\$855 under-spent
	\$
Proposed 1981-82	50 000
Payments 1980-81	43 145
	\$6 855 (16 per cent increase)

The increased provision in 1981-82 allows for recurring items, an allowance of 4 per cent for inflation and provision for unavoidable administrative and training costs associated with the increased number of State Emergency Service units now operating.

Subsidies to local government bodies:

	\$
Voted 1980-81	52 000
Payments 1980-81	61 998
	\$9 998 (19 per cent over-spent)

The additional expenditure in 1980-81 resulted from a carry-over commitment from the previous financial year. A total of 57 local government authorities received subsidy payments.

	\$
Proposed 1981-82	69 000 (11 per cent increase)

The increased provision for 1981-82 is to cover the anticipated increased commitment in relation to the establishment of new units and increased participation by units. The maximum subsidy payable remains at \$2 500 per unit.

The State Emergency Services also receives equipment from the Commonwealth Government from the national disaster organisation. The honourable member asked whether there were any steps in train to place emergency services under one Minister. There is not at this juncture. The honourable member would be aware of the revamp of the fire services that has resulted from the report of the Select Committee that inquired into the Fire Brigade.

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

Auditor-General's \$1 969 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr S. G. Evans
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
Mr G. F. Keneally
Mr G. R. A. Langley
Mr I. P. Lewis
Mr J. W. Olsen
Mr J. K. G. Oswald

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

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

Mrs P. Stevens, Ministerial Assistant, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr R. A. Henry, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr KENEALLY: The most immediate and obvious question is to ask why the Auditor-General is not available to attend this hearing. I think the Auditor-General did not attend last year's Committee hearing, either.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The Auditor-General is on annual leave. He was also on annual leave last year when the Committee was sitting. It just so happens that he applied for his leave some considerable time ago; he made certain arrangements, and he is absent. Mr Harrison is the Deputy Auditor-General, he is present and is competent in his office.

Mr KENEALLY: I am certainly not reflecting on Mr Harrison. I am certain that the Minister has described him very accurately and that he is very competent and that he can do the job. Is the Minister content that the Auditor-General should be absent when the Parliamentary Estimates Committees are in session? I should think that the Auditor-General, as the senior officer of his department, should be present, not only to provide information to members of the Committee but also to sit in on some of the sittings, as he did early last week. Is the Minister content that the Auditor-General seems to go on holidays when the Estimates Committees are in session? If not, does he propose to do something about it?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is unfair for the member for Stuart to say that the Auditor-General seems to be away. The fact is that he is away on annual leave. Like many other people, Mr Tattersall made certain arrangements. It has also been brought to my attention that the sitting times of this committee were altered, and Mr Tattersall cannot be blamed for that, nor can anyone else. Originally this hearing was set down for 8 October, but it was changed to 15 October. The Auditor-General is absent, and I am sure that Mr Harrison is quite capable of running the department and that he is quite capable of advising me on questions that might be asked.

Mr KENEALLY: I take it that the Minister would not be concerned if the Auditor-General was absent again next year when the Committees are in session. I am not saying

that we have no confidence in Mr Harrison, because we are absolutely certain that he is able to do his job very competently. However, the Opposition believes it is rather odd that Mr Tattersall's holidays coincide with these hearings. I should have thought that his being away last year would be a good reason in itself for the Minister to ask Mr Tattersall to make himself available this year, and to make arrangements for his leave accordingly. The Minister did not do that, so he must be content to allow his senior officer in the Auditor-General's Department to be away. I find that rather strange, as does the Opposition. I do not intend to question the Minister any further on this matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I wish to add my comments to those of the member for Stuart on this matter. Important matters are being considered by this Committee and by Committee A, which should be matters of interest to the Auditor-General. I was surprised to hear that he was not only on holidays last year at this time but that he was proposing to be on holidays this year at the same time. The Minister has assured us that he has every confidence in Mr Harrison to provide the necessary advice on any matters raised. I would like to refer to a number of issues relating to the morale of the staff of the Auditor-General's Department, which I believe is fairly low at the present time. Is the Minister happy with the standard of morale amongst the field staff of the department at present?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not believe that they are upset. However, the honourable member may have a particular reason for that remark. I have discussed this matter with Mr Harrison, and I believe his staff are alive to their job and alive to their responsibilities. From what I have seen, they are doing a very good job. I will ask the acting head of that department to comment further. I know that the staff are behind their acting chief.

Mr Harrison: I certainly concur with the Minister's remarks in relation to the morale of the staff. I believe that it is high. There was one small problem but, following discussions with the executive and the section heads, that matter was resolved. I point out that it was only a small matter, anyway. I believe that the morale of the staff is very, very high at the present time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Is the Minister aware of a report from the research and development officer to the executive?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: No, I am not. Mr Harrison has drawn my attention to the fact that it was an internal document, and that is why I did not see it. The member for Elizabeth seems to have a copy. Several departments come under my portfolio, so it would be impossible for me to see every internal document. In fact, one of my colleagues was recently bashed in the press over an internal document.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In the second paragraph of this document it says, 'the executive has a low expectation of the field staff's ability to contribute constructively to considerations of policy, to planning and to problem solving'. Does the Minister agree with that statement?

The CHAIRMAN: Please repeat the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The question is: does the Minister agree with this statement in the second paragraph:

Associated with this view is the impression that the executive has a low expectation of the field staff's ability to contribute constructively to considerations of policy, to planning and to problem solving.

Does the Minister agree with that statement?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have not seen it before. I daresay that, if it is an internal document, it has been dealt with by the Auditor-General himself and his staff. It is a matter that has not come to my notice.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Unfortunately, the Auditor-General is on holidays and he is unable to tell us. I then ask in relation to the following statement:

It is suggested that a departmental policy of openness and disclosure should be adopted. Such a practice would portray a degree of trust that is not now evident and would reduce the impact of 'the grapevine'.

Does the Minister agree that that suggestion should be adopted?

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order. In the Estimates Committees, basically our role is to examine the expenditures of money and I believe the questioning by the member for Elizabeth is now on an internal document, into the operations of a department with staff perhaps expressing a view and it is a research document back to those who are higher than them. It is not a thing on which the Minister might be likely to have direct knowledge, nor is it a matter that is directly related to our form of inquiry, when there are many lines we still wish to ask questions about in relation to expenditure of money. Even though the member may be able to argue that it costs money to operate the department, I believe it is divorced from the questions we should be asking the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: In answer to the member for Fisher, I do not uphold a point of order. The position is in the hands of the honourable Minister. Questions have been admissible in the proceedings of the Committee concerning staff but, of course, the Minister has the right, if he wishes, to answer the question. Secondly, if he wishes to seek advice, he has the right to do that. If the Minister feels that is not appropriate, it is within his decision to give the answer he feels correct.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: This has nothing to do with the lines. Now I get the reason for the first question about it from the honourable member, about the Auditor-General being on leave, and then the question about the morale and I get this. I have not seen this before. It is 'Minutes of Meeting Thursday 1 October'. It refers to the executive and this is a matter that has been dealt with in-house by the relevant department. I think this is highly improper and I do not know where the member for Elizabeth got it from, but here we are discussing a matter that is privy within that department. This puts Mr Harrison in an embarrassing position.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am quite sure it does embarrass the Deputy Auditor-General.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: If the purpose of the argument is to embarrass the Auditor-General, it is pretty poor on the part of the member for Elizabeth and the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: I might say once again I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that this Committee is arranged to question and to seek information from the honourable Minister. The Minister has the right to have advisers here and I do not see it as the right of the Committee to examine the advisers. It is the answers that the Minister gives, and if the Minister is satisfied that he does not wish to seek advice from the officer, then that is the Minister's answer. I would like the Committee to accept that.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr Chairman, can I give you my assurance that I absolutely accept what you are saying; the very point we are making is that the Chief Secretary himself should have ensured that he had the proper and correct officers here to be able to provide information to him. The fact that the Auditor-General is not here is not a direct reflection on the Auditor-General; it is a reflection on the Chief Secretary for not making proper arrangements, or what we would consider to be proper arrangements, fitting to be able to receive advice. I accept that entirely and it is not a reflection on the

Auditor-General, but, to take Mr Evans' words, very clearly it is an important matter in relation to the Budget and the Estimates for the State.

It is an important matter because of the very fact that an efficient audit department and one that is operating effectively and properly is the most important thing that we can have to ensure that the funds of this State Government are being expended efficiently and properly. There are quite serious matters in this document that I have been quoting from, which indicates that all is certainly not well within the Auditor-General's Department.

I am very pleased, that here this afternoon I have been able to bring these matters to the attention of the Chief Secretary, who did not know about the very existence of this document that is so damning to the department. In those circumstances, I think that it is important that we should have the opportunity of going through it to see what are the Chief Secretary's views of these criticisms. I will put it to him again to see whether he agrees with this comment:

It is suggested that a departmental policy of openness and disclosure should be adopted. Such a practice would portray a degree of trust that is not now evident and would reduce the impact of 'the grapevine'.

Does the Chief Secretary agree that that should be implemented?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Mr Chairman, I find it utterly despicable that an internal document of a department can be leaked and brought into this Committee, holding the department up to ridicule, when the Acting Auditor-General (Mr Harrison) tells me that this matter has been dealt with at executive level, dealt with internally, and it just points up that somebody is not playing the game if that person is leaking this sort of information. I do not propose to answer any questions on an internal document. I make that clear to the Committee and to the member for Elizabeth, because I think it is a most despicable action in bringing the matter before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The situation is that the honourable member has acquired this information and I guess it is the honourable member's own business as to how he acquired it and the right to question on it. I say once again, the Minister has the right to make the decision that he has now made. I will call the member for Elizabeth once more.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Thank you. Of course, it is the purpose and intention of these Committees, to elicit information such as is possible. I must say I am very pleased to have been able to enable the Chief Secretary to extend his knowledge of the way his department is running. This report goes on to make a number of other comments, which I again want to put to the Chief Secretary. Quite clearly he is able to simply refuse to answer, as he has just done, but that does not deny me the right to put the question to him. One other quote I want to refer to is:

The 'grapevine' sometimes informs a significant proportion of personnel in advance of the person(s) concerned.

Consequently, feelings that there is inequality and preferential treatment, experienced by officers not privy to inside information, would be dissolved. [If there was more openness of information, that means] the possessor of information is seen to be advantaged.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the time. The honourable member for Elizabeth will have the call after the break.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the Committee that Mr Randall, the member for Henley Beach, is taking the place of Mr J. Oswald, the member for Morphett, on the Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will wind up what I want to say about the morale of the department and the implications of this report in this question and comment. I was talking before about the recommendations that were made in relation to consultation. They were as follows:

1. That a policy statement be produced, stating the roles of the executive and section heads and their inter-relationship.

2. That the executive adopt and display an open attitude towards section heads by sharing its concerns over policy matters, current and future plans and problems, and by communicating useful and general interest information.

3. That decisions affecting staff be immediately communicated to the persons who will be directly affected when such decisions are put into practice.

4. That consultation with staff be actively encouraged, particularly prior to executive decisions involving changes of audits or staff.

Then, under the 'Management' heading, the following appears:

'Where are we heading in auditing?' is asked, because we lack positive direction on matters of audit policy and methodology. Where direction is given it is often inconsistent or negative.

Then, in relation to written reports, the following suggestion is made particularly in relation to reporting to clients:

There is much frustration resulting from the executive's modification of reports prepared for forwarding to clients. The adoption of a soft approach does not indicate management support to field staff, but engenders a reluctance by senior staff engaged on pertinent issues with clients to raise contentious matters. There appears to be an official lack of independence.

For someone within the audit office to have made that sort of comment is most serious, in my view, and indicates that all is far from well within the audit office at the present time. Undoubtedly, these are matters which should long ago have been brought to the attention of this Minister. If he was properly and effectively administering this part of his portfolio load, he should have been aware of and sensitive to these problems and to the issues raised in it.

The report goes on, but I will not delay the Committee further. It is quite clear from this report that there are grave problems within the audit office in relation to morale, and the direction that the office is taking; particularly, concern is expressed as to the professional independence of the auditors working in that office.

Mr OLSEN: I rise on a point of order. Under Sessional Order No. 3, I ask where the member links his question and remarks to what is contained on page 58 of the Budget papers.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On page 58 under the item 'Auditor-General's Department, salary and wages and related payments', these are matters relating to the value for money that the State of South Australia is obtaining. The honourable member can laugh, but these are very serious matters indeed.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order raised by the member for Rocky River because the line is 'Deputy Auditor-General, Directors of Audits, Senior Auditor, auditors, administrative, accounting and clerical staff'. As I see it, the debate is concerning staff.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I dealt briefly with this report. In my view, it is a most important document. It indicates widespread concern within the department about the direction of the department, the professional independence of the auditors working therein, and reporting to clients. All these matters relate to the morale within the department. Everyone knows that, without a happy work force, you do not get a very effective work task undertaken.

I believe that the Minister should pay very great and careful attention to these matters, and I ask him to obtain a copy of this report and consider its recommendations and suggestions carefully, with a view to implementing them himself, if necessary, to ensure that the staff in the audit office are turned into an effective team with a high morale.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am advised that action taken by the executive was accepted by section heads at a meeting on 1 October chaired by the Auditor-General himself. This does not mitigate in any way what I said before the dinner break, namely, that this is a leaked document. That must give rise, I am sure, to the Auditor-General and to the Deputy Auditor-General, that, if these documents that are produced in their department perhaps to communicate dissatisfaction in the staff are leaked to members of Parliament, and then become the subject of debate in a forum such as this for all to see—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It shows a grave morale problem.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It may suit the honourable member to talk about morale problems. We know that he is on a witch-hunt. That is his wont. I am not unfamiliar with the wont of the honourable member. I could open up and say a lot of things on this issue. I said before dinner that this is a despicable thing, and that it is a private or an internal document.

Concerning morale, this is the first time for a long time since I have been in this House that, when the Budget came in, the Auditor-General's Report came in with it. It is a very fair document. It reports faithfully, and I think it gives a lot more detail this year than it has in the past. I know that recommendations were made to do that. There are in the Auditor-General's Report notes that draw attention to the various factors that go to make up a report. To me, that does not seem to suggest a lack of morale in a department that would have produced a report as comprehensive as this. Action has been taken. I have the assurance of the executive that this was accepted by section heads at a meeting. That is all I propose to say on this leaked document.

Mr EVANS: Even though I believe that discussion on that document is outside what it was originally intended this Committee should be discussing, I have to express a view before asking the Minister a question. I believe that it was a direct reflection on Mr Harrison by the form of questioning that took place, after he had stated quite clearly that there had been a problem within the department but that it had been corrected. That was a clear indication to the member for Elizabeth that it was admitted that there had been a problem within the department but that it had been corrected. It was really being said, by the continued questioning, that Mr Harrison was not speaking the truth, that there was a morale problem and still is a problem within the department, and that members were not accepting Mr Harrison's word. That is a reflection on him that I do not accept. Regarding the Auditor-General's not being available, at any time any head of Government may be taken away because of illness, leave, or any other of the normal processes.

Members interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Under them are persons who are quite capable of answering questions. Proof of that to date is that no member of this Committee has asked Mr Harrison a question directly relating to finance. Questions have been asked indirectly, but not directly. None asked a question in regard to finance, which is the main purpose of this committee's questioning and operation. Seasonal order 3 clearly states that.

Mr Harrison is here, (although Mr Tattersall is not) to answer questions that are being asked. As the Auditor-General's Department has changed its method of auditing to a system-based approach, leaving it to the department to have more internal control of minor matters, and as they are going to a material form of concentration by the auditors themselves, having gone away from the checking of numerous individual transactions that might take place in

the department, I want to know whether that has meant a saving of money to the State and, at the same time, allowed the Auditor-General's Department to have the proper check and control over the expenditure of each department that should take place.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The point made by the member for Fisher is well taken. Having spoken to Mr Harrison, I know that has had a beneficial effect in the Auditor-General's Report. I refer to the fine report which came down this year and which contained a lot of information. It clearly sets out not only what departments are spending but also what they are doing. Mr Harrison will reply in some detail on that question which has been raised by the member for Fisher.

Mr Harrison: System-based auditing as such rests on the simple hypothesis that, if a system is properly oriented towards its objectives, and if the controls built into the system are adequate and functioning on a continuing basis, only limited sampling of transactions is needed as the basis for an auditor to form an opinion on the reliability of all transactions passing through the system. The Auditor-General adopted this system in November 1979. The basis of achievement for this is through flow charting the systems in operation within the departments, showing the control points and, from those control points, setting the objectives of the audit and trailing these things through.

At present, we have achieved only about 30 per cent of those systems by that method. It would take four to five years for us to go through the whole of those that are currently there. It has been a major exercise. We believe that the departments themselves should perhaps document and flow chart their own systems, but they have not got the resources to do it. We have put our resources into that area. Eventually, we see that some savings should perhaps be made. However, it would be perhaps four to five years before any great effect could be felt with respect to the Auditor-General's vote on that score.

Mr EVANS: Is the department aware of the need to have personnel well versed in the area of computers because of the possibility of computer crime even in Government departments, as has occurred in other parts of the world? Is any of the money that we are making available being directed towards training or making sure that people are kept up to date with all developments in computer technology, so that we have as many areas of checking through the computer system itself to save personnel time and to ensure that we suddenly do not have a major crime in one of our departments through one person having a greater knowledge of computer programming and operation than, say, the Auditor-General's Department or departmental computer operators operating in an honest way?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The matters raised by the member for Fisher regarding the department being aware of areas of computer crime, training and technology to ensure that this type of offence is kept under due guard and surveillance is indeed something of which the people of the State would be appreciative. Mr Harrison will reply in detail.

Mr Harrison: I draw the honourable member's attention to page 8 of the Auditor-General's Report. We inserted a paragraph this year in relation to audit response to computing developments. It details the action that has been taken to meet the audit responsibilities in the data processing environment. Specifically, a professional development and training programme on auditing of A.D.P. systems has been provided for field staff. To date, approximately 50 officers of the current staff have participated in that programme. We have also programmed for an additional 20 officers to do that course, which is commonly called the

Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants course in November this year to further update our people in that area.

The second part is the section of A.D.P. specialist staff with computing and auditing skills, which is maintained to advise and assist field staff in the audit of computer systems. A lot of these people are computer service officers, with great technical knowledge. Selected field staff are periodically seconded to the A.D.P. section for specialist training. Last year, we had four staff but, because of a shortage of staff in our field area, we had to move them out. Currently, we have one person seconded to that area, and we propose to put another person in there within the next month. Added to that, comprehensive draft computer audit guidelines have been developed and are being used on a trial basis. Those computer audit guidelines were developed in conjunction with the offices of other Auditors-General throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr EVANS: I thank Mr Harrison for that, because not many people see the Auditor-General's Report but many more people read *Hansard*. It is important to have that recorded. I wish to ask a question in relation to motor vehicles. Through all of my questioning on motor vehicle purchases I have been trying to ascertain whether every department has the same method of using and disposing of funds and I find that they vary. Can the Minister say whether moneys received for vehicles that have been disposed of are paid into general revenue or whether they are paid back into the Auditor-General's fund?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have been informed by Mr Harrison that it is paid into general revenue.

Mr KENEALLY: Without canvassing the merits of the departmental document that has been the subject of a lot of discussion this afternoon and tonight, can the Minister say whether he is happy with a system that allows a document of such importance to circulate and be decided upon within his department without it being made known to him as Minister and as the person responsible for the activities of the department? Are you happy with a system that allows that?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I stated earlier that I would not refer to this document again. It is an internal document and it is the responsibility of the head of that department. If he feels that it should be drawn to the attention of the Minister, it will be drawn to the attention of the Minister. Ministers do not go around snooping. The heads of departments are given a charter to run a department, and indeed they do. Ministers could miss something; it is not part of the practice for Ministers to be snooping. I have sufficient faith in my directors that, if there is something they should draw to my attention, then they will. I have seen the document now and I will have a look at it. I am certainly not going to hold that against the Director. It was his province, he acted upon it, I have detailed that to the Committee, and I hope it is clear to the Committee.

Mr OLSEN: On page 7 of the Auditor-General's Report reference is made to the concept of establishing internal audits throughout the Public Service after evaluating results achieved in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Community Welfare Department, and Services and Supply Department. It is stated that the proposed programmes of work to be undertaken in 1981-82 by each of the three groups have been drawn up. It is rather detailed, and the Minister might wish Mr Harrison to respond to the question. Can the Minister supply details of the work programmes to which I have referred?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The point raised by the member for Rocky River is an important one and has certain complexities about it. Mr Harrison will respond to the question.

Mr Harrison: The Engineering and Water Supply Department was the first department where an internal audit

group was set up. They produced a programme which officers saw and they did a couple of projects last year. The Community Welfare Department did not have the staff to be able to go into it at all and to my knowledge they have not as yet had any staff at all. The Services and Supply Department only obtained their officers right at the end of the year and I am not aware of any programme as such that they have delivered to our office. If the honourable member wishes I will certainly obtain those details. As yet we do not see any foreseeable gain for our department in the next three or four years from internal audit in these departments until they launch into their thorough programmes.

Mr OLSEN: I will take up the offer to supply that information and would appreciate it when it can be made available. In 1979 it was agreed that the Auditor-General's Department would place more emphasis on efficiency audits to identify where the taxpayer is not receiving value for money. Can the Minister identify what progress has been made with implementing efficiency audits over the last two years?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The Government has looked at it. We have not proceeded with it at this stage.

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

There is a matter I want to bring before the Committee. I advise members of the Committee that it is necessary to adopt a report to the House towards the end of today's proceedings. That report will advise the House of the items of proposed expenditures which this Committee has examined and will also contain any resolutions the Committee has passed. A draft report will be circulated and I will seek a motion for its adoption a few minutes before 10 p.m. this evening.

Correctional Services, \$15 798 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr S. G. Evans
Mr G. F. Keneally
Mr G. R. A. Langley
Mr I. P. Lewis
Mr J. W. Olsen
Mr J. K. G. Oswald
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

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

Mrs P. Stevens, Ministerial Assistant, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr R. A. Henry, Administration Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

Mr I. J. Winton, Chief Administration Officer, Department of Correctional Services.

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

Mr KENEALLY: My question relates to the policy within the prison and the rights of prisoners. I refer to a letter I received dated 14 October 1981 from Mr Edward Splatt, who states:

Mr Griffin would not give Mr Cockburn permission to visit me in prison to discuss my case. He has finally agreed to let him visit me, but only on condition that we do not discuss the case. Just what is Mr Griffin afraid of? Mr Cockburn visited me last Tuesday for the first time since April 1979. We could not discuss the case. Actions of this type by an Attorney-General are really sick.

Mr OLSEN: On a point of order, I seek clarification about the comments of the honourable member. With which line of finance is he dealing? I refer to sessional order No. 3.

The CHAIRMAN: At this stage the honourable member's question has been entirely surrounding the Attorney-General. Tonight we are considering matters associated with correctional services, which comes under the administration of the Chief Secretary. In those circumstances I uphold the point of order raised by the member for Rocky River.

Mr KENEALLY: Mr Chairman, I think you have grasped the point—this is an area of responsibility of the Chief Secretary. Is it the Chief Secretary or the Attorney-General who makes the rules for prisoners in our labour prisons? Is it normal to censor visits to prisoners? What rights do the prisoners have to discuss matters freely with people who visit them?

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is asking whose responsibility it is to make a decision in relation to management, whether it is one Minister or the other. There is nothing in these lines to do with any payment of money that goes to the Ministers. That falls under another line. The honourable member has asked a question totally related to administration. I do not believe it has anything to do with the finance allocated in these lines. Therefore, Mr Chairman, I ask that you rule the question out of order.

Mr KENEALLY: People who exercise responsibility in prisons draw wages.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Stuart is asking the Chief Secretary whose responsibility it is.

Mr KENEALLY: And who exercises the censorship within the prisons. Obviously, officers of the Department of Correctional Services censor the discussion between prisoners and visitors. Is it the department's decision that its officers stop visitors from freely discussing matters with the prisoners? That involves the activity of an employee of the Department of Correctional Services, who would be included in the line 'Salaries and wages'.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair considers that it would be reasonable for the Chief Secretary to give the answer regarding who is responsible. I do not uphold the point of order raised by the member for Fisher.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The policy has not altered from that of the previous Government. Journalists were not allowed into the prisons. It is within the province of the Chief Secretary to say who goes in. Mr Cockburn has had some area of discussion with the inmate to whom the honourable member refers. It is not my policy that we should have journalists fighting the case of inmates through the media. This case is well known but, in recent times, Mr Cockburn was given the right or permission to visit Mr Splatt as a friend. The Attorney-General did have some correspondence, I think, with Mr Cockburn. I think Mr Cockburn found me a bit difficult to get on with, because I stood my ground about who visits the place. However, with that assurance (he is a kindly man), those are the conditions under which he sees Mr Splatt. In regard to who

directs policy within prisons, that is a matter for the Director. The running of prisons is a matter for the Director. Further, Mr Cockburn understood those terms of his permission.

Mr KENEALLY: The prisoner Mr Splatt can have visits from Mr Cockburn only on the condition that they do not discuss Mr Splatt's case? Is that the ruling that will be maintained?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Those are the conditions. Mr Cockburn indicated that he was happy to do that.

Mr KENEALLY: Can the Chief Secretary tell the Committee what the receipts are from prison industries, from workshops within the prisons, the prison farm at Cadell and the various gardens within the prison system? I seek figures which indicate the amount of produce consumed within the department and which obviously reduces the cost of running the department. I seek the value of the produce that is sold or disposed of to other Government departments and elsewhere. I seek accurate figures as to the value of the produce created by the department.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have some details here, and there are some qualifications which I am sure the honourable member would like. The proceeds of prison labour were estimated last year to be about \$600 000. The actual value was \$602 000 and the estimated sum for 1981-82 is \$585 000. In a breakdown, the sale of produce, trade shops, gardens and farms, \$250 000; a Commonwealth recoup, that is, Northern Territory prisoners, \$200 000; others are rents, plant sales and miscellaneous, \$135 000, which amounts to \$585 000. The footnote is that these levels are anticipated to remain much the same as those experienced in the previous financial year. The thrust of the question of the honourable was that some value was consumed by the inmates. That is not easy to quantify but I am going to ask Mr Stewart to comment.

Mr Stewart: The produce consumed within the various institutions is not charged against those institutions, except when it is transferred from one institution to another, for example, preserved fruits from Cadell, which may be transferred to another institution. Any produce grown and consumed within an institution is not charged in any way. We do not keep sufficient records of that produce to give a total figure for production in relation to that consumption.

Mr KENEALLY: Is it not good accounting for the Government to have these figures available to it? In my view, it is absolutely essential to have all of the input available to allow an accurate assessment to be made of the costing figures of a department's activities. One input in relation to cost in the Department of Correctional Services quite obviously is the produce institutions create and consume themselves. Obviously, those figures are not available. Will the Chief Secretary, as the Minister responsible, indicate whether or not he intends to ensure that these figures are available if a similar question is asked during next year's Estimates Committee hearings?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is always worth while if the productivity of various areas can be quantified. I am sure the honourable member will not be insensible to the staff that are available to the department. As I have already said (and I am sure my colleagues have said the same thing), I must stress the financial stringencies which apply at the moment. We have heard the member for Stuart on numerous occasions this afternoon asking why certain things were not being done. However, we are realistic. It would be ideal if everything could be tabulated, quantified and valued. I assure the honourable member that the dairy produce, fruit, vegetables and livestock grown on these properties makes a valuable contribution to the maintenance and running expenses of the various institutions. At the moment, we do

not have the resources to quantify those things, but I will bear the honourable member's comments in mind.

Mr KENEALLY: If the Chief Secretary and his officers have no idea about the quantity of produce that is created within correctional service institutions and if they have no idea of the quantity of produce consumed within those institutions, how can the department have any accurate control of the produce created within the department? If there has to be accountability, there must be accurate accounting. If the produce consumed within the department was a considerable quantity and its cost was added to the \$600 000 mentioned, it would come to over \$1 000 000. Does that amount of produce warrant very accurate accountability?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: All efforts are aimed at self-sufficiency in relation to productivity. Whilst that cuts down on the actual cost of running institutions, there is also the sale of surplus produce to which I have already referred. The sale of produce amounts to \$250 000. The rest of the produce is used in other institutions, so it is not lost.

Mr KENEALLY: Were the cannery's operations increased last year and, if so, to what extent? What increase in production took place in 1980-81, and to what extent will production increase this year?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am advised that cannery production in relation to fruit will remain much the same as production for last year. It is also proposed to move into vegetable production in 1981-82.

Mr EVANS: My first question relates to the annual net cost per prisoner in different institutions. Those figures are recorded in the Auditor-General's Report for the past three years. Documents supplied to members supply that information, but I would like to have it recorded in *Hansard*. What are the various net costs per prisoner anticipated for the year 1981-82, taking into account that in 1978-79 the average cost was \$9 554; in 1979-80, it was \$11 004; and in 1980-81, it was \$12 749? In relation to country gaols, for 1978-79 the cost was \$14 143; in 1979-80 the cost was \$14 797; and in 1980-81 the cost was \$17 987. The cost per prisoner for the Women's Rehabilitation Centre was \$20 411 for 1978-79; \$23 152 for 1979-80; and \$28 012 for 1980-81. The cost per prisoner for the Yatala Labour Prison was \$11 953 in 1978-79; \$13 412 in 1979-80; and \$17 057 for 1980-81. The cost per prisoner for the Cadell Training Centre was \$10 813 in 1978-79; \$11 102 in 1979-80; and \$11 783 for 1980-81. In relation to the general administration for each of those centres, the total cost in 1978-79 was \$619 675; in 1979-80 the cost was \$861 403; and in 1980-81 the cost was \$1 007 405.

Those figures indicate that the cost per prisoner at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre is considerably higher than the cost at any other institution throughout the State. There must be an explanation for that. The cost per prisoner in some institutions seems to be increasing at a higher rate than the normal inflation rate. I am seeking quite a lot of detail, so perhaps the Minister would prefer one of his advisers to comment. What is the reason for such an increase in some institutions as opposed to others? Why is the Women's Rehabilitation Centre so expensive per inmate? What are the estimated costs for 1981-82?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member has posed quite a deal of facts and figures, and it is not beyond the pale to get an answer for him. He has raised the question of the cost of the Women's Rehabilitation Centre and that would suggest that the girls are expensive. I may make a little aside there, Sir, and say that the Women's Rehabilitation Centre is very well run and very orderly and gives us no bother. Perhaps that is the price we have to pay; I do not know whether it is a straw in the wind. I will ask Mr Stewart, to comment.

Mr Stewart: A large portion of the cost of operating the institutions is taken up with salaries; in fact, about 75 per cent of the total cost is salaries and wages. With the increasing wage costs throughout the year and with not a very big increase in the prison population, although there has been a daily average increase in population during the past 12 months, the average cost per prisoner will rise. Concerning the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, I would imagine the increased cost per prisoner has been brought about largely by the increase in wages and the payment of additional overtime that might be required to take people to hospital, or some other venture like that.

It is expected that the cost per prisoner during the next 12 months will be somewhere in the region of the wage increase in the forthcoming 12 months averaged out over the prison population. I guess it is likely to be in the region of perhaps \$3 000 per prisoner if the wage increases continue to rise as they have in the past.

Regarding the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, you will notice that the daily average number of prisoners has been reduced by two, and that is probably fairly significant in a large total wage bill. The prison officers have had wage rises throughout the year. There has not been any increase in staff. If my memory serves me correctly, considerable overtime has probably been worked in relation to the institution.

Mr EVANS: My next question relates to prison staff and the cost of salaries and wages. I will read the figures only for 1980-81. The Auditor-General's Report for 1980-81 shows that head office amounted to \$669 531; probation and parole branch, \$1 439 115; Adelaide Gaol, \$2 057 588; country gaols, \$971 005; Women's Rehabilitation Centre, \$455 232; Yatala Labour Prison, \$4 118 340; Cadell Training Centre, \$707 403; a total of \$10 418 214. Has the Minister the budgeted amount for each of those institutions for the forthcoming year, or have we taken an overall budgetary figure allowing for some percentage increase?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The officers have a schedule that points out the costs for salaries and wages for the respective institutions. I will ask Mr Stewart to give that to the Committee.

Mr Stewart: The actual salaries and wages budgeted for the various sections of the department during the next year are in relation to administration, which takes into account Parole Board members' fees, Directors' salaries, Assistant Directors (Administration), probation and parole staff, terminal leave payments, and pay-roll tax, a total sum of \$2 833 200. The Adelaide Gaol salaries are \$2 331 000. The estimated salaries for country gaols are \$1 009 000; for the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, \$476 000; for the Yatala Labour Prison, \$4 497 000; for the Cadell Training Centre, \$734 000.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Stewart: That gives total salaries of \$11 880 200.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Stuart has the opportunity to ask questions, and while others are asking questions and the answers are being given it will aid the decorum of this Committee if the honourable member for Stuart and others remain quiet.

Mr EVANS: I think I said at the beginning of that question that this was something I wanted to record in *Hansard*. I know the information was available to me, but it is not available to the rest of the public. I wish to ask a further question of the Minister in relation to staffing. As of June 1980, in full-time equivalents the staff was 566, and in June 1981 it was 599. It is proposed to be 612. What does the Minister see on present planning as being the limit of the maximum that will be required in the

foreseeable future to operate our correctional service institutions? Are we reaching the stage where we have picked up the backlog which was not picked up in previous years, and have sufficient staff to manage the Department of Correctional Services effectively, or do we need to go on seeking an increasing number?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I do not know whether these figures equate the figures at page 198 of the yellow book, but the department's staff ceiling has increased from 572 to 619. Most of these 47 people have been employed as general duty and chief correctional officers. As well as the 47 additional officer positions being created in the department since June 1980, 26 additional promotional opportunities have been provided for the rank of Assistant Chief Correctional Officer, grade 1.

In August 1981, eight additional Chief Correctional Officer positions (five at Adelaide Gaol and three at Yatala Labour Prison) were created as a result of a detailed staffing review carried out by the Public Service Board and the department, with representation by the Public Service Association and the Australian Government Workers Association. Mr Stewart may like to comment further on that run-down of staffing in his institutions.

Mr Stewart: In response to the honourable member's question about further staffing in the future, a number of reports have been prepared for the department which indicate a necessity for additional staff to be appointed in the institutional and administrative areas. The degree to which we can provide this staffing will depend on the funding that is available. It has certainly been indicated in various reports that additional staffing ought to be appointed.

Mr EVANS: I ask the Minister what payments are made to our prisoners of the State.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Payments to prisoners are made under regulation 79 of the Prisons Act, which provides for a sum of money to be credited to all prisoners who perform work at a daily rate according to the skill of the work performed. The average working day for prisoners ranges from five hours to 12 hours. The present daily rates of pay are at the discretion of the supervising officers and graded. The base rate is \$1.10, \$1.20 and \$1.30 per day, the top rate being \$1.60. In addition, a bonus of up to 10c per hour worked may be paid on the recommendation of the supervising officer. The bonus system has been implemented to provide incentives and rewards for work well done.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As the Chief Secretary will remember, last year following the role that I played in exposing the shambles in this department, which subsequently led to a Royal Commission, he responded by imposing what I call a black ban on me. I am the only lawyer in South Australia, to my knowledge, who must get the Chief Secretary's permission before I can go and see persons in the prisons in this State. It has not been any great burden to me, because it simply meant that my secretary has—

Mr OLSEN: On a point of order, I seek clarification. The preamble (it is not a question yet) from the member for Elizabeth has very little to do with the Budget papers continued on pages 58, 59 and 60 and the Estimates of Payments put before the House and is not in accord with Sessional Order 3. The purpose of the Estimates Committee is to allow the Opposition an opportunity to question the Minister at the table specifically on financial matters of the State, not policy decisions.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. I listened very carefully to the question, which could relate to administration, and that does come under the lines of this vote. I therefore ask the member for Elizabeth to keep questioning in line with the vote.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed, I will. In fact, I was about to point out that the only inconvenience that this

has been to me is the fact that I have had to ask my secretary on a few occasions to telephone the Chief Secretary's administration officer to make the necessary arrangements. Never have I been refused permission to visit a prisoner. The only point of this black ban that I can see is to be a bloody nuisance.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I request that the honourable member not use language that is not in accord with the Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Its only point has been to be a bally nuisance and to cause difficulties. This thing links up with the Estimates, of course, because all this seems to have done is to cause further administration difficulties (minor as they might be) within the department, because it means that my secretary must telephone the Minister's administration officer. He no doubt then speaks to the Minister, who approves the matter. The administration officer then telephones the gaol and says, 'Expect a visit from Mr Duncan.' They then telephone my secretary back. She telephones the gaol and makes the necessary arrangements for me to visit. It is an extraordinary administration nightmare, I would have thought, which does not seem to have any purpose at all, except that, to my knowledge, I am the only lawyer in South Australia who is in this situation.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In the last hour, a certain amount of frivolity has developed in the precincts of the Committee. It is getting to the stage where vulgar comments are being thrown across the Chamber. I appeal to all members, as members of Parliament, to respect the precincts of this Chamber, the decorum of the Committee, and the very purpose why you have been chosen by members of the public to be here discussing these matters. I appeal to the Committee to bring its behaviour back in keeping with members of Parliament.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rest my case. To have been successful in the interests of the people of South Australia in assisting to set up this long needed Royal Commission, it seems that I personally must be disadvantaged in my dealings with the department, and it certainly disadvantages the department administratively.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am surprised to hear the honourable member, protesting about having to get permission, because all solicitors should get permission.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: They should, and they probably will be henceforth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: How many telephone calls have you had from lawyers—apart from myself, asking permission.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: How many have I had from you?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Every time that I have been there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has asked his question. I am giving the call to the honourable the Minister to answer the question and, if the member for Elizabeth has further questions, I will call him.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member does not always go as a solicitor to see his clients. He has some friends he wants to visit. Anyone else who wants to see a friend may make arrangements. The honourable member must surely know that. There were discussions about this. I appreciate that the honourable member was genuinely worried about some of the young people that he represented. When they were thought to be in some danger, as a result of the approaches that the honourable member made to me, we did ensure that they were given sanctuary in some safer area. Unfortunately, in the prisons we would like to

get on with a building programme that would give the authorities (I am sure the honourable member appreciates this, too) some segregation where we can keep people apart. I say here and now that it is not done in any way to put a black ban on the honourable member. I am sure that he knows that. The honourable member is only a young man himself, and I think he does himself a great discredit when he takes that view, because he knows, too, in his heart of hearts that that is not the case.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have been under this amazing delusion for the whole of the past 12 months that I needed to telephone the Minister's office every time that I wanted to see a client. Apparently, I did not have to do it at all. I am delighted to hear that there is no such thing as a black ban and that it is business as usual from now on, apparently.

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

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$3 305 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

The Hon. Peter Duncan
Mr S. G. Evans
Mr G. F. Keneally
Mr G. R. A. Langley
Mr I. P. Lewis
Mr J. W. Olsen
Mr R. J. Randall
The Hon. J. D. Wright

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr C. S. Morphett, Acting Chief Officer, South Australian Fire Brigade.

Mr B. K. Treagus, Acting Secretary, South Australian Fire Brigade.

Mrs P. Stevens, Ministerial Assistant, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr R. A. Henry, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

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

Mr KENEALLY: My question, which deals with the Fire Brigade, is a logistics one. Will the Minister tell the Committee what is the proposal for the Fire Brigade in relation to the Port Adelaide area and the placement of fire servicing depots there? Currently, I understand that there is a depot in Hall Street and that it was planned to replace that with a larger depot at Taperoo. The Cox Report recommended that an even larger depot should be built south of the Port Adelaide bridge. It has been put to me that, if that is the case, those volatile installations such as I.C.I., fuel tanks, etc., north of the bridge are at risk if the Port Adelaide bridge is up, allowing craft to pass along the Port River. It requires an additional five to eight minutes travel for vehicles crossing Jervis Street bridge. Will the Minister tell the Committee what the Government proposes to do with the Port Adelaide area fire services, and whether in its considerations it will take due account of the unique

problems that exist in Port Adelaide because of the volatile nature of the installations there and because of the road bridges that can be out so often to traffic?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is right. There are unique problems in Port Adelaide in relation to the need to supply fire services. The Cox Report recommended a number of metropolitan locations of fire stations. The matter was canvassed in the House by the member for Semaphore on two occasions. I probably answered in a frivolous way the second time around, as this map does not show provision for a fire station to be established on the Le Fevre Peninsula. Page 53 of the Cox Report indicates that a working party of selected Fire Brigade officers, representatives of officers and the Firefighting Association and a planning consultant be appointed to prepare a comprehensively phased programme for the rebuilding of the resources as illustrated on the map. It is anticipated that the area in question will be carefully considered by the working party, as will all other areas within the metropolitan area, before a final pattern of station placements can be obtained.

The first initiative to be taken in regard to the new restructuring of the Fire Brigade is to build the new headquarters in Adelaide. At the same time, there will be an ongoing examination of the needs of the suburbs. That was one of the great virtues of the Cox Report and was very attractive to the Government. Indeed, the Select Committee endorsed it. It does suggest some regrouping of a number of stations. I have considered the area which Mr Peterson raised in the House and which the honourable member now raises. With the bridge up there can be some anomalies. That area needs special attention.

The Fire Brigade is also looking at the relocation of a station on the perimeter on the other side. I may ask Mr Morphett to comment on that. Also, within the port itself the *Fire Queen* or the *Carlew* plays a part. The new tug company is looking at installing pumps on those new vessels in the Port River. I am conscious that on that side of the metropolitan area there is a need for a station. I will ask Mr Morphett to comment on fire services in the Port Adelaide area and on the location of a new station on the east side.

Mr Morphett: It is intended, as part of the Cox Report, to construct as one of the stations a metropolitan support station, as he calls it, at Port Adelaide which will be quite a bit larger than the existing station. It is planned to concentrate at that base a lot of appliances that are in and around Port Adelaide. We are looking carefully at the moment, and certainly will be doing so when this Committee is appointed, at the possible need for a fire station on the Le Fevre Peninsula. We are looking at a site at Taperoo in case this is necessary. Prior to the Cox Report we had taken steps to acquire land in Taperoo on the corner of Stratfield Terrace. The time trials that will be conducted as part of the Cox Report implementation will take into account the possibility of bridge problems, and so on, as well as the time trial, given a smooth run in that area.

Mr LANGLEY: I refer to the provision of a helicopter service. I notice that we have received from the Minister information on the helicopter sponsored by Channel 10 and the Wales. I think that that is the helicopter concerned, although I could be wrong. There is an allocation of \$270 000. What part do Channel 10 and the Wales play in that matter? Who bought the helicopter, and what has happened concerning it? Although I received a letter, I have never been able to find out from the Minister what help they have given in this matter. It is widely advertised, and I do not doubt that it is doing a good job in this area. Can the Minister say what steps are being taken?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I have some information for the honourable member. There is provision for a full-time helicopter rescue and emergency service in conjunction with commercial sponsors. The service is utilised by the Health Department, the police, St John, C.F.S. and the Surf Life-saving Association.

It is now in its second year of a three-year contract with Lloyd Helicopters. The commercial sponsorship with the Bank of New South Wales, 5AA and Channel 10 is renewed for a second year of operation. The combined allocation from those three sponsors is \$80 000.

Mr RANDALL: My question relates to the number of standard motor vehicles in the fire brigade. Can the Minister say how many motor vehicles in the fire brigade are for personal use of officers as well as for departmental use?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Mr Morphett can give an indication, but for a comprehensive and detailed answer we will have to get some information.

Mr Morphett: The situation is that many of our senior staff who are on daily duties are required to be able to return immediately should they be so summoned. For this reason many of our senior officers have the use of a car virtually at all times. I cannot give an exact number. I will be able to arrange that tomorrow, if that is satisfactory to the honourable member. The purpose behind it is that these people are immediately available on radio, wherever they may be, to return to a fire scene if it is required; it very often is.

Mr RANDALL: I seek a point of clarification. If the information is provided to the Committee tomorrow, will it be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Olsen): It will be brought up in the House on the same basis as a reply to a question without notice.

Mr RANDALL: Included in those figures can I have the positions of the officers who have the use of the motor vehicles? Recently I served on a Select Committee looking at the fire brigade, as the Acting Chief and the Minister would know. One of the things to come out of the committee was to be the upgrading of the fire alarm equipment. I wonder whether anything has been put in train yet; perhaps it is too early. The Cox Report recommended that a Mr Fred Angas, who was the engineering staff member and who was retiring, should be retained on a consultancy basis. Has Mr Fred Angas been consulted since he retired?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will ask Mr Morphett to comment on that in a moment. The Bill has been passed, assent has been given, but it has not been proclaimed. We are setting in motion arrangements for the building of the new headquarters and for the other parameters which are recommended in the Cox Report. We are looking at a five-year capital plan, and that will be included.

Mr Morphett: There has been a Communications Committee set up for some time within the brigade that does have this problem on its agenda. It is an on-going subject. We are finding it compulsory to change, because of the outdated type of communications system we have. Telecom will not allow us to extend that out-dated system, so that we are forced to place new communications systems in our stations as they become necessary.

The latest example of this is the new Gawler station which has just been occupied by our brigade, and has been installed with a system known as the Deltex system. This is the first of our suburban stations to be fitted with that updated system. This will be an on-going system. When headquarters is established, either that system or one compatible to it will be installed.

Mr RANDALL: I understand there will be training facilities incorporated in the new building. Have any discussions been held with the prospect of joint funding with the

Country Fire Services for those training facilities and sharing the country facilities with the new Fire Brigade Commission?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask Mr Morphett to reply to that.

Mr Morphett: Training in the use of breathing apparatus and other types of training have always been available to the C.F.S. They are available at the moment. I have a comprehensive list of C.F.S. stations which have availed themselves of our facilities and expertise. This will continue when the new building is built.

Mr LANGLEY: Years ago the South Australian Fire Brigade most probably had many league footballers who were part and parcel of the fire brigade. I see that physical fitness is an area that is taken into consideration when people become firemen. Does physical fitness play an important part in the choice of applicants?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Firemen are extremely fit people. I will ask Mr Morphett to answer that.

Mr Morphett: Yes, physical fitness is of paramount importance in the fire service. Probably no other service needs to consider physical fitness more than does the fire brigade. It certainly plays a big part in our selection methods. Once a person joins the brigade he is given every opportunity to maintain his fitness. The onus is placed on the individual to maintain his own fitness but every effort is made to assist him while he is on duty along with the other areas of training he must involve himself in. Physical fitness is certainly a prominent part.

Mr EVANS: My question is similar to the question by the member for Unley. Can the Minister say whether, as the result of the information obtained by the Select Committee that inquired into the Fire Brigade, any change has been made or is being considered to any part of the procedures relating to new recruits to the brigade? Are applicants asked whether they are prepared to sign a statutory declaration indicating any criminal offence (I am not worried about any other offence) that they may have committed or, as an alternative, whether applicants object to brigade officers (they could even give permission) going to the police to determine whether the applicant has any criminal record in the country? In other States such a situation occurs in either of those forms (it varies in different States). We have an excellent record in regard to brigade personnel in this State. The brigade can be proud of its record of honesty. However, if a bad recruit was accepted and was called to a fire in, say, a jewellery shop or a fire involving private property, he could possibly bring discredit to the total brigade. So far, the brigade has not carried out this practice. Has any change taken place or been considered in this area?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The matter raised by the honourable member was discussed in evidence taken interstate. It is a good point. Only three or four weeks have passed since the Bill was given assent and it has not yet been proclaimed. The present board will continue until the new corporation comes into effect. I have not canvassed the matter with the board or the Chief Officer. Perhaps the Chief Officer may comment for the benefit of the Committee.

Mr Morphett: Management views with great concern the need for honesty and the establishment of an honest record as a necessity for anyone who joins the brigade. Going back through history, it was recognised that every man's record was examined. Unfortunately, from the point of view of the brigade's management, this was curtailed when certain legislation was introduced which forbade records being searched. Since that time we have only been able to rely on the word of individuals. Personally, I welcome the consideration that such an agreement be signed by all our new recruits when

they sign on. I hope such a system will be implemented.

Mr RANDALL: Although I indicated earlier that I had further questions on this matter, as there is only one hour to go and there are several other areas still to be covered, I have no further questions.

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

Fisheries, \$2 383 000

Chairman:

Mr E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr S. G. Evans
Mr G. F. Keneally
Mr G. R. A. Langley
Mr I. P. Lewis
Mr J. W. Olsen
Mr H. H. O'Neill
Mr R. J. Randall
Mr G. T. Whitten

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. A. Stevens, Director, Department of Fisheries.
Mr R. J. Green, Senior Administration Officer, Department of Fisheries.
Mr R. A. Henry, Administrative Officer, Chief Secretary's Office.

Mr KENEALLY: My question concerns abalone and the Government's undertaking when in Opposition that it would allow abalone permits to be sold. Reports have been received that these authorities have now been sold for up to \$150 000 each. This report comes from the *Sydney Morning Herald* as well as from some fishermen in the industry. Apart from the fact that divers seemed to be selling authorities (which they received for nothing from the Government) for \$150 000, the high premium reflects high profits in what is a highly restricted and regulated fishery. What is the Government's attitude to the provision of windfall profits in this case?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is a commercial transaction between a willing buyer and a willing seller. It is a matter between those two people. We do not interfere in that transaction. There is no socialism in our policy.

Mr KENEALLY: Can the Minister tell the Committee how many abalone authorities have been sold since the policy was changed?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not sure—about five or six. We will get the authentic figure.

Mr KENEALLY: How many authorities are there in South Australia at present?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: There are 35 authorities.

Mr KENEALLY: Do I understand that immediately the policy has been changed at the request of abalone fishermen, five or six have immediately disposed of their authorities for sums of \$150 000? Does this not concern the Minister? Should he not explain to the Committee how such huge profits have been made?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: When discussing the fee and the commercial transaction, the figure is a matter that is confidential between the seller and the buyer. As the honourable member asks for details, I will ask the Director to comment.

Mr Stevens: As the Minister stated, the transaction between the purchaser and the seller of the authority is a confidential matter between them and the department. There is a fee charged on abalone divers—2½ per cent of the gross value of production.

Mr KENEALLY: Is the Government concerned about the effect that these high prices will have on the incomes of those abalone divers who are now paying this sort of entrance fee to the fishery? Surely the Minister appreciates that, if a fisherman has to pay a premium of \$150 000 or the like to enter a restricted industry such as the abalone fishery, this places extreme pressure on that fisherman not only to make a normal living but to service his capital investment. Is the Government concerned about fishermen who now have to pay \$150 000 to enter the abalone fishery and service that capital investment?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I presume that an incoming buyer is not altogether a dude at business transactions, if he paid that price. Obviously he will have done his sums; it is a business transaction. At the moment there does not appear to be any pressure on the industry, but we are certainly not issuing any more permits.

Mr KENEALLY: Is it not strange that in an industry where the participants have been stating that it is a failing industry which needs greater protection that, immediately they are able to sell their authorities, they can command a sum of \$150 000? Does that not indicate that there must either be something wrong in relation to the information held by the Government or that the fishermen are tending to mislead the authorities about the viability of the abalone industry?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The honourable member is basing that on his assertion that \$150 000 has been paid for an abalone authority. Can the honourable member authenticate his assertion?

Mr KENEALLY: That sum was reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald*. I do not have the cutting with me but I will obtain it for the Minister. Is the Minister saying that a figure of \$150 000 for an abalone authority is fictitious? Are the Minister and his Director, who well know the going price for an abalone authority, suggesting that this information is not known to them? If the Minister wants authentication I can obtain it for him, but I do not have it with me at the moment. The Minister knows, as well as I do, that the figure I have mentioned is correct.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not doubting the honourable member, but we require something more, as authentication, than a cutting from the *Sydney Morning Herald*. I ask the Director to comment, because he is very close to the fishery.

Mr Stevens: In relation to the question raised by the honourable member, abalone divers are required under managed fishery regulations to declare the transfer fee. I am not aware of any amount of \$150 000 or anything like that being paid. Certainly, no such amount has been declared to the Fisheries Department as being the transfer fee.

Mr Blacker: In relation to law enforcement, has there been an increase in the number of fisheries officers, and what is their classification and wage and salary structure?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will make some preliminary comments before asking Mr Green to comment. This year's estimate provides an increase of \$116 000 and an average staffing level of 89. The anticipated cost is as follows: executive, \$70 000; management, \$69 000; licensing, \$128 000; law enforcement, \$356 000; research, \$499 000; and administration, \$200 000. Mr Green will now comment.

Mr Green: During last financial year, seven new fisheries officers joined the staff in January. The \$356 000 in this year's estimates for law enforcement includes provision for

about 28 law enforcement officers out of an establishment of 30.

Mr Blacker: I ask that question because I am rather concerned that the increase is not very significant when compared to the previous allocation. I believe that these fisheries officers are relatively poorly paid. Is a salary level fixed for these officers?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to Mr Green.

Mr Green: Unfortunately, I do not have those details before me at the moment, but I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr Blacker: Is any research scheme or proposal under way to try to capitalise on the 200-mile offshore economic fishing zone?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: There is on-going research in this area by the C.S.I.R.O. The Director will enlarge on that.

Mr Stevens: The C.S.I.R.O. research vessel, *Sorela*, has done a number of research cruises from Western Australia right around to Queensland. Each of these cruises has resulted in information being collected in the 200-mile zone off South Australia. It will take some time for this information to be tabulated and written up in a form that will be of value to the department. Apart from that, the department has not undertaken any research of its own, although a number of fishermen have done so, particularly one in Port Lincoln who is operating a vessel known as *The Seeker*. He is intending to get involved in long-lining for tuna and other fish. We hope to gain information from that research.

Mr Blacker: The Director's comments are specifically directed to long-lining for tuna. Is any effort being directed to other species of fish or any other type of fishing?

Mr Stevens: Apart from drop-lining off the South-East

coast, in which a number of fishermen have indicated interest, I am not aware of any specific research being undertaken in the 200-mile zone by commercial trawlers. I am aware that a number of tuna vessels are interested in mid-water and deep-water trawling. As far as I am aware, the results have not been all that encouraging.

Mr Blacker: Is there any known response or effect continuing through the fishing industry as a result of the lifting of the freeze on Commonwealth tuna licences? Has there been a flood of vessels into the industry that could affect the potential of tuna fishing in South Australia?

Mr Stevens: In evidence given before the Senate Inquiry into the Australian Fishing Industry, I indicated that, following the Minister for Primary Industry's lifting of the freeze, there were certainly quite a few South Australian fishermen interested in pole and live-baiting for tuna. As I understand it, there are no new large vessels, certainly between 20 and 32 metres, being built or licensed in Australia, apart from *The Seeker*, to undertake tuna fishing. However, the lifting of the freeze has certainly resulted in a large number of rock-lobster fishermen indicating a willingness and an interest to put live bait and pole machines on their vessels and partake in the tuna fishery. They will be working more in the in-shore areas than in areas in which the larger fleets would not normally work, but they will be catching some of the proportion of southern blue fin tuna stock.

Mr KENEALLY: Referring again to abalone, there appears to be a discrepancy between figures from the Fisheries Department's assessment of profitability of the fishery and those obtained from fishermen and Safcol. Figures supplied by the Fisheries Department for 1979-80 show the profitability and catch as follows (*Safic* August 1981, p. 30):

Southern Zone		Central Zone		Western Zone		Total	
Catch	Value	Catch	Value	Catch	Value	Catch	Value
('000 kg)	(\$'000)	('000 kg)	(\$'000)	('000 kg)	(\$'000)	('000 kg)	(\$'000)
110	298	171	462	514	1 388	795	2 148
	(\$2.71 kg)		(\$2.70 kg)		(\$2.70 kg)		(\$2.70 kg)

These prices are approximated on the basis that abalone in the shell weigh three times shucked abalone. Abalone are sold shucked in the western and central zones and in the shell in the southern zone. Catch figures are adjusted to 'in shell' quantities. Thus, the price for 1979-80 is quoted at \$8.13 and \$8.10 kg for shelled abalone.

A check with Safcol on 9 October 1981 gave the following prices for abalone: green small \$13.50 kg; black small \$12.50 kg. The price given in Fisheries Department figures is between \$4 and \$5 a kg less than the reported price for abalone over the past 18 months, when it has been relatively constant at between \$12 to \$15 a kg. Thus the market price appears to be about 50 per cent higher than the Fisheries Department figures would indicate.

The ramifications of this understatement of the profitability of the abalone fishery are important and well known to the Minister and the Director. By understating the profitability of the fishery, the divers and the Government can sustain an argument that the fishery is unable to stand any further effort (that is, any more authorities), thereby protecting the profits and premiums for those divers already in the industry. Will the Minister investigate these matters?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Yes, Mr Chairman, I certainly will.

Mr KENEALLY: Is the Minister aware and therefore concerned that the possibility of the abalone fishery is being understated?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It is a matter we will investigate, subject to details and data the honourable member has given the Committee.

Mr KENEALLY: Could the Minister give a report to the Committee as to the current situation in the St Vincent Gulf and Investigator Strait prawn fisheries? The Minister is well aware of the matters I raised in Parliament recently, and I wonder whether the Minister can now give an up-to-date report of the viability of the operatives in both the St Vincent Gulf and Investigator Strait fisheries.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Following discussions between the Commonwealth and industry (as represented by AFIC), the Government determined that the key question in resolving the matter was the long-term viability and production of both the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and the Investigator Strait prawn fishery. There were indications that Gulf St Vincent already had too many boats, and the same argument also applied to Investigator Strait. The one obvious factor is that there is inadequate information on the long-term viability of the two areas for prawn fishing. In these circumstances, the Government felt that no action should be taken at present to merge the two fisheries until the viability of the total fishery has been assessed and the Commonwealth has acted to rationalise operations in Investigator Strait. I emphasise that Investigator Strait is Commonwealth waters.

Mr KENEALLY: Has the Minister looked at the possibility of allowing fishermen in the Investigator Strait fishery

to participate in the Spencer Gulf fishery?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: No.

Mr KENEALLY: Because the Spencer Gulf fishery is a much more lucrative fishery than that of the St Vincent Gulf. The figures I could give the Minister would clearly indicate that. If he is not prepared to look at merging the Investigator Strait prawn fishery with the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery why is he looking at merging the Investigator Strait fishery with a much less viable fishery in St Vincent Gulf?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We acknowledge that the merging must follow a plan to rationalise boats in Investigator Strait and look at some long-term viability of the fishery. I do not know whether Spencer Gulf is a better fishery, but it is a better managed fishery. We would be in big trouble if we decided to put some more boats in there.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister would be aware that the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishery averages \$97 000, while the average gross return for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery is \$223 000. Is the Minister telling the Committee that the reason for that difference is that the Spencer Gulf fishery is better managed than is the St Vincent Gulf fishery? If so, what does he mean by better management?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The Director has some specific details. I must say that the Spencer Gulf fishery was in an unfortunate state some years ago. A successful plan of management was embarked on. I do not think those people should be penalised now. There is now a plan of management in St Vincent Gulf, but I will ask the Director to comment further on the matters the honourable member raises.

Mr Stevens: We have undertaken quite extensive research in the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery with the active co-operation of the fishermen. In fact, the degree of trust and co-operation between the fishermen in Spencer Gulf is quite astounding. It has resulted in our being able to implement management measures in that fishery which have been to the benefit of not only the fishermen but also the State as a whole.

We have not had the same degree of co-operation and trust in the Gulf St Vincent fishery at this time, although three representatives of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishermen's Association attended the recent workshop for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery. They recognised very clearly the obvious advantages that can be gained from co-operating with the department in researching and surveying the gulf, and, in fact, bringing in more direct closures that could result in a far better return from the fishery.

The fishermen have indicated through their President, Mr Justice, that they will co-operate with the department, first, in organising a juvenile prawn programme for the gulf and, subsequently, surveying the whole gulf to determine areas that should be closed off at the appropriate time to bring about a better size of prawn that can be caught from the fishery. I should point out that the returns from Gulf St Vincent for the first six months of this year were 60 per cent up on those for the first six months of last year.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out at this stage that the Committee has a further life of 30 minutes, and that there are five other votes. I leave it in the hands of the Committee. Has the member for Stuart quite a number of questions?

Mr KENEALLY: I would have liked to follow up a number of areas, but I am prepared to take only one more line of questioning so that my colleague can ask questions about marine and harbors.

The West Coast prawn fishery is proving to be a good commercial proposition, and the three authority holders are doing extremely well. However, there is growing evidence to suggest that they are understating their catches in order

to conceal the prosperity of the fishery.

The reasons for this are that high returns to the Fisheries Department would provide a strong case for the issue of further authorities for the fishery; fees are presently based on a percentage of the value of the catch so lower catches mean lower fees; and, with only three fishermen working the resource, the Taxation Department would obviously begin to ask questions if the total returns for the fishery were very high.

The three fishermen involved process their catch through the factory belonging to Mr Con Paul. Thus, catch and processing figures can be made to tally. A fisherman who has been skipper of the *Cavalier* (owned by Mr Con Paul) has provided the following catch figures for that vessel:

	kg
July 1980	3 846
August	4 750
September	6 140
October	4 500
November	7 500
December	9 200
January 1981	10 950
Total	46 880

Value at \$5 per kg equals \$234 430 or \$33 900 per month.

These figures do not correspond with the returns provided to the Fisheries Department. *SAFIC* (August 1981) shows Total Returns for the West Coast Fishery for 1979-80 as 62 000 kg, valued at \$267 000.

In spite of this evidence and other information made available by fishermen, the Fisheries Department so far has refused to carry out any investigation of this matter. I suggest that the false returns are making a mockery of fisheries management. Will the Minister say whether he is aware of the allegations that are being made and whether he will instigate an investigation into the matters that I have raised here tonight?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am aware of some wild allegations that have been made, and some conflicting allegations have been made to me. Regarding the west coast prawn fishery, stocks continue their recovery. This may be one of the few prawn fisheries in the world (perhaps the only one) to recover from a virtual stock collapse. The Government would proceed very cautiously in adjusting effort in this fishery. Further research will be carried out on this fishery in the coming season.

The honourable member has asked me to make a specific investigation into the figures which, I understood him to say, were given by Mr Paul, a skipper of the vessel.

Mr KENEALLY: Yes.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Did the skipper indicate why different catches were given to the department? He would not, I suppose.

Mr KENEALLY: No, he thought that we were probably intelligent enough to realise that.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I ask the Director to comment further on this matter.

Mr Stevens: There is a regulation under the Fisheries Act that requires people to submit accurate statistical returns within 15 days of the end of the month. The figures that the honourable member has supplied indicate that the skipper has in fact committed an offence against the Fisheries Act. Is that correct?

Mr KENEALLY: Am I to understand that the Director is asking me whether the skipper has offended against the Fisheries Act? I rather thought that that would be his and the Minister's responsibility to determine.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it the Director has suggested that there is a difference in figures.

Mr KENEALLY: Sure.

The CHAIRMAN: If that is the case—

Mr KENEALLY: Investigate it.

Mr Stevens: We surely will.

Mr Blacker: I noted that the Minister was going to obtain figures on the viability of the respective prawn fishing zones, particularly in relation to the \$97 000 gross average income of the Investigator Strait and St Vincent's Gulf fisheries, and the average of \$223 000 for Spencer Gulf. In making the analysis of those figures, will the Minister take into account the size and nature of the fishery areas undertaken, and the crew size compared to respective fishing operations? I contend that, because it is more of an offshore fishery, it is necessary to have larger vessels involved.

Getting back to abalone, will the Minister indicate whether or not there is a likelihood of a viable roeii abalone industry and also whether there is any future in the marketing of the abalone shell, which was a lucrative sideline to the abalone industry some time ago?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: In his question the member for Flinders indicated that we were going to an investigation on Spencer Gulf as well. Is that right?

Mr Blacker: I understood that there was an undertaking to look at the viability of the respective prawn zones.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: We are looking at the viability of Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait. It has been done in conjunction with the Commonwealth. I did not say anything about Spencer Gulf.

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

Works and Services—Department of Fisheries,
\$937 000—examination declared completed.

Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous,
\$98 000—examination declared completed.

Marine and Harbors, \$15 917 000

Chairman:
Mr E. K. Russack

Members:
Mr S. G. Evans
Mr G. F. Keneally
Mr G. R. A. Langley
Mr I. P. Lewis
Mr J. W. Olsen
Mr H. H. O'Neill
Mr R. J. Randall
Mr G. T. Whitten

Witness:

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

Departmental Advisers:

Mr K. R. Freeman, Director—Administration, Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr R. F. Kinnane, Acting Director-General, Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr J. M. Jenkin, Director—Commercial, Department of Marine and Harbors.

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

Mr O'NEILL: Before I ask a question, I want to express my disgust at the way in which this has been handled. There are now 21 minutes left for this Committee to examine—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the member for Florey that the length of time taken for each vote is in the hands of the Committee. If the honourable member is reflecting on the Chair in the handling of the Committee, I do not accept that. I point out to the honourable member that it is purely in the hands of the Committee in regard to the time that a vote takes.

Mr O'NEILL: It just shows what a farce these Committees are, if that is the case, because we are now considering a vote of \$15 000 000—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the honourable member for Florey to order. These Committees have been discussed by the House of Assembly, and every member had the opportunity to speak in the debate. A decision has been made by that House, and it is not for us at this stage to reflect on that decision. As it is so late, and the honourable member is complaining about that, I suggest that, if he wishes to make use of every minute, he ask his question and seek the information that he requires.

Mr O'NEILL: I would be remiss in my Parliamentary duties and my duties to the people who work in the departments that are now under discussion if I did not seek to get on record the fact that we are now allowed 20 minutes to discuss the vote for this department. The member for Henley Beach laughed a moment ago, and thought that it was funny.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I bring to the attention of the honourable member that in the House of Assembly there will be an opportunity for discussion on the report from this Committee. I suggest to the honourable member that that will be the time when he will have the opportunity to bring these matters to the House.

Mr O'NEILL: I defer to your ruling, Sir, because, if I do not, you will probably take the avenues that are open to you. In respect of the department, which we will not have time to examine in any depth at all, I want to concentrate on one issue that I know is of considerable concern to the many people who work in the department at the Glanville dockyard. On 27 August last the Minister, in answer to a question, said:

The H. C. Meyer [that is the dredge] must be refurbished. These matters are being examined by experts.

We now know that the Minister misled the House on that occasion because the *H. C. Meyer* is not going to be refurbished. In accordance with a Ministerial statement made at a later date, he indicated that the dredge the *A.D. Victoria* had been purchased for \$1 500 000, and that this decision had been made after detailed consideration was given to the alternative, which was to refurbish the *H. C. Meyer* at a cost of \$3 700 000. Despite the assurance by the Minister in August last year that the *H. C. Meyer* would be refurbished, we now find that the Government is not going to refurbish it. Is it proposed to sell the *H. C. Meyer* to an operator or an engineering firm which intends to refurbish it and then put it back into operation in South Australian waters?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: That is a specific question I will come to. Let me say this—

Mr O'NEILL: I hope you are not too long in coming to it. There are about 400 more questions we want to ask.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Regarding the question, the capital expenditure estimates for 1981-82 include—

Mr O'NEILL: On a point of order, Sir. The member for Henley Beach seems to think that this is very hilarious. He

is sitting over there laughing. If he cannot contain himself would you ask him to leave the Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Florey must accept that the Chair has control of the Committee.

Mr O'NEILL: Exercise it.

The CHAIRMAN: As far as I am concerned the member for Henley Beach has not uttered a word. I take no point of order.

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I ask whether the comment by the member for Florey was a reflection upon the Chair when you stated that the Committee was in control and under your power and he said, 'Exercise it'.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable member for Florey make that statement?

Mr O'NEILL: It was a request, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable member for Florey make the statement as suggested by the honourable member for Fisher?

Mr O'NEILL: No Sir, I made a request.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member for Fisher repeat what he said?

Mr EVANS: Mr Chairman, you stated that it was under your power to control the Committee and the member for Florey said, 'Exercise it'.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable member say that?

Mr O'NEILL: I said, 'Exercise it', in the terms of a request, Sir; no disrespect.

The CHAIRMAN: If that was the case, I ask the honourable member for Florey to withdraw the statement.

Mr O'NEILL: I will withdraw it if you so request, Sir.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: The capital expenditure estimates for 1981-82 include an amount of \$1 500 000 for purchase of the dredge *A.D. Victoria* and \$300 000 for essential repairs to bring the dredge to a proper standard. It is acknowledged that the bucket band operation is noisy and that maintenance of the buckets is expensive. To overcome these problems, it is intended to provide during 1982-83 a completely new and lubricated bucket band estimated to cost \$700 000. These factors were taken into account in the economic assessment of the alternatives of purchasing the *A.D. Victoria* versus rehabilitating the *H. C. Meyer*. The department is satisfied that the *A.D. Victoria* will meet the department's requirements in future years and that its purchase is a far more economical proposition than rehabilitation of the *H. C. Meyer*. The honourable member asked whether we are going to sell the *H. C. Meyer*. I refer that part of the question to Mr Kinnane.

Mr Kinnane: At the present time no decision has been made regarding the future of the *H. C. Meyer*. It has some value as a floating platform. There are a number of spare parts and mechanical parts which are still in working order, and the department is assessing whether some of those components could be used in other floating plant. When this assessment is complete, in all probability the floating platform or the hull of the *H. C. Meyer* will be disposed of by public tender.

Mr O'NEILL: The Minister just said that there will be an allocation in 1982-83 for the purchase of a new bucket band for the *A.D. Victoria*. I presume that that means there will be no new bucket band put on the *A.D. Victoria* between now and 1982-83 and, as it will be included in those Estimates, it will be well into the latter part of that year before it is carried out. Can the Minister say what is the maintenance bill per month to maintain the bucket band on the *A.D. Victoria*? How much is it costing the department to maintain that bucket band now?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As this question involves mechanical aspects, I will ask Mr Kinnane to comment.

Mr Kinnane: I do not have with me the exact mainte-

nance costs of the bucket band on the *A.D. Victoria*. It is acknowledged that the wear of the bucket band is high and that much welding and replacement of pins and bushes is necessary. This is one of the reasons why the department is proceeding with the design of a new band which, hopefully, will be a quieter and much better wearing band.

Mr O'NEILL: I imagine that in the financial assessment undertaken at great depth into the relative costs of refurbishing the *H. C. Meyer* and purchasing the *A.D. Victoria*, an assessment must have been made of the approximate figure allowed for maintenance on the bucket band on the *A.D. Victoria* from the time it became the department's property until a new band is placed on it. What will be the situation during the period that the *A.D. Victoria* goes through this change?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: As we do not have that detail with us, we will obtain that detail for the honourable member.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister will take it on notice?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: Yes.

Mr O'NEILL: There is another part to that question. How long will the *A.D. Victoria* be out of service while the new bucket band is put on?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will ask Mr Kinnane to comment.

Mr Kinnane: It is anticipated that the new bucket band will be cast and constructed prior to the annual refitting of the *A.D. Victoria* and that the band will be fitted during that annual refit. Consequently, there should not be any loss of service by the dredge in those circumstances.

Mr O'NEILL: Are we to understand that the annual refit takes place at the end of each year?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to Mr Kinnane.

Mr Kinnane: There will be some refitting of the dredge in December-January. A hull survey is required at that time and some refitting will take place then. Additional work will be required subsequent to that. I cannot say exactly when the fitting of the band will take place, because the process of developing and designing the band has only just begun.

Mr O'NEILL: In relation to surveys, is it correct that Lloyds surveyors have expressed concern about the condition of the hull of the *A.D. Victoria*?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I am not aware of that. I ask Mr Kinnane to comment.

Mr Kinnane: I am not aware of any concern expressed by Lloyds surveyors. The hull was due for survey in June. Lloyds surveyors were requested to extend the life of the survey until a more convenient time, namely December this year. They had no hesitation in granting that extension. To the best of my knowledge they are not at all concerned about the condition of the hull.

Mr O'NEILL: To return to maintenance of the existing bucket band on the *A.D. Victoria*, is it correct that the Marine and Harbors Department has been carrying out maintenance on that bucket band for some time? If so, how much has it been costing the department to maintain it each month?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I put that question on notice.

Mr RANDALL: My electorate takes in a seaside district in the metropolitan area. Some concern has been expressed over the years by seaside councils regarding the maintenance of jetties. Do any local metropolitan city councils lease any jetties?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to Mr Freeman.

Mr Freeman: At the present time no metropolitan councils lease jetties.

Mr RANDALL: Do any local councils contribute towards the maintenance of local jetties?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to Mr Freeman.

Mr Freeman: Not at the present time.

Mr RANDALL: It has been mooted amongst councils that the department may be handing over the maintenance of local jetties to local councils, especially because there seems to be an increasing demand from within the community for other uses of local jetties. By 'other uses' I refer to some elaborate ideas that have been put forward to both local councils and no doubt to the Minister of Marine. Does the department intend handing over the maintenance and responsibility of local jetties to local councils?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I refer that question to Mr Freeman.

Mr Freeman: The existing policy on recreational jetties was ratified by the present Government in July last year, which was really a ratification of the policy of the previous Government, whereby recreational jetties would initially be upgraded to an acceptable standard at the Government's expense. They would then be leased to local councils with future maintenance to be shared between Government and councils on an 80/20 basis (80 per cent Government and 20 per cent councils). That is the present policy and I am unaware of any proposals to amend that policy.

Mr O'NEILL: I understand the spare parts for the *H. C. Meyer* were held at the Glanville dockyard. Is it correct that some of them have been removed recently? If so, to where have they been removed, and is it the intention to remove all the spare parts for the *H. C. Meyer* from the dockyard? Where have they been moved to, and what is the reason for moving them?

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I will ask the Acting Director if he can answer the question.

Mr Kinnane: As I indicated earlier, a decision has yet to be made about the *H. C. Meyer* itself and the spare parts associated with it. I am certainly not aware that any spare parts have been removed. No instructions have been given to move them. We have prepared an answer to a question the honourable member asked in Parliament some time ago regarding the value of the spare parts. They are still in the dockyard where they have been kept for many years.

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

Works and Services—Department of Marine and Harbours, \$11 840 000—examination declared completed.

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$760 000—examination declared completed.

Mr EVANS: I move:

That the draft report, as circulated, be the report of the Committee.

Members will notice that the report mentions all the items that have been considered by the Committee, plus the only resolution agreed to by the Committee, and I believe they are the only matters that should be properly included in the report.

Mr KENEALLY: I understand that the Committee has no option but to agree to the report that has been prepared. Can you assure the Opposition members of the Committee that the Opposition's position on the resolution, which is part of this motion and which we find somewhat objectionable, will be clearly shown in the minutes of the proceedings so that anybody who wishes to refer to them can see that that motion was not passed without severe objection? If we can have that assurance we will see the motion go through. We will not vote against the motion, but we want our objections to it noted.

The CHAIRMAN: Apart from the *Hansard* report, there will be a supplement of the motions and the votes of the Committee on those matters.

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: That completes the Committee's deliberations.

At 10 p.m. the Committee concluded.